PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

E

SSION

ERRATA.

In the speech of Mr. Jennings, on page 275, the 38th and 39th lines should be deleted, and the following substituted therefor: "At Greenspond, a place of about 1,375."

TWENTY-THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1914

ROBINSON & COMPANY, LIMITED, PRESS
Duckworth Street, St. John's, Newfoundland.
1914.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

SESSION 1914

WEDNESDAY, Jan 14. 1914.

Upon the fourteenth day of January, A.D., 1914, the members returned for the several districts, assembled at two o'clock in the afternoon and between the hours of two and three of the clock the members, with the exception of the Rt. Ho.n Sir Robert Bond, P.C., K.C.M.G., appeared in the Council Chamber and took and subscribed the oath of allegiance before the Honourables John Harris, George Skelton and Robert K. Bishop, the commissioners of His Excellency the Governor, thereto appointed.

At three of the clock, the members being assembled in the Assembly Room, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod delivered a message from H.E. the Governor requesting the attendance of the members in the Council Chamber, where His Excellency's commission having been read by the Clerk, the commissioners signified that the members should forthwith return to their own chamber and elect a proper person to be their Speaker, and present such person to His Excellency on to-morrow in the Council Chamber at three of the clock.

Whereupon the members having returned to the Assembly Room, the Rt. Hon. Sir Edward P. Morris, P.C., K.C.M.G., moved that the member for Carbonear, John R Goodison, Esq, do take the chair as Speaker, and it was seconded by Robert Moulton, Esq., member for Burgeo and La Poile; and no other person being proposed, Mr. Goodison was unanimously called to the chair by the House, and was conducted to the chair by the members who proposed and seconded him.

Whereupon the Speaker, standing on the steps, addressed the House expressing his gratitude to the hon. members for the high honor unanimously conferred on him.

The House then adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, at half past two of the clock in the afternoon.

THURSDAY, Jan. 15, 1914.

At half past two of the clock the members of the House of Assembly met in the Assembly Room, pursuant to adjournment.

At three of the clock 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.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber and having returned to the Assembly Room, Mr. Speaker informed the House that when in attendance upon His Excellency in the Council Chamber, His Excellency had been pleased to approve of his election as Speaker of this House, and that in the name and on behalf of the House of Asesmbly he had by humble petition to His Excellency laid claim to all their ancient rights and privileges, which His Excellency had confirmed to them in as full and ample a manner as they have heretofore

been granted or allowed by His Excellency or any of his predecessors. Mr. Speaker also expressed his respectful acknowledgments for the high honour which the House had unanimously conferred upon him. Mr. Speaker further announced that whilst in the Council Chamber His Excellency had been pleased to make a speech to both branches of the Legislature, of which Speech for greater accuracy he had obtained a copy. which he then read to the House as follows:

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

I welcome you with pleasure at this, the opening of the Twenty-third General Assembly, and I trust that your labours, under Divine Providence, will tend toward a continuance of the gratifying conditions of prosperity and contentment now so general amongst our people.

I availed myself of the opportunities during the past year to visit different parts of the country and familiarize myself with the industries of the people and the resources of the Island. It was a great pleasure to me to find the evidences of well-being everywhere manifest, and to note the industrial progress made in the different localities and I take pleasure in expressing the hope that these happy circumstances will long continue, and that still other avenues of employment will open up, to enable the people further to improve their material position, and to add to the wealth of the community. I was specially gratified to observe the increased interest in agriculture, and to learn that developments in this respect are but the forerunner, it is believed, of still further efforts to raise at home larger quantities of many of the foodstuffs now partly procured from other countries.

Feeling confident that in so doing I was but voicing the wishes of the Legislature and the people of Newfoundland, I recently extended an invitation to their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Connaught to visit this country during the coming summer, if their engagements will permit, and you will rejoice to know that they have promised to do so if it is at all possible. I am confident that, should they find themselves able to come to Newfoundland, they will receive the whole hearted welcome that always goes out to members of the Royal Family from the people of the Oldest Colony.

You have been summoned thus early in the year in the belief that a session at this season, when virtually undivided attention can be given to public business, will operate to the general advantage.

The General Election held in October last was, it is pleasing to note, marked on the whole by a continuation of the good order and peaceful discussion characteristic of such contests hitherto, a fact affording strong testimony to the law-abiding character of the people.

The fishing industry last year in its various branches was, I rejoice to say, attended with success. The catch of codfish was about an average one and the prices realized were good. The returns from the seal fishery were considerably in excess of those of 1912. Though the lobster pack was small, the high prices which ruled helped to offset the shortage. The outlook in the foreign markets, moreover, is encouraging, and the recent change in the American Tariff Law, by which our fishery products are admitted free to the markets of the United States, will help materially to maintain prices as well as stimulate

the export of green fish.

The agricultural prospect, viewed in the light of last year's operations, is most gratifying. The number of agricultural soceties is increasing, and the stimulus imparted to the industry by their activity warrants the belief that, as the years go by, this pursuit will be much more widely practiced. The results of the distribution of improved stock and seeds during the past few years are becoming apparent, and each season increasing numbers of our people are widening the scope of their activities in this regard as disclosed by the encouraging exhibits at the series of exhibitions held in the various districts, some of which exhibitions it was my good fortune to open.

The volume and value of our exports are being swollen each year by the constantly increasing output of the mining companies at Bell Island and of the pulp and paper companies in the Exploits Valley, while, of course, the high prices obtained for our fishery products are a chief contributory to our economic stability. The output of iron ore for the calendar year amounted to one million, four hundred and fifty-eight thousand, five hundred and twenty-five tons, valued at one million six hundred and four thousand dollars, against one million, one hundred and seventy-six thousand, five hundred and ninety tons for the previous calendar year, and a similar increase is estimated for the year just opened. The export of pulp and paper for the last fiscal year amounted to two million, four hundred thousand dollars, as against one million, six hundred thousand dollars for the previous year, and figures for the past six months show an output from this source valued at one million, nine hundred thousand dollars, so that the exports of these commodities will probably represent a very large increase at the end of June next over the shipments for the twelve months which ended in June, 1913.

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

The revenue for the fiscal year 1912-13 was substantially in excess of that for the previous year and resulted in a surplus of over one hundred and fifteen thousand dollars. The revenue for the first half of the current fiscal year is below the estimate, the removal of the duties from certain necessaries of life last session having had the effect of lessening the Customs receipts. As the expected increase in duties paid on additional imports of other articles has not been realized, proposals will be submitted to you at an early date to adjust the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, without, however, departing from the principles embodied in last session's enactment, namely, that the producing classes should have, so far as possible, the necessaries of life untaxed.

The estimates for the public service will be laid before you in due course. They have been prepared with regard to economy and the efficient administration of the public service.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

In view of the increasing cost of coal to our people, the price of which has been enhanced because of the advance in wages paid to those mining it in Cape Breton and the ever growing demand for coal in Canada, the Government have decided to make a further effort to determine whether our own coal deposits are commercially workable and have invited Professor Dunstan, Director of the Imperial Institute, London, to visit this country and thoroughly examine our carboniferous areas. He has pro-

mised to come here early this season and besides undertaking this duty will also study the possibilities of our oil shale, of which extensive deposits exist near the line of railway now being built to Bonne Bay. The requirements of the British Admiralty for oil fuel for the navy make it evident that if these shale beds are what we hope, an industry of immense magnitude may be inaugurated.

The lack of an assured supply of bait is one of the greatest drawbacks to the expansion of our codfishing industry, and now, with the employment of motor boats, which is becoming more general, the possibilities of a much larger annual catch are increased, and the need of an adequate bait supply becomes all the greater. My Ministers are giving attention to this matter, and have already taken steps towards securing the fullest information as to how Norway and other countries are grappling with this problem; and it is proposed, as soon as this information is completed, to take such action with regard thereto as may seem desirable in the endeavour to meet the situation in our own midst.

Railway extension during the year has been rapid and eminently satisfactory. The equivalent of sixty-four miles of railway has been completed. The Trepassey branch has been all but finished and is now being operated to Renews on schedule time. The early summer months ought to be sufficient to have this line brought up to contract specification so that the autumn may see the entire branch operated. The Heart's Content branch has also been practically completed and will be operated early in the present year. The Bay de Verde branch has been graded, the rails and ballasting far advanced, and some of the stations built. It should be ready for operation in the early fall. The Fortune Bay Branch has been graded for sixteen miles, and rails laid to the fifteenth mile, but not yet ballasted. The Bonne Bay branch was commenced late in the season and the work done to date is but preliminary.

It is encouraging to observe that your efforts to attract the attention of outside capitalists to the varied and natural resources of the country are gradually bearing fruit. My Ministers are at present in negotiation with the representative of a large group of British investors with a view to the utilization of some of the vast water powers of Labrador and the establishment of very large industries calculated to afford permanent employment to numbers of our people, and to reproduce in that land the transformation that has been effected in our own Island in recent years.

My Ministers have also been for some time, and are at present, engaged in negotiating with British capitalists for the construction of a railway from Notre Dame Bay to Bay of Islands, and for the establishment of a train ferry service between Bay of Islands and the eastern seaboard of Canada, for the purpose of establishing better transport facilities and of developing the fishing industry of the Island.

It is now somewhat over fifteen years since the prosecution of the whale fishery was revived in this country. During that period a feeling has grown amongst our fishermen that the carrying on of this industry is detrimental to our great fishery, the cod, as well as to our bait supplies of capiin and squid. It is important that this question should be promptly enquired into, and if the fears of our people are well grounded, measures must be adopted to remove the evil. My Ministers propose to have an investigation made into that matter immediately.

RESIGNATION OF RT. HON. SIR R. BOND, P.C., K.C.M.G.

RT HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Speaker, before the House proceeds to the regular work of the session, I desire to inform you Mr. Speaker and the House through you, at the request of His Excellency the Governor that he has received a notification from the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond, one of the representatives of the district of Twillingate, resigning his seat in this House. His Excellency has asked me to notify you of this occurrence. In doing so I desire, with the permission of the House, at the earliest possible moment to record my sincere regret that the Rt. Hon. gentleman has found it necessary to resign his seat. We are not now concerned with the domestic or party reasons which led to the unfortunate decision; but as one of the branches of the Legislature I do not think we would be acting fairly to ourselves if someone did not at least record the regret which we all must feel that Sir Robert Bond has found it necessary to resign his seat. It is now nearly thirty years since I came into this Chamber myself and I have been here continuously during the whole of that period—a very short period in the life of a country but a very long period in the life of an individual. When I first took my seat here he had already attained eminence. He came into the House three years before I did—in 1882—and was only here a year or so when he was elected to the highest position in the gift of the House—the Speakership—and while occupying that position he gave every indication that he had selected the theatre best suited to the display of his fine talents and his work since then not alone brought credit to himself but great advantage to the country. In filling the position of Speaker for the years he occupied that post, he had succeeded men of high legal and constitutional attainments—following on the resignation of one of my late leaders in Opposition, the father of my friend the present leader of the Opposition—I refer to the late Hon. Robert Kent—and other illustrious men who had preceded him; and it is sometimes not easy to fill these positions and preserve their high traditions and play the part so highly and ably maintained by such men as these. Since then I have been associated with Sir Robert Bond in this Legislature, and for over sixteen years, as a member of His Majesty's Government, I have been very closely connected with him in the public affairs of the Colony—in the Government of Sir William Whiteway and in his own Government. I have had the honour to represent the Colony abroad with him, in Canada and in other places, and I can testify here to the high attainments and splendid industry that he always displayed in carrying out the work upon which we were engaged. I am not the only one here to-day who remembers him in this House; the splendid parliamentary courage he always displayed, always ready to fight when fighting was necessary and always ready to be fair and reasonable when it was proper that he should be so.

I have had occasions to differ with the right hon. gentleman on many occasions but these were differences on questions of policy and not on personal matters. On these occasions each of us was satisfied that party ties should give way to principle and I am glad to be able to look back over these years and to say that there is nothing on the record that to-day I wish to delete.

I hope that the right hon. gentleman may see fit some day to come back to this House and to take his

part once more in its work. There are many large questions and policies to be worked out in the government of the Colony, if we are to hold our position in the British Empire, which to-day is a foremost place among her overseas dominions. We cannot afford to sit down and be content merely to collect the revenue and pay the salaries of our officials in the civil service. If we are to continue to be a colony that men will be anxious to make a home in and not to leave, we must be prepared to deal with many matters of pressing importance.

The right hon. gentleman is eminently qualified for work of this kind for he is a gentleman of means and leisure and there are not many men in the Colony who are able to give the whole of their attention to public affairs owing to the pressure of private business. For that reason I feel sure that no matter what their personal or political views may be everybody inside and outside this House regrets that the rt. hon. gentleman has considered it advisable to resign his seat.

MR. KENT.—Mr Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the expressions which have been voiced by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister in connection with the retirement (temporary, I hope) of the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond from his seat in this Legislature. I think that it is one of the greatest calamities that this Colony could experience at the present time, when there are so many important questions to be solved in the near future. The rt. hon. gentleman's experience, his ability and his integrity are so great that the Colony can ill afford to lose his services at the present juncture. Personally, I think that there is no person in this chamber that regrets more than I do his retirement from the legislature. He stands in my opinion above all our statesmen and to my mind he has no peer in the Colony. I know that the foundations on which I base that opinion are perhaps not agreed upon to the full extent by some members of this House but I sincerely trust that his retirement is only temporary and that his work in the interests of the Colony is not yet complete. He has still much work to do and I hope the day will come when he will again take a prominent part in the public life of the Colony.

I wish to associate myself with everything the rt. hon. gentleman has said and I agree with him that the whole country will regret his retirement I feel confident that when the great questions that are before us come before this House and the Colony, his advice and direction will be required by the Colony. I hope, therefore, that he will see fit to take up again the duties which he has laid down.

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. CURRIE.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of moving that a select committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the gracious Speech with which His Excellency has been pleased to open this, the twenty-third general assembly.

Following custom I shall, with your permission, sir, take advantage of the opportunity, which the occasion presents, to comment briefly on some of the various matters referred to in the Speech. Before doing so, however, I desire to extend to you my most sincere and hearty congratulations on the great honour which has been conferred upon you by the House in selecting you as Speaker. It is an honour which falls to few, and your unanimous selection is proof of the esteem in which you are held and a compliment to your ability and fitness to fulfil the responsibilities and obligations of the office. I feel sure

sir, that should occasion necessitate any decision on your part on any questions that may arise, the House can depend on your impartiality, and that you will uphold the dignity of your high office with credit to yourself and honour to the House.

In the first part of the Speech His Excellency refers to the visits which he has made to the different parts of the country, whereby he has been enabled to "familiarize himself with the industries of the people and the resources of the Island.' In making these occasional visits His Excellency has been following a somewhat beaten track, for his immediate predecessors performed the same duty during their terms of office. Time was, however, when such was not the custom, when Governors were content to remain in St. John's and more or less perfunctorily perform the duties of their office only occasionally coming in contact with the people, and then mostly the provileged class, who received occasional social invitations to Government House. It is gratifying to know that all this is changed, that the men now sent to the Colony are men of large experience, trained in matters of Empire, men of great ability, who are worthy of the position and who see and know it to be their duty to go among the people, make themselves acquainted with their conditions, and get a first-hand knowledge of the country. These visits must be beneficial not only to His Excellency in assisting him to appraise and appreciate the country in which he is called to serve, but also to the people, for it brings them in close contact with the representative of His Majesty the King and so strengthens that bond of loyalty and affection to the crown which has so large a place in the hearts and the lives of our people.

Again, sir, these visits of His Excellency are not without effect in another particular for the Speech points out that His Excellency has noticed "the evidence of well-being everywhere manifest and the industrial progress made in the different localities." Here we have the unbiased testimony of the Governor to the great development that is taking place throughout the country and to the prosperity of our people—surely, sir, evidence of incalculable value in promoting the Colony's standing and credit abroad.

Newfoundianders, generally, will welcome the announcement that we are to be honored by a visit from His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught during the coming summer, if his engagements will so permit. There was general regret that the projected visit of last year did not materialize owing to the illness of Her Royal Highness the Duchess, and His Excellency may rest assured that should the opportunity present itself this year Newfoundlanders will unite in extending to the uncle of the King and his royal spouse a real Newfoundland welcome, than which there can be none more kind, more warm or more sincere.

With the smoke of the recent political campaign still hovering over the country it was to be expected that the Speech would contain some reference to the election of October last, which resulted in the re-election of the present Government to power. His Excellency has referred very cautiously and with much tact to the election and confines himself to complimenting the people on the general good conduct shown throughout the campaign; but I think I may be permitted to go a little further and extend to the Prime Minister those hearty congratulations which he so richly deserves on the result of the

election. True the country did not support him as a whole—what country ever did unanimously support any man or any policy? But it must be particularly satisfactory to him to know that in those districts where the election was fought on a question of policy only, where no other questions were involved, his policy was endorsed by the return of practically a solid phalanx of supporters to this House,—a very gratifying result and one calculated to encourage him in the continuation of that policy of progress which he inaugurated during the past four years, and which has been so beneficial to the country.

The next paragraph of the Speech deals with the general trade of the Colony and particularly with the great fishing industries that play such an important part in the country's welfare. It is pleasing to learn that the fisheries were attended with great success; that the codfishery was above the average catch and the prices exceedingly good—the highest in the history of the Colony. This most satisfactory state of affairs is due in some measure to the opening up of the American market. Hon. members will remember that the last election in that country resulted in the return of the Democratic Government to power on a policy of free food, and among the articles included in the free list was fish. This gave us the market we were a long while seeking, and our people were quick to avail of it. During the past year thousands of quintals of salt bulk fish were shipped to the American market, particularly from the West Coast, thereby relieving the congestion in other markets. As a consequence prices were kept high and I think we may feel assured that we shall not suffer again from low prices. This should tend to renew confidence in the fishery and now that the introduction of motor boats has made fishing much easier than it has been it is probable that many of our people who in recent years have left the fishery because they have found it too hard and unremunerative may find encouragement to again engage in that industry, increasing their earning power and adding considerably to the general trade of the country.

Closely identified with the codfishery is another matter to which His Excellency refers, the question of bait supply, a matter which it is needless for me to say, is of very great and pressing importance. During the past few months it has been my good fortune to come in close contact with very many fishermen and their one continual cry was bait. Day after day, week after week, these men have suffered from enforced idleness, even when fish was plentiful on the grounds, because there was no bait, and it seemed as if there was something wrong somewhere. It is a well-known fact that during the caplin season thousands of tons of bait are lost because the fishermen have no method of preserving them for future use. The establishment of bait freezers should to a large extent obviate this, and it is pleasing to learn that the Government intends to make enquiries as to the conduct of these depots, and if possible to have them established here. Any expenditure made for this purpose will be returned ten-fold.

The question of the effect of the whale fishery on the supply of bait is another matter that we hear very frequently discussed, and on which there is a great difference of opinion. Some people hold that the killing of the whale has resulted in the bait fishes leaving our coasts and taking to the deep waters while others take the opposite view. It is certainly a matter for very care-

ful enquiry and it would be a matter of much satisfaction if the question could be decided once and for all and the minds of the fishermen set at rest. Not alone has there been an increase in our fisheries, it is gratifying to know that there has been a large increase in the general trade of the country. I have some figures here which show that the general trade for the past year was $32,595,-632,000, with the balance on the right side of the ledger. It is a theoretical principle of political economy that for the trade of a country to be on a sound basis, its exports should exceed its imports. That being so, sir, we have reason to rejoice, for our exports during the past year totalled more than half a million dollars over imports. It is interesting to note that the general trade of the Colony has very largely increased during the past five years. Indeed during that period the increase was larger than during the preceding twenty years. In 1888 our total trade was $14,816,453. In 1908 (after a space of twenty years) it amounted to $22,251,-250. In other words the trade of the colony had increased by nearly seven and a half million dollars during that period. From 1908 to 1913, that is in five years, it increased by ten million dollars, or three million dollars more in these five years than it did during the twenty years preceding 1908. Certainly this is a record that the Colony and the Government can feel proud of, for such prosperity has never been known in the history of the Colony. Particularly pleasing is it to know that this prosperity is not based alone on the successful pursuit of our fisheries but that here has been also an increase in the production of our lumber and mineral resources. Furthermore, there has been a large increase in the quantity of vegetables raised in the Colony and it is to be hoped that this increase will continue until we shall have to depend very little on the outside world for those foodstuffs that can be raised in the Colony. Concurrent with the growth of our trade the revenue of the Colony has increased by leaps and bounds during the past four years. Each year showed a surplus over expenditure, and in the four years this has amounted to about $800,000 00. That amount has been expended in improvement of our public and marine works, in largely increased grants to the public schools of the Colony and in other directions beneficial to the people. The sum of $228,000.00 was spent in the improvement of our public works and a somewhat similar amount was expended on our marine works. The grant for education was increased by $100,000.00, which amount does not include the special grant of $100,000.00 to construct new schools and improve old ones.

We are told in the Speech from the Throne that the revenue for the first half of the current fiscal year is below the estimate and that we are not to expect a surplus this year. This is not surprising for it will be remembered that last session the Hon. Minister of Finance thought that the revenue could stand a reduction of $385,000.00 on food stuffs and accordingly sugar, tea, pork and beef were placed upon the free list. It is possible that the decrease will be made up during the remainder of the year and the hopes of the Minister fully justified but he may have been a little too sanguine. There is one point in connection with the matter that should not be overlooked, but which possibly escaped the attention of the Minister at the time, and that is. elections generally have a marked effect on the trade of the country and consequently on the revenue. Busi-

ness men throughout the world are practically unanimous in the opinion that an election year is a poor business year, for an election has the effect of making matters unsettled and uncertain. Business men become suspicious and do not care to go into ventures until the campaign is over and the country assumes its natural condition. It is quite probable, therefore, that the revenue has suffered considerably during the past six months from this reason and that the deficit may be made up from the buoyancy of trade that is bound to occur during the next few months. The Hon. Minister of Finance, however, is not trusting too much to this, and wisely so, for we are informed that there will be an adjustment of the tariff during the present session, which will provide the necessary revenue, without departing from the principle laid down by the Government "that the producing classes should have, so far as possible, the necessaries of life untaxed."

The question of the taxation of food together with that of the high cost of living is one that has been engaging the attention and study of students of political economy the world over. Many reasons have been advanced for the present high cost of living; the Trusts have been blamed by many; others claim that it is due to a demand for higher rate of wages by labour organizations; others attribute it to transportation and handling charges. All these things tend of course to increase the cost of living, but there is another reason, which has been advanced by J. J. Hill, the American railway magnate, that cannot be passed over. His idea is that the high cost of living is due to the cost of high living, and there is possibly a great deal in what he claims. Everybody knows there has been a complete change in the manner of living throughout the world during the past few years. Conditions have changed in this country. What were luxuries a generation ago have now become necessities. Our people are no longer content to live as they did only a few years ago. Their houses are bigger and better built; their clothing is of much better manufacture than it was, and they demand better food than they were content with in the past. The resultant increase in the demand for better things has now become greater than the supply and prices have soared. Particularly is this so in food stuffs, and there seems but one way out of the difficulty and that is by greater attention to agricultural development. In this country we have made agriculture the cinderella of our industries, we have probably not given it that serious attention that we should. True during recent years governments have made some attempts to foster agriculture. During the past four years, for instance, the people have been helped and encouraged by the distribution of better seeds and an improved breed of cattle. The establishment of the ninety-one agricultural Boards, with their thousands of members, must also have had some beneficial effect; but there is still room for improvement, still room for development in this industry. In the past agriculture has been impeded to some extent by the fact that there has been no means of getting at some of our best areas, and though the railway development of the past four years has improved this, there are yet parts of the country, particularly fitted for the promotion of agriculture not yet touched. This is especially true of the beautiful Salmonier Valley and the Burin peninsula. A few months ago I had a conversation with a Canadian gentleman who was here for the purpose of securing land to establish a large cat-

tle ranch. Easy transportation facilities was a big factor in deciding his location, and yet the only two parts of the country that appealed to him were the two portions I have mentioned. He was especially pleased with the Salmonier Valley, but the lack of transportation opportunities shut him completely out there. This only proves how essential it is that we should continue the policy of railway extension. The District of Burin to-day is urgently seeking the benefits of the railway. From Marystown, on the one side, noted for its beautiful scenery and growing rapidly as a commercial centre, to Grand Bank, the fishing and commercial capital of the west, there is a strong demand for the railway. I need not detain the House, sir, telling of the importance of Burin District, or what, for instance, the value of the railway would be to Grand Bank with its large banking industry but poor harbour. Hon. members will probably know as much about it as I could tell them; but I am looking forward with confidence to the day when the extension of the railway through the district will be an accomplished fact, and when the industrious people of the west will be brought into closer touch and speedier communication with the rest of the Island.

There are other matters in the Speech which are worthy of attention, but we shall have an opportunity of discussing them later on. The question of coal is a live topic just now, and it is interesting to note that the Government have made another move to do something toward the development of our coal areas, and have succeeded in inducing Prof. Dunstan, of the Imperial Institute, to come out and report on our carboniferous areas. Anything that could be done to remove the burden which is now pressing so heavily on our people by the high cost of this necessary article would be greatly appreciated. Only a few days ago the price was increased in the city forty cents a ton, without any apparent reason, and the end is not yet. May we hope that Prof. Dunstan's visit will be productive of much good, and that the day will soon come when we shall be producing this very necessary commodity in our own country.

In closing, I can only hope that the ensuing years will witness a continuation of that prosperity which is so general throughout the country, years pre-eminently distinguished by the increased growth and development of our industries, by the augmentation of our public revenue, by the diminution of our public burdens, by the improvement of our laws and by all those other victories of peace in which are to be found the true felicity of the state and the true glory of the statesman.

I beg to move the appointment of the Select Committee.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, before seconding the motion which has just been so eloquently made for a Committee to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech which has been delivered by His Excellency, I trust I may be permitted to join with my learned friend, the honourable member for Burin, in asking you to accept my heartiest congratulations on your election by your fellow members to the high office of Speaker of this House. I assure you, sir, that you enter upon your new duties with the entire confidence and support of those who unanimously called you to the post of our First Commoner. And because of this fact, because of the general chorus of approval with which your selection has been greeted by the public, and because of the knowledge we all have of your fitness for the position we trust you

may be long spared to grace it.

I likewise join with the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, and with my colleague, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Kent, in expressing my regret at the information that the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond has seen fit to resign his seat in the Legislature. His loss is especially to be deplored by us younger members of this House, who will miss the guidance and example of his superior knowledge and greater experience in legislative matters. I would endorse all that has been said in tribute to the high character and great accomplishments of the Rt. Hon. gentleman, and concur in the hope that we may again see him on the floors of this House.

As regards my task of seconding the motion just made, I think hon. members will appreciate the truth of my remark when I state that, paradoxical as it may appear, my duty is at once easy and difficult. My learned friend has so very ably reviewed the salient features of His Excelput them before you in his very eloquent speech to which I am sure we have all listened with such pleasure, But, Mr. Speaker, I deem the privilege of being permitted to second the motion such a very high honour indeed that I trust hon. members will bear with me whilst I say just a word or two.

I endorse all that has been so well said with reference to the visitations of His Excellency to the different sections of the Island. Someone has remarked that those who dwelt under the shelter of the British flag live within a real republic, in that England's flag to-day typifies the highest form of democratic government. Although monarchial in name and form the constitution has so developed that it may be said the people rule through the sovereign. And instead of the early day barrier between King and subjects we have to-day the freest intercourse. And it is this association of the monarch with his subjects which enables him the better to understand and govern them, and in like manner it is fitting that in self-governing colonies such as ours the representative of His Majesty should have free intercourse with and know the people over whom he is placed. Hence it has been the practice for our Governors of late to visit the different outports and see for themselves the conditions under which our people work and live. His Excellency began this intercourse immediately on coming amongst us, for it will be remembered that almost co-incident with that arrival was the departure of our sealing fleet. His Excellency visited the different crews, and his receptions then and on all occasions at the various outports that he has called at during the past year have been as we know whole-souled and enthusiastic I think it may be safely said that even allowing for the loyalty of our people much of the heartiness of these receptions were due to the gracious manners and kindly dispositions of His Excellency and Mrs. Davidson who always accompanied him. His Excellency has correctly gauged the wishes of our people in inviting the Duke and Duchess of Connaught to visit the Colony during the coming summer. Members of the Royal Family have ever received an especially warm welcome in this loyal and ancient Colony, and if the proposed visit materializes it will be found that our distinguished visitors will receive a welcome in line with the best traditions of England's oldest dependency.

It is indeed, Mr. Speaker, as His Excellency remarks a matter of congratulation that the recent general elections were conducted with no unusual disorder or trouble. This is

only as it should be. Those of us who are beginners in political life are told stories of strenuous days and troublesome times of the long ago, and if these stories are true the present conditions only forcibly remind us that the "schoolmaster has been abroad," and that our people have learned to appreciate their power under the Ballot Act—learned that on Election Day the humblest man has in his right hand a power equal to the highest in the land. Hence we have been able to emerge from a strenuous campaign without any black marks on the characters of our people in the way of disorderly scenes.

The paragraph in His Excellency's Speech having reference to our fisheries is naturally always a matter of particular interest to us, because the fishery is our main industry and will be for very many years to come. Conditions in our staple industry, as all honourable members know, are gradually changing. There is the change in the method of fishing and the change in the manner of the disposal of our catch.

As to the former, the very general introduction of motor boats, with their consequent benefits for our fishermen in their avocations, bids fair to revolutionize our methods of fishing; and as to the latter the growing green fish trade and the great possibilities in this direction in the future suggest a like revolution as regards our catch. The frozen fish industry is bound to become a great one. It is only a question of regular and efficient means of transportation. The high cost of living everywhere makes an increasing demand for fresh fish, besides which there is the general cry in all quarters for new fishing grounds and a greater variety of edible fish. So far in this country we have confined ourselves to a very small number of varieties of fish, but it is well known that we have very many kinds of food fishes never taken from the waters by our fishermen. The possibilities of the fresh fish trade are unlimited. If beef and mutton can be carried thousands of miles and sold fresh, why cannot the same be done with fish. If right here in St. John's, Mr. Speaker, we can purchase fresh meat brought from New Zealand, why should a Newfoundlander visiting that country in a year or two not be able to see the fresh fish for which his homeland is famous. And here is where we can look with much interest as to the outcome of the establishment of the train ferry service referred to in His Excellency's Speech. Under the offer made by this Government to those capitalists interested in this scheme which embraces a railway from Notre Dame Bay to Bay of Islands and a train ferry service between the latter port and Canada we have nothing to lose and much to gain. There can be no doubt of the markets for fresh fish and also of our ability to supply those markets, and if the prospect takes practical shape then a very broad and new avenue to large markets is open to our fishermen.

My learned friend has made reference to the mention of the work in the way of agriculture. Well, sir, however much we may differ as to the extent to which agricultural operations can be pursued in this country I think even the most pessimistic will admit that a very big increase can be made in the value of that industry. The opening up of branch rali ways and the bay boats touching the heads of the various bays has meant that much good land is brought within easy access, and that the cultivation of this land will result in our main industry being greatly aided and the earnings of our people considerably augmented none will doubt.

Just a word, Sir, with reference to the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne wherein His Excellency speaks of the fact that the estimate of revenue has not materialized. I do not consider that this is a problem over which this House or the members of it have any cause to feel concerned, particularly when one looks at the facts. It might be a matter of grave concern were we not able to find reasons in explanation of it. But one reason is and in the fact that while it is true that there is an actual shortage in the revenue we must not be unmindful of the position that during the past year there has been approximately $400,000 taken from the revenue and this has gone back into the pockets of those people who after all need the benefit of it most. The second feature in this problem is to be found in the fact that this non sufficiency in revenue, or rather in the estimate of revenue is found in a country where we are making large expenditures year by year upon which we have not alone to pay an annual interest , but from which we can expect no immediate returns. The value of these expenditures in the way of railways and other development works cannot be felt at once, and it will take a few years before their effect will be manifest. In the years to come when we begin to get value for these expenditures no shortage in revenue can possibly occur. Meanwhile there is no cause for alarm,—taking into consideration these two points I have mentioned, and we can all feel assured that the shortage of to-day will be a surplus of to-morrow. The reference to the price of coal comes with peculiar force at this particular time. On all sides one cannot help noticing the outcry that has been raised at the latest advance in price. We live in a country where because of peculiar climatic conditions coal is one of the prime necessities of our lives. It now bids fair to become a luxury. It is a necessity in the truest meaning of the word. But it is fast becoming a luxury as the price soars higher and higher. We all require it, but only a few can now have it. It is therefore pleasing to note that further efforts are being made to solve this problem and that another enquiry is to be set on foot to see what can be done in the direction of lessening the price. We have had these areas examined and reported upon most favourably by those competent to judge. Amongst others Mr. Howley has expressed himself most forcibly on the question, and has stated in no uncertain terms his unshaken belief in the existence of good coal in this country. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that we will all look forward to the visit of Prof. Dunstan because we feel that he will concur in the opinion expressed by Mr. Howley, and such a concurrence will go a long way towards interesting outside capitalists in these areas and we hope the development of these areas will go hand in hand with the development of our oil shale deposits. His Excellency also referred to the interest taken in regard to making the resources of this colony known to outside investors. I think I may be permitted to voice the opinion of all the members of this House and of the people generally when I say that to a very large extent this interest can be attributed almost solely to the Prime Minister. To him we are indebted to a large degree for the unusual interest taken in this Colony by British investors. By his labours across the waters, by his methods of showing his faith in the country, by the manner in which he conducts public affairs outside the Colony we have become the source of much enquiry in regard

to our resources—and we all hope that the reference made tc the development of Labrador water powers by British investors will bear fruit. If it should bear fruit it will be another testimony to the wisdom of the policy of prohibition in regard to the pulp wood export from Labrador.

I think it would be unfair to the members of this House who have been good enough to give their attention to me after the eloquent speech of my hon. friend, Mr. Currie—if I were to continue further. I should hope that the first session of the 23rd general assembly, and I feel sure we all hope the same, no matter on what side of the House we sit, will be marked by a unanimous effort to develop our common country, and I trust in the words of His Excellency that the conditions of prosperity and happiness that now exist may long continue. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion that a select committee be appointed to draft an appropriate Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the previous speakers in congratulating you upon the high honour conferred upon you in being chosen as the Speaker of this House. I feel in common with every member and in common with the public at large that every confidence can be placed in your judgment, impartiality and fairness in all matters that will come before the House and in your power and willingness to maintain the dignity, privileges and rights which are the fundamentals of its constitution. These opinions give us every confidence in the choice that has been made.

The Speech that has been delivered from the Throne is of the usual character, but before I pass to a criticism of the Speech itself, I wish to extend in no formal manner, but with true feelings of pleasure my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion now before the chair. Seldom in the history of this House have the moving and seconding of the Address in Reply been done with more felicity and adaptability, or in better form than by my friend the member for Burin and my colleague in the district of St. John's East, Mr. Higgins. They have covered the matters contained in the Speech from the Throne and have dealt most intelligently and lucidly with the various questions raised therein from their own point of view. It is not usual upon opening day for the opposition minutely to criticise those matters contained in the Speech from the Throne, nor to go into the policy of the government itself, nor as it is expressed in the Speech from the Throne. For there are many things that strike an observer in connection with the policy of the government which do not occur at all in the Speech from the Throne. There are many things which one would expect to appear in the speech which his ministers prepare to be delivered by His Excellency the Governor which do not appear. Many things that would justify criticism, many things that have been pointed out from this side of the House which have been thoroughly justified by time. Time in its evolution has amply justified many of the criticisms offered from this side of the House. In particular, time has justified that criticism offered twelve months ago, at the time when the reduction of duties took place. As was then pointed out this reduction was for no other purpose that that of influencing the voters at the election then pending. Not only was that a fact, but we have the Hon. member for Burin pointing out as one of the reasons to justify the necessity for now making up

the deficit, the fact that last year was election year. Sir, the Hon. Minister of Finance knew it was election year. I remember that when the estimates were going through I pointed out that there was no estimate for a general election. Perhaps the Hon. member forgot that there was an election coming on. Surely, Sir, he was reminded of it often enough during the session. The result might have been different had the country known then what it knows now. The estimates now show by the practical light of actuality that the government was wrong. The electors did not know that—they know now. This I say, sir, is a justification offered by us in the House last year. As I said, sir, the speech itself is in the usual form. There is really nothing to it that is not familiar to every member of the House, who has sat here for years past. If you take the Speech of 1909 you will find the same matters referred to. The same promises held out—and there has been nothing accomplished. It has been as though we were chasing rainbows for the past five years. It is a matter of great pleasure I am sure to the members of this House and to the country at large to know that His Excellency the Governor has invited Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Connaught to pay us a visit during the coming summer. I hope that the intended visit will be realized and that we will have the honour to entertain in this country once more a member of the Royal family. They are sure of the same reception, hearty and complete, that has always been tendered to members of the Royal family in this island home of ours. I do not intend to go through the Speech from the Throne paragraph by paragraph. I have already referred briefly to the feature which is perhaps the most striking, namely necessity which the Minister of Finance is under of making the revenue meet expenditure. This under any circumstances is a serious condition for a Colony to find itself in. Even under ordinary conditions this is a matter of serious consequence to the country but we are to-day, sir, in no ordinary condition. We are under heavy obligations, heavy contractual obligations which necessitate the entering into of further borrowings to complete the cantracts for construction of the branch railways which were entered into four years ago. I think it is generally admitted that the borrowings which the Colony has made up to the present time for the purposes of railway construction will not be sufficient to meet the full and complete construction cost of the railway and works called for by these contracts. We have borrowed $6,000,000 already under this head alone and up to the present as far as my information goes there is not one of these branches completed. On not one of these branches has the final certificate been given. I speak now subject to correction. If I am not correct the Prime Minister can correct me. Now, every one knows that any Colony or any Dominion or any country whatever that goes into the London market at the present time or at any further time cannot go there under the same conditions or with the same prospects of raising money on the same terms as has been done heretofore. We know that it is getting more and more difficult for colonial governments to raise money than it has been in the past. We know that the conditions of the markets are changing. I have here in my hand an extract taken from a statement issued by Lord Strathcona, High Commissioner for Canada, in London, at

the end of the year just passed, 1913. In this he says:—

"Speaking generally, money has not been easy in the matter of rates, and there has not been quite the same disposition to welcome Canadian or any other loans as was the case a few years ago. The Dominion and Provincial Governments and the larger municipalities have been able at one time or another to get the money they desired, but in every case at the cost of higher rates of interest, and this may be said also of the great railway companies. The Dominion has had to increase its interest to 4 per cent. The Provinces have been compelled to make their rates 4½ per cent., and so have the larger municipalities. For the smaller municipalities 5 per cent. has been the minimum rate on loans. And it is by no means certain that the maximum has yet been reached. But, as already mentioned, the difficulty of obtaining money is not confined to Canada. It has been felt in official, financial and industrial circles in the United Kingdom, in all the Dominions beyond the seas and in most foreign countries. It may be said, in fact, that the demands for money have been greater than the available supply, and that in order to make the transactions more tempting borrowers have been forced to give higher rates of interest."

That is the opinion of an experienced financier and statesman who has occupied the responsible position of High Commissioner for Canada for a number of years. How does the condition he describes affect this Colony and its present financial condition. Does it not point to the lack of wisdom and the lack of judgment shown by the Government in making the contracts for the construction of the railways. What becomes now of the argument that there was an advantage in paying in gold instead of in bonds. Surely now under the changing condition of the market we will have to pay a higher rate of interest, while if the construction contracts had provided for the payment for the work in 3½% bonds as was done under all former contracts, the Colony would have been in different circumstances financially as to the fluctuations in the market. Its rate of interest would have been fixed and it would be saved the difference not only in the price of the securities but in the changing rates of interest. The Government talks about the necessity of establishing the equilibrium between expenditure and revenue. Here you have a menace which like a large snowball is growing year after year and will render it necessary to re-establish the equilibrium of our finances year after year and which is going to fall ultimately upon the people of this country.

Not one of these railways is under final certificate. The estimates as to mileage were wrong; the estimate of the cost of the work was wrong and when the work is completed and the final certificate given and the full balance of the cost has been established it will be found that the amount allowed in the contract price for equipment &c. will not equip one branch and that all the equipment and rolling stock &c. for all the branches except that one will be extras over and above the $15,000 a mile.

I did not intend, sir, to weary the House with these matters this afternoon but one matter has led up to another. I think it a pity that the Minister of Finance did not last year find some other way of financing his budget than that which renders it necessary to undo what he did last session. An intelligent readjustment of the tariff would have been far better. The Minister was not happy in

the manner in which he financed these matters last year. He has had to undo them again. I think that this manner of "backing and filling" is not going to have a good effect upon the standing of the Colony. I think that if there is one thing that is necessary in handling finance it is that it should be permanent. It should show clear anticipation of events to come and we should not shut our eyes to the fact that we are facing a general election.

I would like to refer briefly to the matter of coal. I think that this matter has reached that stage when we can hardly believe in any proposals made in reference to it. Year after year we hear about what is going to be done, but nothing is done and no Government has made less effort than the present to develop our areas. There seems to be a general admission that the coal is there. Mr. Howley, our Geological Surveyor, in his reports year after year, points to the coal areas at Grand Lake and Codroy which he says are only waiting development. The only act of the present Government in relation to this matter of coal supply was in the first or second session of the last Legislatur to make a contract handing over the coal areas for development to some English concern. I am not aware that this Company ever did anything under its agreement and I think its rights have lapsed long ago. It is time that something really effective should be done and it would have been much better that the one or two hundred thousand dollars that have been squandered in other directions had been expended in a persistent effort to uncover and see by practical work what coal we have. We have had in the past experts coming here regarding coal as we have had regarding other matters, but, sir, I think that so far as the coal is concerned and the power of deciding whether we have coal or not, we have as much information and as much intelligence and as much probability of ascertaining the value and extent of our coal areas from Mr. Howley, our Geological Surveyor, who from his experience of thirty or forty years, ought surely be able to tell where our coal is and in what quantities, far better than any expert imported from abroad, who would almost exclusively depend on Mr. Howley. I think, sir, that any expert we may bring in here will not be able to give us any better information than Mr. Howley is able to give. We should get down to work give Mr. Howley a free hand and do what can be done on these coal areas.

I notice that arrangements are being made for the development of Labrador. I hope that the Prime Minister will be able to inform us sometime during the session as to the position in which the dispute between us and the Province of Quebec regarding the Labrador territory, stands. This is a matter of much vital importance to us. While I myself believe that we have a case that is impregnable in defence of our claim to Labrador territory, still we see in the papers that the legal advisors of the Province of Quebec, take an equally strong stand in defence of their pretensions. Five or six years ago, when I was at the Department of Justice, it was agreed that this matter should be referred to the Imperial Privy Council. Since then we have heard nothing regarding it. I hope, sir, that before any large expenditures are undertaken or contractual obligations entered into that this question will be settled decisively one way or the other.

I note that it is the intention of the Government to have an enquiry into the effect of the whale fishery upon

the codfishery. This, of course, is most desirable. It is a matter in which the fishermen of the country have been interested for some time past. If an enquiry in which they will have confidence is held into this matter and it is found that there is nothing to worry over, then they will be satisfied. If on the other hand it should be established by such a Board that there are grounds for their fears, then steps must be taken to protect the codfishery, which is the great staple industry of the country.

I shall not delay the House further. I would simply say that when the various matters which the Government has under contemplation come before the House, they will receive from the Opposition the most careful consideration. We cannot at the present time determine what means the Government will take to establish the equilibrium in their finances, but I am sure, sir, that when they appear in the Minister of Finance's budget they will be given our best attention.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Speaker, just two or three observations in relation to the remarks that have fallen from my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition. I agree with him that it is not usual on the opening day to go into details as regards the various matters that form the subjects of the Speech from the Throne, yet I may be pardoned if I say a word or two, and only a word or two, in reply to the remarks which he has made.

In the first place, I should like to follow his lead in congratulating you, sir, upon the important position to which you have been elected. From the acquaintance of this House with you, your general fitness for the position, and your experience in the late Parliament, we feel that you will fully sustain the highest traditions that have been handed down to you by your distinguished predecessors. I would also, like to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. I agree with what the Leader of the Opposition has said, that it is not often that we find two juniors, at least juniors in parliamentary life, acquit themselves so acceptably as they have done. I am sure that it will be a matter of congratulation to their constituents when they read the report of the very interesting and able speeches which they have made to-day. And if congratulations are the order of the day, surely, Mr. Speaker, I may be pardoned if I congratulate my friend Mr. Kent on his appointment to the leadership of the Opposition, and express the hope that for many years he may be spared to fill that post. I should also like to welcome to the House the new members. There are some of the old faces missing, some whose experience and industry and general knowledge of the country's affairs would have been of great value to the Legislature. They are with us no longer, but I hope that some day they will be back again. Notwithstanding that I tender a hearty welcome to the new members on both sides of the House, and I am quite satisfied that they will all establish a record that will be appreciated by their constituencies and do good generally for the whole country.

My first difference with my hon. friend on the opposite side of the House is as regards the statement that he made in relation to the reduction of the tariff last year, namely, that that reduction was made for the purpose of influencing the electors. Last year when we were in session we put tea, sugar, pork and beef on the free list. We were told then, and we are told now, that that was done to influence the electorate. Is it not extraordinary how some people are

always imagining that others are doing just what they would do themselves if similarly situated? That is the explanation for the statement made here this evening. My learned friend is aware that nearly six years ago, when this Party first appealed to the country, the first and most solemn pledge made was in relation to the reduction of taxation, and the placing of these items on the free list. It was not an election promise; it was not a death-bed repentance; it was the fulfilment of a solemn obligation entered into with the people six years ago.

"Chasing rainbows," is the expression with which my hon, friend describes the work in which we have been engaged for the last six years. What effect "chasing rainbows" has to the action of the Government does seem incomprehensible. Well, I could have closed my eyes and imagined that I was listening to a speech that was delivered here thirty years ago. The Leader of the Opposition in referring to the Speech from the Throne stated that it was like nearly every other Speech that he had heard delivered. I can say precisely the same of the speech which he has just made. I do not say this in any sense of blame, because one of the duties of the leader of the Opposition, if any duty at all attaches to that position, is to put up a criticism to the Speech from the Throne. He is expected to do it and he does it and I find no fault whatever with him for the manner in which he has performed the task. But I do say that it is not fair to the district he represents, to his party,or to the country that statements should be made by one holding a responsible position which may injure the country abroad. For the last five years in this House we have heard the same old story told here, that the bottom is dropping out of everything; that there is no hope for the country; that we are pursuing a policy which will ultimately end in ruin; that all that we have been doing, all the projects which we have been putting forward, are opposed to the best interests of the country. For five years in opposition my friend has played the part of a Cassandra, a prophet of evil. In his opinion there is no hope for the country; it is simply a question of calling in an official receiver and winding it up. Of course no one takes him seriously. I have been listening to this for thirty years in this House from men in opposition. I remember in 1890 when we embarked on the policy of building a railway from Whitbourne to Port aux Basques we were told by the then Leader of the Opposition that it meant ruin for the country, bankruptcy and confederation. You have only to turn up the debates of that day and you will find resolution after resolution pointing out that to build the railway across country meant absolute ruin. But those of us who supported that policy —Sir William Whiteway, who has passed away; Sir Robert Bond who has now retired; and others whom I could mention that were in the Party at that time and started to build the railway from Whitbourne to Port aux Basques; had faith in the country and its great natural resources which that railway was destined to develop; and instead of having to increase taxation, government after government have been enabled to put the necessaries of life on the free list, so that now the people are taxed less than they were in 1882 when we started to buiid the railway. In 1882 an ordinary fisherman's account of $400 paid about $50 taxation. To-day it pays half that amount. When I was associated with Sir Robert Bond's government we placed flour and salt, lines and twines and molasses and kerosene oil on the

free list. The present Government placed tea, sugar, pork and beef on the free list. And we are not going to reverse that policy. It is a wonder to me why a dollar is brought into the country; how anyone can have any faith in the country, if they read what is said here by the members on the other side and by persons in apparent authority outside. You can hardly take up a paper without finding something decrying the country and its resources. Speaking of the railway my learned friend the Leader of the Opposition referred to the fact that not one final certificate has been issued in relation to any of the five branches of railway. Well, I may say that that is a fact, and no Final Certificate will be issued until the Contractor has entirely carried out his contract, until the last nail is driven and the last bit of ballasting put in. There is only one branch that a Final Certificate might be issued for —the Bonavista branch. All the others are only partially built, and even the Bonavista branch is not yet entirely finished. There is certain trestle work to be removed and filled in and other details to be finished. It is a matter between the Government Engineer and the Reid Nfld. Company. No final payment will be made or certificate issued until the Government Engineer, who is an absolutely impartial and thoroughly competent man, reports that he is satisfied that the work has been done and passes the branch. In view of this explanation what becomes of the statement of my learned friend, that no final certificate has been passed, or of what value is it?

Then my learned friend referred to the responsibility of the country in having to pay for the branch lines, and what they are going to cost the Colony. Well, all I can tell him is this: In the first place no one ever expected that the roads would be built free. We have already borrowed $6,000,000 to build these branches. The interest on that sum amounts to about $210,000 a year. In other words at a cost of a little more than $210,000 a year we will have built the five branches of railway. He then went on to point out that we would have done better if we had got the contractor to take bonds as he did before instead of paying him in gold. One would imagine, to hear my hon. friend, that the contractor was prepared to take bonds and that we refused to make such a contract. The contract that we made with him was the very best that could have been made at the time. As my hon. friend well knows, the price of labour, rails, ties and equipment has increased since 1893 when we made the first contract with him. In the contract we made with the contractor not alone did he agree to build at the figure of '93, namely, $15,600 a mile, but he reduced that figure to $15,000 and he raised the pay of the labourers on the works from $1 to $1.50 per day. In consideration of that reduction in price and the increase in the labour wage we agreed to pay him in gold instead of in bonds. It meant the same to the Colony if we could get $96 clear for our $100 bond. The reduction of the $600 represented the four points. We raised the first loan of $4,000,000 at that figure and the Colony netted 96. The next loan, that is the $2,00,000 raised two years ago, only netted us 91, the bonds having been placed on the market at 93 but this difference was more than made up by the increase in the labour wage paid our people and the Colony has more than recouped itself by the duties collected by reason of the increased purchasing power of the people. We were not able to go to Reid and ask him to take bonds when we were

insisting on better terms under the 1909 contract than had been given under any previous contract. Under the contract for building the road to Port aux Basques the men who worked on the road got a dollar a day. We insisted that no man should get less than $1.50, an increase of fifty per cent. In other words, he brought a dollar off the road, as it probably cost him about 50c. a day to live on the road. When it is remembered that out of that $15,000 a mile which we pay the contractor for building these lines, half goes in wages, then the value of the contract which we made can be understood. As regards the increased cost of borrowing money, I don't doubt the accuracy of Lord Strathcona's statement just read by my learned friend, but that statement is true not only in relation to Newfoundland but to the whole world. The cost of money is going up. People will probably never again get money in England at 3½ per cent., as they have been getting it for hundreds of years. Over two billions of dollars of English gold have gone into Canada to build up that country at 3½ and 4 and 4½ per cent. Just fancy! Not two millions, nor two hundred millions, but two billions. But Lord Strathcona is probably right. He says that that day has gone, and that in future people will have to pay a little more. But suppose we do have to pay a little more, are we not able to do it in order to bring the train to the doors of every man, woman and child in the country? One would imagine that we were going to live on this earth for a thousand years and that the conditions that we have around us in this country were good enough for the people. People are satisfied to pay a little more and live better. They want some of the comforts and conveniences and some of the civilizing agencies that we find in every country. Look at the people of Bonavista and Trinity and Bay de Verde and all that section of the country to-day. Why, they ran the risk of their lives if they came on here to carry on the seal fishery in the spring; while with the railway, they can for a small amount sit comfortably and safe in a car as they come through district after district. Then the railway is a developing agency, to open up the great natural resources of the country. And you hear people ask: Will it pay? Why there are a thousand things that we do not because they will pay but because we have got to do them and because they are necessary. Did you ever hear anyone ask whether a dose of medicine when taken to save life, will pay? Does a lighthouse pay? We get no money returns from them but still they pay and we must have them. We have got to keep the young people in the country, and if we don't make the country worth stopping in they will go away to Canada or the States or other countries where conditions of life are easier, where they get higher wages and where the comforts and conveniences of life are all round them. If we sit down and do nothing, if we simply pursue a policy of collecting the revenue and paying the officials, then we will have an emigration out of the country and there will be nobody left but the old and infirm. We can get all the money we want. I will be able to show my learned friend before the session is over the truth of that statement. We will require something like a million and a half more to finish the five branches, and even then the total cost will not be large. All this criticism about the railway is intended to throw dust in the eyes of the people. The question is merely selected because it is more difficult for the people to assess its value and follow the reasoning. If I were here to-night

proposing an increased vote of $100,000 a year for Pauper Relief there would not be a word about it because hon. members would be afraid to oppose what would be regarded as popular. When we came into office there were not alone the ordinary permanent poor but there was pauper relief all over the country. Now labour is plentiful and well paid, you cannot get a man to go to work. This could only have been accomplished by opening up and developing the country.

Then my learned friend referred to the reduction in the tariff. The Minister of Finance did not reduce the tariff for the purpose of getting revenue. He reduced it in pursuance of a solemn pledge made to the country, a pledge that we were not able to carry out until the last session because we had other and more serious obligations to deal with. The first thing we had to do was to find $210,000 a year to pay the interest on the railway loan; then we had to find $100,000 a year for education; then we had to find $60,000 a year for Old Age Pensions; then we had to find money for lighthouses, fog alarms; and then, being blessed with large revenues, after carrying out our policy we found ourselves in a position to meet every obligation and take $380,000 a year off the shoulders of the poorest people in the country. And suppose that right here this evening we were proposing to put it back, would the people be in any worse condition than they were before we came in? But we are not going to put it back. We will get that $380,000 from those who are better able to pay it than they are. Why that sum is only a mere bagatelle for the people of this country. There are people In this country to-day spending $200,000 a year on the maintenance of motor cars who would have dropped down dead with heart disease ten years ago if you had told them that they would own a motor. And some of them have not only one motor but five motors, and that is the class that we are going to get the revenue from. There will be nothing unfair about it. We will remove the burden further from those who are unable to bear it and put it on the shoulders of those who are spending their time looking around for new pastimes and new ways to spend money.

My learned friend wound up a very creditable and a very able speech by reference to the coal question. The coal question is still troubling him. It has been a source of trouble to the Opposition, as far as I can remember, for thirty years. When they are on this side of the House they never think of doing anything in relation to boring for coal, but when they get on the other side they never "let up" on the boring. They bore themselves and everyone else but don't bore for coal. It reminds me of the story of the friend sympathizing with the lady whose husband had recently died. "Poor fellow," she said, "I know how he would feel if he were here this cold weather; he would be thinking about the coal." "Well," said the other, "where he is now, he isn't worrying much about coal." Now, as regards the coal, it is a matter of history that when Sir Robert Bond was in office, and I happened to be a member of his Cabinet, we did everything in our power to develop the coal. The first step in the matter was taken by the late Tory Government, by the late Sir James Winter and Mr. Morine; it was to hand over the coal areas at Grand Lake to Mr. Reid as part of the land grants he was entitled to. He further bound himself to develop the coal The Reid Co. spent fifty or sixty thousand dollars in developing this coal area, and then

dropped it, and surrendered the grant of the coal areas to the Government and it is now down in the Colonial Secretary's office and may be had by any of the members of the Opposition or any of their supporters outside who happens to have fifty thousand dollars to invest in this proposition. The next effort of the Bond Government was in 1905. When we entered into a contract with Lord Northcliffe, who, jointly with the Government decided to develop the coal area at Grand Lake, Lord Northcliffe obtained the services of an expert from the United States who examined the regions, but the result was not sufficiently satisfactory for Lord Northcliffe to feel himself justified in proceeding further with the venture. The Government then looked around and spent a large amount annually in boring for coal summer after summer by importing expert coal borers. The hon. member, Mr. Clift, the then efficient Minister of Agriculture and Mines, will remember that although this work was carried on for some years nothing of a tangible nature resulted beyond the making of a report. If hon. members will look at the records they will find that failure after failure was the outcome of attempts to exploit the coal areas. When we came into office we found only the records of repeated failure. This Government then made a contract with an English company, the members of which were highly recommended by our financial agents in London, but owing to the inability of that Company to procure the necessary capital nothing further was heard of the matter. It is a very easy matter to exploit an undertaking of this description, but it is an altogether different thing to raise the necessary money for its operation. We then entered into communication with the Colonial Office and we have now succeeded in obtaining the services of an expert, Prof. Dunstan, to come out and make an examination of our coal areas. The only thing we can do is to keep on obtaining the best experts to make examinations of these regions. The late Capt. Cleary had a grant of probably the best seam of coal in the Island, and paid the rent on it for nearly fifty years and entered into all sorts of contracts and options with various persons and companies for its operation but without avail; and his estate surrendered their lease only last year because the representativs of the estate did not feel justified in making further expenditure on the claims. These areas are now at the disposal of any applicant who may apply for them at the Crown Lands Office. I have read the reports of our Geologist, Mr. Howley and those of his predecessor, Mr. Murray, and I am firmly convinced that the coal of a superior quality is there in large quantities. I have also had special reports upon the coal areas of this country made by Mr. Fletcher and others and I am satisfied that large quantities of good coal exist but that a great deal of money is required for development purposes; in fact much more money than we as a Government would be justified in spending; consequently the development of our coal areas must, I fear, be largely left to private enterprise. The hon. member, Mr. Kent, is not justified in his remarks in reference to the development of our coal areas when he spoke as if this Government alone were to blame, and it is a pity that he marred his speech in this connection. All of us are anxious for the time to arrive when we will be consuming coal mined from our own areas. I can assure the House that nothing will be left undone by the Government to bring about this de-

sirable condition of affairs. We all deplore the increased cost of coal but every rise in the price of coal brings nearer the day when our coal areas must be developed, and we may hope that that day is now at hand. Nothing that the Government can do to assist it, whether in the way of expenditures for boring or otherwise, will be left undone, having regard always to the safety of the finances of the country.

The motion being put, was then carried, and it was ordered that Messrs. Currie, Higgins, Clift, Grimes and Le-Feuvre be the Committee to draft an Address in Reply.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that on the morrow he would ask leave to introduce the following bills:

A bill to amend Chapters 40 and 41 of the Consolidated Statutes, respecting the Storage and carrying of Gunpowder and other explosives.

A bill to amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes, respecting Patents.

A bill entitled, "An Act respecting the exhibition of Advertisements."

A bill to amend 6 Ed. VII. Chap 3, entitled, "The Aliens Act."

Mr. Coaker gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Kent gave Notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, JAN. 16, 1914.

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

QUESTIONS.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement showing (1) the cost of the Lighthouse erected at Shoe Cove Point, Greenspond; (2) and the Fog Alarms at Puffin Island and Greenspond; (3) the amount paid for coal for Lighthouses during 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1913, from whom purchased, the cost paid per ton for the coal, and the cost of freight per ton delivered at Lighthouse; (4) also a detailed statement of all moneys expended for the construction of Marconi Stations during the years 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913; (5) also a statement showing when the Cod Liver Oil Expert entered the service of the Government and what amount of money has been paid for his services; (6) also a statement showing the amounts expended by, or in connection with, the Fishery Board from 1909 to 1913, both years inclusive; (7) also a statement showing what money was collected by the Inland Fisheries Board during the years of 1912 and 1913, for what, and from whom received. (8) also a statement showing the number of foxes confiscated during the year 1913, from whom taken, how such foxes were disposed of, and what they were sold for.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to inform the hon. member that the answers to all these questions are in the course of preparation except that relating to the Marconi stations, which is not in my department, being under the Department of the Post Office.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing (a) what grants other than local were issued by his department during the months of April, May, June, July, August, September October, November and December, in the district of Bonavista giving dates such grants were issued and to whom, and copies of the returns of such expenditure and accounts in connection therewith. (b)

What grants other than local were issued by his department for Bonavista District during the years 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913, and to whom sent.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that section (a) of the question does not set forth the year for which he wishes to obtain the grants referred to.

Mr. COAKER—I wish to have them for the year 1913.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—In that case I shall have them prepared. As to section (b) of the question I wish to state that it would take the entire staff of my department fully six weeks to prepare the statements therein asked for. If the hon. gentleman is satisfied I shall bring the originals here and leave them in care of the Clerk of the House in order that the hon. gentleman may be able to examine them. I am sorry I cannot leave them out of the care of the Clerk of the House for last year I brought up some original papers and owing to the fault of some party they were not returned.

MR. KENT—The members of the opposition returned all papers given to them.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I do not know who was to blame, but I cannot allow the papers of my department to go out of the possession of the Clerk.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. 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, 1910, and the amendment thereof and the contracts thereby confirmed or authorized, showing separately the amounts paid under the following headings: (1) to the Contractor for construction work, showing separately the amount paid for each branch line; (2) to the Contractor for any of the works specified in Sections 34, 36 and 37 of the contract, showing the particular works in respect to which each such payment was made and the branch line to which it related; (3) other payments to the Contractor or any other person the authority for which is based upon the said Acts or the contracts thereby confirmed or authorized, specifying the dates and purposes of every such payment; (4) whether any payments other than those above specified have been made out of the loans of £800,000 and £400,000 respectively and, if so, give the details of each such payment with amount, date and purpose of, and person to whom each payment was made; (5) the balance now to the credit of the said loans and, where such balance is now deposited.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—All the answers to the questions asked are in the course of preparation with the exception of the answer to (4), which I now table.

MR. KENT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House, a statement showing, in detail, all amounts paid or allocated in the District of St. John's East, out of the ordinary, special and surplus trust grants, from February 1, 1913, to date, giving in each case the dates, names of the parties and purposes of each payment; also, a copy of the returns of each such payment.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I gave instructions this morning to have the statement prepared and I hope it will be ready early next week.

MR. KENT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing, in detail, all amounts paid or allocated in the District of St. John's East, out of the ordinary, special and surplus trust grants from February

1, 1913, to date, giving in each case the dates, names of the parties and purposes of each payment; also, a copy of the returns of each such payment.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—The statement asked for is in the course of preparation.

EXPLOSIVES BILL

Pursuant to notice and leave granted the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister introduced a Bill to amend Chapters 40 and 41 of the Consolidated Statutes, respecting the Storage and Carrying of Gun powder and other Explosives, and it was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

PATENTS BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister introduced a Bill to amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes, respecting "Patents" and it was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

ADVERTISEMENTS BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister introduced a Bill entitled, "An Act Respecting the Exhibition of Advertisements," and it was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

ALIENS BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister introduced a Bill to amend 6 Edward VII. Chapter 3, entitled: "The Aliens Act," and it was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. KENT gave Notice of Question.

MR. CLIFT gave Notice of Question.

MR. COAKER gave Notice of Question.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in future a record should be kept in the Journals and the published debates, of all answers to questions asked in the House. It is customary to keep a record of the questions alone, in the Journals and official reports of the House of Assembly. I have never been able to see the reason for this, as the questions are of no use as a record without the answers.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member. I cannot understand why the answers do not appear in the Journals. I believe that their omission is due to the ruling of some former Speaker, for what reasons I do not know. I agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Kent, that a record should be kept of the answers and will bring the matter before the Internal Economy Committee.

The House then adjourned till Monday at 3 p.m.

MONDAY, Jan. 19th, 1914

The House met at 3.15 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table replies in answer to the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Kent's question about expenditures asked yesterday.

PETITION.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from John Churchill and others of Portugal Cove, in the District of St. John's East on the question of the appointment of a Road Board in that section. They think it is in the public interest that a Road Board should be appointed and that better results would be accomplished and that more satisfaction would be given to all the parties concerned, if a Road Board were established. I think it would be desirable that expenditures of public

moneys in any locality should, where possible be under local control, both in this and other departments. I beg to recommend this petition first to the Department of Public Works, and then to the Government. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary and be brought before the Government.

QUESTIONS.

MR. KENT asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister whether Hon. Donald Morison still fills the office of Minister of Justice and Hon. Sydney D. Blandford still fills the office of Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and what measures have been, or will be, adopted to have these offices filled by members of the House of Assembly, and when will these measures be given effect.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Mcrison does not fill the Office of Minister of Justice and Mr. Blandford does not fill the Office of Minister of Agriculture and Mines. These gentlemen resigned their respective offices on the 2nd January 1914. Up to the present the Government has not considered the filling of these offices.

MR. CLIFT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing, in detail, all amounts paid or allocated in the electoral district of Twillingate out of ordinary, special, or surplus trust grants during the year 1913, giving the dates of such allocation, the names of the parties to whom allocated, and also the purposes for which allocations were made.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.— I am now preparing the required statement.

MR. CLIFT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing, in detail, all amounts paid or allocated in the electoral district of Twillingate out of ordinary, special, or surplus trust grants during the year 1913, giving the dates of such allocations, the names of the parties to whom allocated, and also the purposes for which allocations were made.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I have the statement asked for by the hon. gentleman and beg to table same.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing (a) what amounts of money were expended for Telegraph extension in 1912 and 1913; (b) what amount was expended in each District; (c) the number of miles of cable used and the cost of such cable; (d) also the amount of money expended in 1912 and 1913 for repairs to cables.

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the hon. gentleman that Mr. LeMessurier, the accountant at the Post Office is getting the statement ready. I have made arrangements and will table the answer to-morrow if possible. I may say that the accountant has been ill for a few days, hence some delay.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing (a) what grants, other than local were issued by his department during the months of April, May, June, July, August, September, October Novem ber and December, for the District of Harbor Main, giving dates such grants were issued and to whom, and copies of the returns of such expendi ture and accounts in connection therewith; (b) what grants other than local were issued by his department for Harbor Main District during the years 1911, 1912 and 1913. and to whom sent.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I

beg to inform the hon. gentleman that am having an answer prepared.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE

MR. SPEAKER presented to the House a certified copy of minute of His Excellency the Governor in Council appointing the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the Legislature for the Session of 1910, as follows:

The President of the Legislative Council.

Hon. R. K. Bishop.

Hon. P. T. McGrath

His Honour the Speaker

Rt. Hon. Sir Edward P. Morris, P. C., K.C.M.G

Hon. J. R. Bennett.

Hon C. H. Emerson.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. J. S. CURRIE tabled the report of the committee appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, which was as follows:

To His Excellency Walter Edward Davidson, Esq., Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, 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.

Signed,—

J. S. CURRIE,
W. J. HIGGINS,
THOS. LeFEUVRE.

House of Assembly, Jan. 19th, 1914.

On motion of **MR. CURRIE** the report was received.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Speaker, before the adoption of the Report I should like to make one or two observations in connection with it. But first of all I would like to avail of this opportunity to extend to you my personal felicitations upon your elevation to the chair of this House. I have every confidence in you personally and every confidence that as Speaker you will perform your duties in such a manner as to be acceptable to the whole House.

I wish also to avail of this opportunity to follow the remarks made by the Premier and my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, upon opening day when it was announced to this House that the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond who for so many years had been a prominent figure in this House had retired from active political life and had resigned his seat in this House. I wish to place on record my feelings of the deepest regret on account of this occurrence.

Mr. Speaker, I need not dilate upon Sir Robert Bond's political history. That is well known to the country, well known to this House. It is a matter of sincerest regret that he has disassociated himself from his House. Personally, I have been associated with him in politics for a period of twenty-five years and during the past thirteen years I have been associated with him as a colleague in the representation of the District of Twillingate. And I say, sir, that it is a matter of the greatest regret that that gentleman has thought fit to resign his seat. The absence of such a man from this House is a distinct loss to the whole country. No matter on what side of the House he sat, whether on the Government benches or upon the Opposition side, he always brought into debate in this House very much matter that we might all profit by in the future. I make these observations because I feel that I am being severed from one for whom I always had the very highest regard and esteem. Notwithstanding anything that may be said

to the contrary by certain portions of the Press I think that the public generally will concur with me in this expression of deep regret and in the hope that at no distant future date Sir Robert Bond may again be induced to enter political life.

As to the Speech with which His Excellency opened the present parliament I do not intend to make any lengthy comment. The Speech itself is very like many other similar speeches from the same source. We all know that practically it is the Speech of the Government of the day. It is intended to be a record of the many matters that have been dealt with by the Government and an intimation of the policy that the Government intends to pursue in the future.

In proposing the appointment of a Committee to draft an Address in Reply the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Currie, made a very excellent speech and I have to congratulate him upon the manner in which he delivered that speech and upon the tone in which it was delivered. I am glad to see coming into this House men who are able to deal with a matter of this kind as he dealt with it. And the same remarks apply to the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, who seconded the motion.

In his speech Mr. Currie, amongst other things pointed out that the revenue of the country during the past four or five years had increased to a very large extent. And he pointed out that that increase had taken place during the administration of the present Government. That is perfectly true. But an ordinary observer would be led to suppose that that increase nad taken place by reason of some act of the present Government. It was not owing to any particular policy of the present Government that that increase took place, it was because of the result of the policy of the previous government.

I am sure, sir, there is no one in this House or in the various constituencies represented by this House who will not join in extending a hearty welome to their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Connaught should they honor this country by visiting it during the coming summer. We are all delighted at the prospect of such a visit and I am sure that the people of the country will extend to the Royal visitors that hearty welcome which is of this country a noteworthy characteristic.

The Speech from the Throne points out the fact, if it is a fact, that the agricultural prospects in the light of last year's operations are most gratifying and that the number of agricultural societies have increased all over the country. Well, sir, I shall content myself with observing at the present moment that so far as the agricultural policy of the Government is concerned I have not yet been able to see that any substantial result has come from it and we have had no return adequate to the large amount of money expended annually in the so-called advancement of agriculture. The system of appointing societies throughout the Colony for the purpose of promoting the best interests of agriculture is not a sound one and the only way in which our agricultural conditions can be improved is by taking the matter up in our schools and teaching the science of agreulture to our children or by the establishment of an agricultural college. In no other way in my opinion can the great science of agriculture be taught to our people.

The Speech goes on to deal with our coal areas and points out that Professor Dunstan, Director of the Imperial Institute, has been invited to come to the Colony for the purpose of making enquiry into our possibilities in this direction. Well, sir, I only say

that I hope something definite will be done in connection with these areas. We have not yet had any opportunity of hearing very much about Professor Dunstan but I have no doubt that he is a man of some reputation and if he does come to this country and is able to make a favorable report upon our coal areas it is just possible that upon this report some capitalists may be induced to take up the matter. It cannot be expected that within this country itself it would be possible to form a company that would be able to undertake the operation of our coal areas. We must not expect anything in the way of development in this direction. It must come from capital to be obtained abroad and it is only upon the report of some reliable and eminent man that outside capitalists will be induced to put their money into this venture.

Some of the matters that have been dealt with in the Speech from the Throne will no doubt come before the House in other forms during the balance of the session and I shall content myself until then as I have further observations which I desire to make.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks in connection with the matters before the House. I should like first of all to congratulate my hon. friend, Mr. Currie, upon the speech he made upon opening day. Although I heartily congratulate him upon that speech I do not agree with him in most of the things he said. Especially is this so when he took up the question of the fishery. He stated that the price of fish was kept so high this year by the fact that we exported so much green fish to the United States. Before he made that statement he evidently did not try to find out the exact figures, because if he did he would know that the export of green fish to the United States for the past year was not as great as that for the year 1912. In fact, Sir, the export of green fish had nothing whatever to do with the price. There was not enough exported to make any difference in the price, but I hope the day is not far distant when we will have one-third of our total catch going out of the country as green fish for the American market, or in such forms as it is now packed for use in the United States. When that time comes you will find that the export of green fish will have an influence on the price of fish in Newfoundland.

Another remark made by my learned friend was that after the reduction of taxation the revenue did not come up to expectations. There is not the slightest doubt about that. But why was not better consideration given to that fact when the Government were considering their reduction? $380,000 was the amount of the reduction made by the Government. I contend that when this amount of $380,000 was under consideration, everything possible should have been considered And such was not the case. I am told that all the members of the Executive were not present when the matter was decided upon. I do not know whether that is true or not, but in any case the matter did not receive a great deal of consideration. We, as members of the F.P.U., have been considering the matter of the reduction of the tariff. We have expressed our opinion, and we have brought our opinions before the Government We asked for a reduction in tea, sugar and other articles, but we never contemplated that there would be a reduction of three cents on granulated and four cents on cube sugar If the Government wanted to take off the duty on sugar, why did

they not take off two cents on granulated and keep on one cent That would have given them fifty or sixty thousand dollars The amount of sugar consumed since the reduction has nearly doubled, and at one cent a pound that would have given $50,000 or $60,000 revenue Then, again, they took four cents off cube sugar That is the sugar used by professional men, by business men, by men who have plenty of money to pay for it. The Government took off 4 cents when they should have put on 2 cents and made the duty 6 For these reasons I do not agree with a lot that has been said by my hon.friend,Mr. Currie. I hope that when any such matter comes before the Government it will receive better consideration than heretofore. I do not believe that the duty should be taken off these articles altogether. I do not believe in bringing in a number of articles and making them free of duty. The people expect a lot of money to be spent upon public necessities, and that being so, it is not fair that all these things should be free. One cent a pound upon sugar should have been left, and the people would have been just as well pleased to get that reduction. Then that particular duty should be ear-marked. I do not believe in everything being placed to the general revenue. There are various things required by the fishermen for which certain duties and certain moneys should be especially ear-marked. Such things as motor boats. Certain duties should be ear-marked for certain purposes.

Another remark made by my hon. friend was in regard to the recent elections. He said that where the policy of the Government was discussed, the Government was victorious. What was discussed down North? What was discussed in the districts where Mr. Blandford, Mr. Morison, Mr. Squires and other gentlemen stood? What was discussed but matters of policy? I contend that in the northern districts nothing but the Government's policy was laid before the people. It was in the northern districts that the matters were discussed, and no other matters were laid before the people. Elsewhere and in the Southern Districts anything and everything was sufficient to hurl about, and we find the men who fought these districts attacking not only the Opposition party, but the F.P.U., with such cries as Socialism and Godless schools, and other catch-cries. I have here in my hand a paper issued just previous to the election, in which such dastardly charges are made against the F.P.U. Now, Mr. Speaker, where is this dastardly thing, Socialism? Where is it in the F.P.U.? This kind of thing was got off on dozens of platforms in the elections. I contend that we are as far from Socialism in the F.P.U. as the North Pole is from the South. We have never had anything to do with Socialism. Socialism, as it is known in Germany and England, has never had a foothold in the Councils of the F.P.U. We have been accused of circulating "Cotton's Weekly" and "The Menace." Now, Sir, we have never circulated "Cotton's Weekly" or "The Menace." I have never taken "Cotton's Weekly.' It is true it was sent to me for three months, but I returned it and told them I did not want to have anything to do with it. If you are going to run an election upon such stuff as that, how can you say that the policy of the Government has been laid before the people, and that you have won on its merits?

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the Speech contain? I was expecting that the first Speech that we would hear in this House would contain something that would be of real benefit to the fishermen.

The Premier congratulated us as the new members of the House. I do not think he really meant that. I think he would prefer that some of his friends had been returned in our place. But, Sir, now that we are here I hope that we will work together, that we will be able to do something that will be of great benefit to the people, and that at the end of four years we will be able to say that the fishermen of this country are in a better position than they are now

As I said before, there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne. I see there is reference to the water powers on Labrador. I doubt whether we are ever going to have that. There is no chance of it. There is no more chance of getting a company to undertake the development of these water powers than there is of my flying to Heaven to-night. If the Premier can show us one specific letter that he can lay before the House to show that he is negotiating with some substantial Company or man to open up the water powers on Labrador, I would believe it. And I would ask the Premier that he hand any agreement he may contemplate to the House, and to take the House into his confidence before anything of a binding nature is done, so that we may not be party to anything that is likely to cause friction with the fishermen of the country. We have several agreements with companies and corporations, and particularly with the Reid-Nfld. Company. They all appeared to be splendid when brought before the House, but were of doubtful benefit when the agreements came into operation. I hope something will come of this Labrador business, and I hope the Premier will lay his proposals before us in a friendly way before they are embodied in a formal agreement, so that something may be done to develop these water powers to the interest of the country. One thing that strikes me about this matter is the dispute over the boundary question. That seems likely to wreck the whole proposition. If people are going to spend six million or one million dollars in a venture like this, they are not going to do it without knowing who has the right to give them the land, and who is going to give it to them. Another matter is that some provision will be necessary so that no one will be allowed to export wood pulp from Labrador. Now, I hope we wont have any such measure without that. If we do, I am sorry but we shall have to oppose it from this side of the House.

Then there is going to be an investigation into the whale fishery. I remember taking an interest in this whaling business when it first came up in Newfoundland. Quite a number of fishermen presented a petition to Sir Robert Bond, who was then in power, against allowing any whale factories in this country. An investigation was then supposed to have taken place, and the decision of the Government was that no injury had been caused to the Norwegian fishery by the killing of whales there. Now that the whales have been exterminated and the damage done we find that the Government are to have an investigation to find out what effect the killing of whales has on the fisheries. There are hundreds and thousands of fishermen in Newfoundland who think that if you kill the whales you will get no bait. I do not give this as my opinion. I have no opinion upon the matter; but these fishermen think that if you kill the whales you destroy the agency which drives the bait fishes towards the shore. They may be right and they may be wrong, but why should the Government have waited ten or twelve years, until all the whales have been killed out, and then sit down and make an investigation

into the matter?

Another thing that we want is Cold Storage, and the Government are going to see now what can be done in this matter. The only way to deal with that question is to erect bait stations, and in cases where the fishermen would not have easy access to these stations, have a flotilla of motor boats to carry bait to where they can get it. Thousands and thousands of quintals of fish are lost annually to our fishermen because of the want of bait. How often will you see fine fishing days in the summer or fall, when there will be lots of fish around and no bait? If the Government had done what we wanted there would be no necessity to take up this matter now. The Fishermen's Union offered to erect bait depots free and maintain them free if the Government would provide the money for the materials. We knew that our fishermen wanted this, and we offered to assist the Government in the matter of erection and maintenance; all they had to do was to provide the materials; but, of course, nothing was done; and now we are going to have another investigation to see whether such a thing as bait depots are required. Now, give it up and get down to business. Allocate $100,000, and offer to every harbor who will come forward and agree to build the depots free and maintain them free, whatever the cost of the necessary materials will be—$1,000 or $2,000, or whatever it may be—and you will find that nothing that you have done since you have been a Government will be of greater value to the fishermen.

We are also going to have something done with coal again. We are going to have a Professor come here to tell us about our coal. Well, it seems to me that we have had a lot of men here from time to time to tell us whether we have got coal or not, but we do not seem to have got any further ahead. If there is coal there, I would like to see it located. There is nothing that I would not do to settle this question; but whether, in the event of coal being found, it is going to be a tremendous benefit to our people is another matter. I don't think it is going to be of very great benefit to the outport people or to St. John's people. It may be a great benefit in developing the interior resources of the Colony, and the Fishermen's Union, Mr. Speaker, will dc nothing to cause any trouble to the Government if their object is to find out fair and square what coal there is in the interior. As regards supplying coal tc the outports, we have taken up this question. We find quite a lot of trouble in getting schooners and many a harbor that wants coal cannot get it because of their inability to get schooners to bring it. We have done what we can, in fact we have supplied all our harbors that wanted coal at $6.00 a ton. Some of the business men think that we are off our heads because we are doing that, but I want to say that so far as we are concerned we have lost no money on the coal which we have delivered to the outports; and if we can deliver coal at $6.00 a ton and make a profit on it I don't see why business men cannot do the same. We are bringing in a load of coal now to sell here in St. John's to the poor people at $6.80 a ton. Coal has not risen in Sydney to the extent that local business men say it has. Coal can be landed at $6.80 if the business men are prepared to sell at a small profit; but, of course, you cannot expect business men to be philanthropists. But why do not the representatives of St. John's do something? Where is Mr. Higgins? Why does he not try to do something for the people of St. John's who have just returned him with such

a tremendous vote? Why should he not get four or five men together and charter a steamer and bring down coal here and sell it at cost? It could be landed at the Government wharf, and the Government might put a scales there so that it could be weighed out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to delay the House with my remarks on this occasion. In a maiden speech a great deal cannot be expected from the speaker. It is only right that I, or some one from this side of the House should make some remarks upon this occasion, because our presence here indicates something unusual. It is not by accident that we have come here. A revolution, though a peaceful one, has been fought in Newfoundland. The fishermen, the common man, the toiler of Newfoundland, has made up his mind that he is going to be represented upon the floors of this House to a larger extent than he ever was before; and the day will come, Mr. Speaker, when the fishermen of Newfoundland will have the controlling power in this House. Sir Robert Bond has laid down the issue that he is opposed to that policy. I would like the Premier to open the district of Twillingate in a bye-election and if he will do that, I will resign my seat in Bonavista and oppose Sir Robert in Twillingate and we will then decide this question as to whether the fishermen have the right to control the Government of Newfoundland or not. I am quite satisfied to go to Twillingate District and lay that issue before them there and have them decide, and I will be content with the result. The common man all over the world, Mr. Speaker, has made up his mind that the future is going to be a different thing from what the past has been with him. Men are no longer content to be slaves. They are going to be represented and to have a voice in the making of the laws of their country. They are not going to be content any longer to go to work at 6 in the morning and knock off at 6 in the afternoon, and then go home as best they can, get something to eat and go to bed, and get up the next morning and go to work again, and do that for three hundred and sixty-five days in the year, and be just as well off at the end of December as they were when they started on the second of January. There is a general protest all over the world against this condition. You can see it in England; you can see it even in China, where the people rose up last year and overthrew a government that had been in control for thousands of years, and established a republic. And if the Chinese can do these things, how is it that men living in Anglo-Saxon countries cannot have a greater say as to how they shall be governed. Heretofore they have not used the powers which they possess, but they are now waking up to see that unless they have public representation, unless they have men to represent them on the floors of the Assembly, they are not going to get what they should get.

I shall have a considerable amount to say upon matters that come before the House, especially in connection with expenditures. We are not sent here to fight the Government on small details of general matters, but we want to get at the expenditures. Four millions of dollars are taken from the people of Newfoundland and expended by the Government, and of that four millions the toiling masses pay the greater amount. Out of their pockets the greater amount comes. A man may spend lots of money on luxuries and thereby pay a considerable amount into the revenue of the country, but if there were no fishermen to catch fish and no labor to

cure it and export it, that man would not be able to buy luxuries. All the taxes that are collected on luxuries comes out of the pockets of the poor man eventually, and if you are going to put a higher duty on luxuries you are simply going to take it out of the pockets of the producers in the long run. You talk of putting taxes on motor cars. Why, they have got all the motor cars they want. They wont need to get very many more.

The Rt. Hon. Premier referred in his speech to the benefit derived by the people through the construction of the railways. He pointed out that the poor man down in Bonavista or Catalina who wishes to come here in the spring of the year don't have to go through all the exertion and hardship that formerly existed. I might tell him that the man that comes up here in the spring from Catalina or Bonavista does not get up any cheaper by railway than by steamer, and in the case of a steamer there is much less exertion, because he simply gets aboard at one point and does not have to worry until he is landed at the place where he is going. I tried to get some men along by rail last spring from Catalina, and the figure quoted me by the Reid Newfoundland Company was $3.10, while the steamer was taking men up for $2.00. Eventually, and through the exertions of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the price was lowered to $2.00. But if the railways are of such tremendous benefit to Bonavista and Trinity, how is it that we are here and the men who built the railways are outside. You have spent $2,000,000 to build a railway to Bonavista, and nearly $1,000,000 to build one down to Heart's Content, but we are here to represent these districts. Now, I'm not opposed to railway building. If I had been in the House I should have voted for the railway to Bonavista, and I should have voted for the railways to Fortune Bay and to Grate's Cove, but I should not have voted for the railway to Trepassey nor the one to Heart's Content. We hope that the Government will find, when they get the additional 1½ millions that that amount will be sufficient to complete the five branches, but I very much fear that the Premier's estimate will be a little out again. Four millions was to do the work first, and we were told that for that amount the five branches could be built. We said; alright, go ahead. We put out Bond; Bond was no good; he would not give us any railways; Morris was the man; he was going to build five branches for four millions of dollars. We then found that it was going to cost $6,000,000, and now we find that another million and a half is wanted. How much more will be required we don't know, but we will have the railways. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that when we get the railways finished, that the next thing after that which we will have to consider will be Confederation.

A word before I close in connection with those questions which I have laid upon the table of the House. The Minister of Public Works says that it will take his Department six weeks to get me the information which I have asked for. Well, I intend to ask twenty-five times as many questions as I have asked, and at that rate we wont get out of here until some time next Christmas if we are going to wait for the answers. If the Minister will bring up the original documents and lay them on the table of the House, we will manage to get the information which we want from them. We don't want to give the officials more work than they can do although at the present time they are not working very hard in answering our questions. I passed along by the

Public Works Department on Saturday last at 4 o'clock, and found that there was no one in the Department at that hour. Now, I am not going to say very much about the officials at the present time; I want to give them a chance to get us the information for which we have asked. As I have said, if we had the original documents we could get the information ourselves. I have here three or four outport men who have not very much to do just now; and they would be delighted to do this work. We have got to do our duty to those who sent us here. A great deal of money has been spent without any return, and if there is any way of finding out where it went it is our duty to discover it.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you upon your election to the high office that you now occupy in this House, and I trust that when we close this session we will be able to say that Speaker Goodison was as good a man as ever occupied that position in the House of Assembly.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, I listened with some attention to the opening remarks which were made when the Governor's Address came before the House, and followed to some extent what was said by the hon. member for Burin and by the seconder of the motion, the hon. member for St. John's East. It seemed to me that the House had turned itself into a sort of Mutual Admiration Society. The members were congratulating each other upon the excellent speeches made, and the hon, member for Burin congratulated the Premier upon the splendid showing made on that side of the House. I do not agree with him, because in the first place if he had given the matter a little more thought he would have found that owing to the way in which the electoral districts are divided up in this country, although they are in a majority they really only represent the minority of the people, and that the majority are represented on this side of the House. If the majority ruled in this country, the Premier and his colleagues, instead of being over on that side of the House, would be sitting over here. It has been stated here that the election of last fall was conducted upon a poiicy of principles That may have been true in some districts, but as has been pointed out by my honored leader, it is not true as regards all districts. Side issues were brought in that had no bearing upon policy or principle; and the members on the other side of the House who used these side issues were, in the first place, fooling the people, and, in the second place, misrepresenting a body of men who are working in the world for the benefit of humanity. I am not at all, sir, ashamed of the word Socialist, because anyone who understands the principles of Socialism knows that its aim is the elevation of the masses from the low position in which they are to-day. Now I have listened to the Rt. Hon. Premier at different times during the past four or five years, and I have heard remarks from his lips which would, if uttered in some countries, have qualified him to be a good member of the Socialistic body. Why, it was only during the past year that I listened to him making an address in the T. A. Hall, and there he came out flatly for what is known as the Minimum Wage. Now, sir, when we find the hon. the Premier insisting on a Socialistic principle as is shown by his support of the Minimum Wage, we could throw the word Socialist at the other side of the House.

When the Hon. the Premier spoke upon the coal question, I noted that it was the intention of the Government to engage a Professor to come out here and examine our coal areas and if it is ascertained that coal is there, that private capitalists are to be asked to invest their money so as to establish a coal industry in this country. Now, sir, I think the hon. the Premier is a man who is styled a Progressive and if he is a Progressive, then I think he ought to study what is being done in other countries in relation to these matters. He ought to study the position in the progressive countries of Australia and New Zealand, and he will find that instead of the Government of those countries trying to put their coal fields into the hands of private capitalists, they are going into the business themselves. It is very well known in this country what private ownership of these areas would mean. I do not stand here to-day to contend that all industries should be owned and controlled by the Government, but I do say that such natural utilities as coal, the railways, and other things of this sort should be owned and controlled by the people through the Government. As I have said, in the countries to which I have referred they have their coal owned and controlled by the people, because the people of those countries were up against the same conditions that we are meeting with in this country to day, and, as has been done in this country, the working classes there organized themselves into a union and decided that they would send their own representatives to the Legislature, and to-day their representatives are in a majority and govern the country. The establishment of a coal industry to be owned and controlled by the Government was commenced about 1909. Prior to that all the coal fields of those countries were operated by private concerns, but in 1910 practically all the coal areas were being operated by the State, with the result that the men had their wages increased, their hours were shortened, and besides that the coal was lessened in price to the people. In fact, everybody gained by the State control of the coal fields of these countries. The reason why I mention this matter is that if the Hon. the Premier is the progressive that he is considered to be, and if it is ascertained that we have coal in this country which can be worked, then I think that he and his associates in the Government ought make arrangements here for its operation by the Government.

I wish, sir, to tender my congratulations to you upon the high position which you occupy; and I, with my honored leader, hope that when the session is through, we will be able to say that the Speaker has done his duty faithfully and well.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I also desire to make one or two remarks regarding the Speech, with which His Excellency has been pleased to open this Assembly. Of course we new members shall have to be here some little time before we can be expected to be acquainted with the mode of procedure, and as a matter of policy, we have to fall into line with the leaders of debate and thought in this House. When a person is no more, he is generally treated with all the good-nature which can be shown but the living, thanks no doubt to rivalry and feelings of jealousy, get no praise from us, but when one has passed away then we have nothing but good to say of him, nothing that is not commendatory. Sir Robert Bond has passed out of public life, as far as this House is concerned and the

Premier on the opening day eulogized him in no uncertain language. In flattering him the Premier enumerated many of the wonderful things which Sir Robert Bond has done for this country during the years of his political activity. To the simple minded and plain-speaking this seems but flattery, and we, accustomed to pointed words and straight dealing, recognize a good deal of double-dealing and hypocrisy about such laudation. I know we are all more or less hypocrites, and seem to be afraid of the mirror lest we find ourselves worse than we anticipate. Notwithstanding the remarks of the Premier with regards to Sir Robert's remarkable ability, I can and do with all sincerity regret the absence of Sir Robert Bond from this House and I do deplore the step which he has taken, because I always admired him and had a very high appreciation of his statesmanship. I believe also that, were he now present a very different complexion would be put upon the debates of the House during this session. It is generally recognized that a part of the work of the Opposition is to criticize the actions of the Government. I heartily congratulate those who have spoken on the questions before the chair this afternoon. We would be false to our duty if we did not criticize the agricultural policy of the Government. The method of putting it in operation is patterned with mistakes and embroidered with errors. I have no hesitation in saying, from the information gained from the men of Fogo District, that aside from all other issues the agricultural policy, with its attendant extravagance and glaring defects was enough to prevent the intelligent voter from supporting Government candidates. The Agricultural policy is so disadvantageous to the country that a child can understand and see through its gross errors and defects. I was Secretary of an Agricultural Society and had the handling of the grant of $100.00, which was supposed to meet the requirements of nearly 3,000 people living in five or six different harbours. The result was that these people fared in exactly the same manner as they did before this agricultural policy was adopted by the Government. Some people sent for a sheep or a pig and obtained it in exactly the same manner they had obtained other animals before this agricultural policy came into existence and the only result of the carrying out of this policy was the wasting of thousands of dollars of public moneys in the way of commissioners' salaries. There is little benefit to the people by pursuing such a course. And I ask, can one acre of land be pointed out as being cleared and tilled as a direct result of the policy. In order to keep our animals from absolute starvation we were obliged to take the duty off of imported hay, which was a very different thing from what we were led to expect a few years ago. For we thought this policy would be fraught with so much good to the country that we would be able to raise sufficient hay and other products for exportation. And this, I may add, was only one among the many other instances. There was no necessity of pointing out to the electors defects which were so apparent. The people can scarcely believe that the leader of the Government could sit down in council and adopt a policy of this nature. For this policy it is said could only emanate from a crowd of irresponsibles. There is not a great deal of matter in this Speech from the Throne, which lends itself to criticism. The Speech it may be said, is more remarkable for what it does not contain than for anything it does. So far, the speakers on the Government side of this House

have said nothing beyond mere congratulatory speeches. They could say nothing in connection with the Speech because the Speech itself is barren of any legislation which might hold out any hope for the future of this country. And as regards this agricultural policy—to call it an agricultural policy is to give it a misnomer—no good results could come of it except the payments of fat salaries to certain individuals who went around different parts of the country talking about its great value, but teaching nothing, in reality, that the school children did not already know. We were told a text book was to be compiled and that this subject was to form a part of the curriculum of the Council of Higher Education. I do not believe this was ever done. We also were informed that we were going to have a peat fuel industry inaugurated. I would like to know how much of the public money was spent in experimenting on this peat business and how much it has cost up to the present time. Nothing is ever said about peat now. All we can suppose is that it was tried and proved a failure. Now we have been hearing a good deal about Sir Robert Bond's failures in the past, the next thing I suppose that will be engaging our attention will be the present Premier's failures. "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." If a leader criticises his predecessors for party purposes, he must be prepared to receive the same treatment from his successors. Now during the election just passed there was a great deal of talk about undenominational schools, and such like, which, by the men the North of this Island, was regarded nothing more nor less than a mere catch-cry. A candidate who succeeds in getting votes by resorting to methods like those is welcome to them, for such tactics are mean and disgraceful in the extreme. Also I may here remark that the Advocate was accussed of favoring the idea of undenominational schools, which were called godless, because a person who had been teaching some time, and who had travelled somewhat in England and Belgium wrote an article for the Advocate. Mr. Coaker was away at the time. One of the things that this correspondent stated was that undenominational schools must come. This article appeared some 18 months previous to the election, during which time nothing was heard of the matter until the campaign began, when it was used throughout the country against Mr. Coaker and his party. Facts speak for themselves, and in cases like this it is necessary to place ourselves in a right light to the public, and we must hit straight from the shoulder. This is the entire extent of Mr. Coaker's connection with the article on undenominational schools which appeared in the Advocate. I have listened to remarks of the members this afternoon about the question of coal. It seems to me that the Government is tinkering with this matter and spending money in a useless manner. It is only a repetition of the old story of Newfoundland's wealth of minerals and now the Government propose to secure the services of an eminent scientist to ascertain the extent of our own resources. This is being done in the face of the fact that we have in St. John's our own geologist. Such a proposition coming as it does from the Government, is nothing short of an insult to our own man. I presume we shall have another opportunity of dealing more fully with this matter when the Bill is brought before this House. I merely say these things now to prove and show we are ready and anxious to assist in every possible way, any legislation which we may

consider expedient for the development of our coal areas. We, as members of this section of the House intend to prove and assert our identity and we shall be found the first to encourage any legislation beneficial to the interest of the country. On the other hand, however, we shall be ready to criticise any measure we consider introduced simply for the purpose of indulging in the extravagance and waste of public moneys. I was informed in Fogo District that the general idea was that the Goverrment was squandering money broadcast. Now we have been hearing a great deal with regards to the natural resources of this Island and what does all this talk amount to. I know a case in Horwood where a man of enterprise started to earn a living by agriculture there. He started his homestead there and settled down. What encouragement did he get? The present Government gave him no more assistance than if he had been in the wilds of Central Africa. Yet, this agricultural policy stated that the people would be encouraged to till the land. Would it not be better to make roads for those who honestly try to earn a livelihood from the land than to pay huge sums out in big salaries to commissioners? Before concluding, I must congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon the position bestowed upon you by this House and I trust that you will maintain it with honour and impartiality. We believe you will and we shall all endeavour to do our best to assist you, feeling confident that you will deal equitably with all concerned.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks referring to some of the clauses contained in the Speech from the Throne. The remarks I shall make shall be concerning the practical matters with which I am acquainted. In the first place I wish to refer to that clause in the Speech, which relates to the agricultural policy of the Government. The Government claim that that policy has been a success, but I have no hesitation in saying that in the district of Twillingate it is termed an agricultural farce. I have opportunties of hearing different opinions from people of all parts of the district, but I do not know what advantage is derived from pursuing such a policy unless it be the assistance given to some of the Agricultural Commissioners. I have never heard a case which resulted in the improvement of either stock or seed. I have heard certain remarks about animals sent to the societies, such as pigs, sheep and Sable Island ponies. I think the same policy was adopted with regard to these ponies as was pursued in the case of the Irishman who tried to keep a mare on nothing. Just as he succeeded, however, the animal died. This at any rate, happened to the Sable Island ponies to which I refer. Personally, I know nothing of the policy of the Government with respect to these animals, but, it is my opinion that such a policy cannot but create much dissatisfaction, for the reason that one man in a neighborhood might be given a sheep from the society, while ninety-nine men would get nothing. It would follow as a matter of course that those ninety-nine men would feel that they were just as much entitled to receive from the Society an animal which was purchased with money from the public revenue. If you cannot give to all then you should not give to any one individual in particular. I now pass on to that other clause in the Speech which refers to the question of the supply of bait fishes, wherein it is stated that the Government are giving attention to this matter, and are going to take steps to procure

full information on the subject from Norway. I cannot understand why the people of Norway should be called upon to teach Newfoundland fishermen the manner in which bait should be preserved. I am aware that there are certain seasons in which fishermen cannot get enough bait to meet their requirements and what they do need is a freezer in different sections of the country so that bait can be preserved. I think that the policy of the F.P.U. with regard to bait freezers is generally regarded as being a wise one. and this policy should be endorsed by the Government before we look to Norway for information on the subject. With regard to the section in the Speech which deals with the whale fishery it seems to me that this is a case of locking the stable-door after the horse is gone. I remember years ago in Notre Dame Bay when it was no unusual thing to see hundreds of whales in a day to the one seen during the last year or two, for the carrying on of that fishery has resulted in the killing of large numbers of whales and the frightening of them away from the shores. Had this matter been taken up four years ago some good might have resulted. But now, the whale, as a visitor to our coast, seems to be a thing of the past. There is a decided difference of opinion amongst the fishermen as to the effect the killing of the whale has upon our bait fishes. I remember that during the three years previous to the season of 1913 caplin were scarce around Notre Dame Bay, but during the past year they were very plentiful. I have not a doubt that if a fisherman were consulted about the closing up of the whale factories about 1911 they would have been in favour of adopting such a course. But in 1913, although there were no more whales, there was plenty of bait. No doubt there are a great many agencies at work, such as for example, the ocean currents, which have an effect upon the quantity of bait fishes which visit our shores and of which causes we have practically very little information. I feel almost like apologizing to the House for my first attempt at making a speech, but I propose before sitting down to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon the honour which this House has conferred upon you by electing you to the chair, and I feel confident that you will be impartial in your decisions and just to all members sitting in this Assembly.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, just one or two words in relation to the matters referred to by the various speakers who have addressed the House during the present session. First, I think I ought to congratulate them, one and all, on the very excellent and creditable display they have made here this evening; and I think that, whatever else we may differ on, all will agree that the gentlemen who have spoken this evening represent a very distinct gain to the debating powers of this chamber, and I have no doubt that as the session goes on and other sessions follow, very many wise and welcome suggestions will come from the other side of the House.

The last speaker, Mr. Halfyard, made one or two references which, although he was the last speaker, I think I shall deal with first; and principally the reference which, although not very important, was at the same time of a personal nature and made, I think, principally through his having failed to understand the meaning of my remarks on the opening day in relation to Sir Robert Bond. I used no words that I am aware of, and I do not think that the official reports when they come out will show that I have, that could in any way be term-

ed flattery or hypocrisy. The hon. member said he was not going to be a hypocrite and was going to deal straight from the shoulder; and whilst he was prepared to express a regret that Sir Robert Bond had left public life, at the same time he would not be guilty of the sin I had fallen into, namely, that of the hypocrite and flatterer. Well, I do not think Sir Robert Bond himself will assert that I have ever flattered him—whatever else I may have done with him—or that I ever acted the hypocrite to him or anyone else; and if I had been a hypocrite perhaps the personnel of this chamber even this evening, would be somewhat altered.

MR. HALFYARD.—I said all men are hypocrites to some extent.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER. —Then I am not prepared to include myself in that category. I might almost copy an historical and literary precedent, but I do not think I shall because here at present it will not be necessary to refer minutely to authorities; it will be sufficient merely to suggest them to hon. members on the other side of the House and if to-night when my hon. friend goes home and sits at his cosy fireside, he will take down his Shakespeare and refer to the words of Brutus with reference to Caesar he will find probably a more correct precedent for my attitude to Sir Robert Bond. I will ask him, however, to omit the word "slew" as I have no desire to be recorded as a murderer.

What I said about Sir Robert Bond was in no sense a flattery. I have a very great personal regard for him. For years we were very close and intimate friends and we never had a personal quarrel or squabble in our lives. He has never said anything about me in a personal way or I about him. You can go over the debates and newspapers for the last thirty years and find that what I say is correct. I was not playing the hypocrite and I only spoke as to his earnestness, his great industry, his great ability, his great Parliamentary courage and the creditable manner in which he performed his public duties in this House and outside of it Was there anything of the flatterer about that or anything of the hypocrite? I have differed from Sir Robert Bond, but on large questions, and in my difference, I was in good company and I think a good many of our differences are supported by no less an authority than 'The Fishermen's Advocate'–the latest and most modern authority on these matters.

MR. COAKER.—It is bad policy to quote newspapers. I have nothing to do with the "Advocate."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I am glad to hear it, very glad indeed, because that will lessen the need of my references to the Advocate.

Now my first great difference with Sir Robert Bond was in relation to the railway. I left his party on the 1898 Contract; but I was not alone in that respect, the late Mr. Duff, member for Carbonear, a high type of man, left also. The late James Fox, the late James Tessier, my friend, Mr. Cashin and others, also left, and there were twenty-eight men on this side of the House and every one of these men were in entire sympathy with that Contract. Sir Robert Bond took a different view and we agreed to differ. I afterwards left his Government upon a question which was entirely a question of policy and it is so recent that I need not refer to it. We have differed for the last five years and, probably, if he remained here, we would continue to differ. He has said some hard things in his various Manifestoes in relation to our policy but that does

not detract from the man personally, because he may have been absolutely sincere and believed in what he set forth, although we believed he was wrong; so that as far as I am concerned, anything I said on the opening day cannot be regarded as hypocrisy and I cannot be regarded, I am sure, as playing the part of the hypocrite when I said something about Sir Robert Bond's public life. It is a matter of regret that he has left public life. I did not turn him out. I am a mourner at the funeral but it is my hon. friends on the other side of the House who committed the execution that led to the funeral.

Then my hon. friend went on to say that he was sent here to criticise the Government. Did anyone ever hear such a statement from a member of a representative Legislature before? The hon. member is sent here to represent the people of the District of Fogo and not solely to criticise the Government. That is a mere detail. He is sent here if you like to criticise any measure that may come before the House, but if he is going to follow merely the policy of being against the Government he will not be fulfiling in any way the true duties of a representative. If anyone comes in here who happens not to be a member of the Government and thinks that his only duty is to criticise the Government then he does not realise or appreciate what his duty is. It is a mere accident that we are sitting as two parties here. Party Government is good enough in some ways but no man must be bound too much by party ties; he must always be prepared to put principle before party.

Then my friend went on to say that as to our Agricultural Policy a child could see its errors and the reason he gave was that he had been Secretary of the Society in Catalina. That may be convincing to him but I do not think that it is convincing to this House or that it will be for the people outside. There are over one hundred Agricultural Societies in Newfoundland to-day doing great work and if the Society which he presided over failed to conceive or appreciate what its work was or what its duty was then all I can say I am sorry for Catalina in that they did not have some other person looking after their Society.

MR. HALFYARD.—I was only doing the clerical work.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have no doubt that you did it well; but the point I want to make is this, that coming in here and making statements about the Agricultural policy of the Government which are mere party statements is absurd. The late Government had no Agricultural policy unless it was in its last hours. It was practically a dead Government in 1907 and in 1908 in its last session it introduced the measure with reference to the Model Farm. Up to that time, for the nine years it was in power, it had never had any Agricultural policy, and nothing had been done. There was a capable and competent head at the Department for years, my hon. friend Mr. Clift, but he had no funds and even if he had so desired it was impossible to accomplish anything. Then just as that Government was going out a Model Farm policy was adopted and when this Government came in five years ago we did not consider that it was a wise policy for this country to spend thirty or forty or fifty thousand dollars to send our young men to Agricultural colleges and educate them in agriculture so that they would leave this country. It was not a policy that commended itself to this country and we altered it. Afterwards our policy was endorsed by that miracle worker in Canada —Professor Robertson—a man who

has worked miracles in Canada in the matter of Agriculture. You have only to take up his report and you will see that in it he endorsed all we are doing and have done. Hhe said: You can double your crop in Newfoundland with the same labour and the same land but you have got to have better stock and better seed to do it. A man who is growing eight barrels of potatoes to one barrel of seed can grow fifteen if you give him good stock. He cannot double this crop if he continues to use the old seed he has been using for thirty or forty years. It requires no more labour to dig out fifteen barrels of seed potatoes than seven; no more land, no more cultivation, and no more fertilizer. That is the policy that we are pursuing; we have given thousands of barrels of seed potatoes all over the country. We did not give them to individuals to sell them or eat them, but we formed Societies all over the country and gave these societies the best seed that could be imported and to-day thousands of barrels of seed—the very best seed—are in the cellars of the people of Newfoundland waiting for the springtobe put into the ground and produce large crops of potatoes such as have been produced during the past four years. What is true of seed is also true of cattle. We imported the very best breeds of cattle both from the Old Country and from this side. We did not give them to individuals to be used for a little while and then killed or sold; but we gave them to the Societies and if the Societies neglected them and did not properly look after them how can the Government be blamed. But we did not stop there. We gave every Society a cash grant somewhere in the neighborhood of $200.00 and we gave each Society the right to spend that money on what they considered would give them the very best returns. If they liked to buy sheep or cattle or seed or ploughs or any sort of machinery they could do as they pleased. The benefit of such a policy working all over the country through a hundred intelligent Societies can be well understood and if as my friend has stated some people took them and practically allowed them to starve the Government cannot be blamed for that. But I consider such a statement more as a reflection upon his constituents than upon the policy of the Government. I cannot believe it true in relation to the people of Fogo that they took these animals and intentionally starved them. Then he referred to the supposed cost of the Sable Island ponies. Now as a matter of fact these cost the country nothing. We got two large shipments as a present from the Agricultural Board of Canada. They are ponies which live wild on Sable Island. They were landed at Port aux Basques and cost this country nothing but freight by train to various places; and they will improve the breed considerably all over the country. They live out all the year round on Sable Island and very little food keeps them. It was thought desirable to send them all over the country and, as I said, they cost us nothing except the freight from Fort aux Basques.

Then my friend went on to point out what Sir Robert Bond had said in relation to the fishermen having control; and he wanted to know my opinion. Well, if it is any advantage to my hon. friend I am only delighted to give him my opinion. I think the fishermen, as they have always had control, should continue to have control I never remember a time when they did not have control; because the fishermen of this country represent practically nine-tenths of the population. They are more interested in the public affairs and in the country than any

other class of individuals. They are the vital spark, the main spring, so to speak, of this country, the principal and main owners if you like. But there are others who are interested too and who are necessary for the development and working out of the country; but nevertheless our fishermen are our main class and have been and probably will be for a great number of years and they have always had charge of this House because this is the People's House. Now Sir Robert Bond did not say a word against this principle. He objects to any one class having charge to the detriment of all other classes; that is all he says. He never said a word, as far as I can understand his letter, against the fishermen of the country having control and it is right they should have control, but they can have control and let everyone else live too. There is no need to execute everyone who does not happen to be a member of the Fishermen's Protective Union.

Then my friend went on to point out that I made a statement here that I was going to put a tax on Motor Cars. I never made any such statement and the Debates of the House will prove it. I was speaking of a class that could pay taxes, and I illustrated that fact by pointing out that ten years ago we had hardly a motor car and to-day we are spending two hundred thousand dollars a year on motor cars as a mere luxury. I pointed out that these persons can pay more taxes but I did not say that we were going to put a tax on these motor cars. From the importation of these cars and the parts and materials for them we get a great deal of revenue. Now as to the remarks of Mr. Jennings one of the members for Twillingate; he made a very interesting speech and I congratulate him upon the very fine effort he made, but he fell into the same mistake as my friend Mr. Halfyard in relation to the Agricultural grant. He said it could only be called an Agricultural farce and that he had never heard that our stock had been improved or that our seed had been improved. Well I would like to ask him how he would propose to improve the seed in this country except in the way the societies are now working. I do not know of any other way, if you want to improve our seed potatoes or any other seed, than by importing the best seed and distributing it amongst the people. If there is any other way that my friend knows of and if he will be good enough to let me know how to do it I shall be glad to suggest it to the Board. If you want to improve the breed of cattle in this country there is no way but that of importing good stock and putting that stock out all over the country through the agency and machinery of Agricultural Societies. By so doing you fix the responsibility on some one. In the old days all sorts of seed and cattle were given out only to be used by individuals. Now the responsibility is fixed upon the society in each settlement which is given the seed and the stock and the grants. How that can lead to a farce I cannot understand I have seen the result of that policy in Fogo and all over the country and I know to-day that there is hardly a settlement where you cannot find the people with better seed and better stock. Making such statements as this is useless; they cannot injure the Government; they carry with them their own refutation and bear on their face their own condemnation, because there is no man that hears a statement like that or reads it in the Press but will see there is nothing in the statement and that it is made for purely party reasons by a member of the Opposition purely for the purpose

of throwing dust in the eyes of the people and injuring the Government. If my learned friend had gone further and pointed out some policy by which the improvement of cattle and seed could be accomplished, then there would have been some sense and logic in his remarks but merely criticising the Government without any real grounds can accomplish nothing.

Now with reference to my friend Mr. Grimes, the member for Port de Grave. He referred generally to the question of Socialism, and he went on to point out that I had said certain things during the last autumn and during the elections that bordered very much upon, if they did not entirely come under the head of, Socialism; and he referred particularly to the minimum wage. Now why Socialists should arrogate to themselves the exclusive right to every idea of the past, the present, and the future I cannot understand. Why I could not make a statement in relation to a minimum wage for labour without being considered a Socialist I do not know. That is not Socialism as it is generally understood. It has nothing to do with Socialism.

MR. GRIMES.—It is part of their aims.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It may be part of their aims but surely we can not sit down and drop our work in every realm of human enterprise because it has been considered by the Socialists. As a matter of fact the Socialists would adopt anything that they think would attract a vote. All is fish that comes to their net. No man can object to many of the aims and measures of the Socialists, not because they are advanced by Socialists, but because inherently the principles and the measures are right in themselves. There are many things advocated by Socialists that are not good but are very bad and very wicked; but I suppose all Socialists are not alike.

It would not be fair to blame all Socialists for the policies that are advocated by some of them and on the other hand because a man favours some policies that are advocated by some Socialists it is not fair to rank him as a Socialist. I stated that I was in favour of the principle of a minimum wage and I am in favour of that principle because I do not think that any man or woman should be expected or forced to work for a wage that is not sufficient to enable him or her to provide a decent living for himself and those dependent on him. You can call that Socialism if you like but I do not call it by that name. Sometimes the worker cannot help having to work for a lower wage than what is necessary to give him a comfortable living and this is especially the case when competition enters greatly into trade.

Look, for instance, at the position in England at the present time. There they are living under the policy of Free Trade and are open therefore, to competition from other countries. The result is that there are labourers and workmen in factories and mines, who are expected to live on wages that are ridiculously low in many cases. You ask the employer why wages are so low that the best men are forced to emigrate to the United States and Canada and he replies that if the wages are increased the manufacturers will be unable to meet competition and the result will be that the works will be closed down and thousands more will be out of employment. This brings us down to the great question of Tariff Reform and Free Trade, on which the firty-five millions of people in Great Britain are almost equally divided. If you go into the city of London and discuss the question with the bankers, the finan-

ciers, the brokers, the shipowners and the owners of factories and the men in command of the great wealth of the country, you will find that about half of them are in favour of free trade and half of them in favour of Tariff Reform. Many of them would be glad to raise the wages of their men but they are unable to do so because of competition.

Here I think we are improving all round. The labouring man is much better off to-day than he was five, ten or twenty years ago. I can remember thirty years ago when most of the labouring men were glad to get eighty cents a day and even seventy or sixty cents. To-day some earn $1.50 a day and even two, three and five dollars. I know working men in the city to-day who make as high as $5.00 a day under certain conditions. Their condition is improving and I hope it will continue to improve and that is what I had in mind when I advocated a minimum wage.

I was very much interested indeed in the remarks of my hon. friend, the member for Port de Grave, with reference to the coal areas of Australia and the methods adopted there; but we have to recognize the fact that conditions are very much different here to what they are in that country. In this Colony we have not yet developed our coal but we have merely prospected it or seen the exposed seams, whereas in Australia they know all about their coal areas. For years they have had an extensive geological department and after expending thousands of dollars they know with some accuracy the quantity of coal in the country. If the Government there is spending large sums of money on the development of their coal they have an early return for their money assured, whereas in this Colony we are merely in the discovery period as yet and I do not think the Government is justified in taking up the development of our coal as a commercial undertaking. A day or two ago I stated the history of the development of coal in this Colony and I repeat now that we are making a bona fide effort to get expert advice as to what ought to be done with our coal. Up to the present time all efforts in this direction have proved a failure and if future efforts prove no more successful it will not be because of any lack of effort on the part of the Government.

I now come to the remarks made by my hon. friend, Mr. Coaker, the member for Bonavista. He made a very interesting speech but he was a little out in some of his observations. This was not done intentionally, of course. Far be it from me to suggest that he would make any statement in support of which he had not the absolute facts and proofs. He began by endeavouring to correct my hon. friend, Mr. Currie, who moved the Address in Reply, in his statement that the increase in the price of fish was due in a measure to the fact that a very large amount of fish was exported to the United States and Canada. The hon. member for Bonavista was not correct when he said that less fish was exported this year than last year, for as a matter of fact nearly double the amount was exported to these countries this year. It might suit the hon. member to attempt to show that there was some other reason why the high price for fish was maintained but on this point he was as silent as an oyster and did not utter a word as to what had put the price of fish up. I am aware of the fact that he has claimed that he was responsible for putting it up for I have seen this assertion in print on more than one occasion. Will the hon. gentleman deny this? I have no desire whatever to make any state-

ment here unless it is a fact. He has made the statement and there are thousands of people who believe it to be true. As a matter of fact such a statement is ridiculous, perfect nonsense and childishness of the worst type. No man can put up the price of fish. If he could, why should he stop at $6.50 and not raise it to $8.00 or $9.00. The matter has only to be mentioned to show how absurd it is and yet paper after paper has appeared in which it has been claimed that the hon. member put up the price of fish. What are the facts? It has been put up by the opening up of new markets for our fish. In dealing with this question also we have to look at the conditions existing in foreign markets and also the discovery of new methods of putting up fish. Last year half a million quintals went to the United States and Canada, that never went there before, and it cannot be denied that this had a very sensible effect on our foreign markets. Anyone who knows anything about the fishery business knows that if we have a shortage of eighty or ninety thousand quintals of fish in our Labrador fishery, it means that there is a probability that the price will go up. The foreign markets require a certain amount of fish just as our people require a certain amount of flour and if the supply is greater than the demand the price will go down and vice versa. If a large amount of our fish goes to the United States and Canada it will mean that there will be less to go abroad and this will mean that there will be a demand there for our fish and that the price is not likely to go down. One firm from the United States, the Gorton Pew Company, have themselves purchased from the fishermen of this Colony 300,000 quintals of fish. Five years ago this company was unknown here. My hon. friend asserted that less fish went to Canada and the United States this year than last year but the figures show that last year 4,872 quintals went to Canada and 30,000 quintals went to the United States, whereas this year 8,300 quintals went to Canada and 49,000 to the United States. This is nearly double the amount of last year and these figures have been obtained by me from the Customs House.

If 10,000 quintals of our fish are taken away from Brazil and sent to the States and Canada it helps to keep the price up in Brazil just as the sending of an extra 10,000 quintals to Brazil would help to put the price of fish down there. The firms that buy fish there are watching our markets very closely and not an ounce of our fish is exported without their knowledge for they have their agents here to report on these matters. They know where a lot of our fish is now going and when they see that we have a growing trade with the United States and Canada they will know that they have to pay an increased price for our fish or else they will not get it. It is only a matter for our commercial men and agents, aided by the Government, to take hold of the matter and to put up fish in thirty or forty ways as it is put up in Gloucester, so that the money that is made by the people there will be put into the pockets of our people. Then our fishermen will come into their heritage. These are some of the reasons why the price of fish is as high as it is; and it is impossible for any one individual to put up the price. No man and no Government can put up the price of fish and it is ridiculous for anybody to claim the credit of doing it. My hon. friend should learn the lessons from history and learn that sooner or later every man meets his Waterloo. I can remember the late Sir William Whiteway, whose policy practically

discovered the country. I knew him for years and years when he was at the height of his power. It was then that he did his great work towards developing the country and making it something more than a fish-flake. I saw him later in life defeated in the district of Trinity. I afterwards saw the men who defeated him and they only wished they had an opportunity to undo what they had done. If my hon. friend will read history he will find that revolutions of all kinds have taken place in many countries and that usually they have been as evanescent and uncertain as the individual who was responsible for them. "'Brag' is a good dog but 'Hold fast' is a better one." "The good man boasts when he takes his armour off, not when he puts it on." After we have had another tussle at the polls and the people have had an opportunity of examining the causes which led many of them to vote as they did in the recent election, they will probably change their minds as to my hon. friend.

Now let me deal with the price of coal which has been referred to by the hon. member for Port de Grave. I can remember when thirty years ago North Sydney coal could be had in St. John's for $4.50 a ton, sent home. I do not know but that it could have been had more recently for that price. Since then the cost of labour has doubled in Sydney and that has helped, of course, to increase the price of coal. Then the cost of freight has doubled and in addition to that there is the tax of seventy cents a ton, which goes to the Municipal Council. That has also helped to put up the price of coal. There are many firms on Water Street dealing in coal, such as Morey & Co., Mr. Mullaly, Franklin & Co., A. Harvey & Co., H. J. Stabb & Co. and Cresbie & Co. and the public gets the benefit of the competition that exists between them, as I am sure that they sell coal as cheaply as possible in order to get trade.

I saw in the local paper that the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, was selling coal eighty cents cheaper than the firms on Water St. The reason why he can do this is obvious, for a man can deliver coal from the wharf much cheaper than a man who has to put the coal in a store and deliver it from that store after paying the extra charges, such as fire insurance and interest and labour. If all our goods were purchased from the vessel's side there would be no labour. If everything were delivered from "Kintails" there would soon be no people to deliver it to, for there would be no labor given the people. It is the same with fish; if fish was sold direct from the schooner to the consumer it would be cheaper because the consumer would not have to pay the other expenses, such as culling, storage, freight and other charges. This really does not require any explanation for it is self- evident.

In connection with this, I would like to inform the House of an incident which occurred when I was at Bonavista four years ago. I spent four days there and as I was merely on a holiday I had nothing to do but to look around and enjoy myself, for there were no meetings of any kind. While I was there I had the pleasure of meeting some very interesting members of the F. P. U., for it must be borne in mind that there are some very good men in that body as in every other. One young man that I met was very intelligent and a very prominent member of the Union. After a little conversation we began to discuss the Union and I told him that I was in favour of Unions; in fact, I had been identified with them all my lifetime. Many improvements in the

wages and hours and other conditions of the working classes were the outcome of unions. I told him then that I would be in favour of his Union if he could show me that some benefit could be obtained from joining it and that I would be the first to run up my flag for the Union if he could do so. He said that this was a fair offer and then informed me that one benefit that he obtained from the Union was that he could get his coal at Bonavista a dollar a ton cheaper than he could before. I told him that that was a good reason but that I would like to examine it a little first.

You know, I said, that the Union paid the same price in Sydney as other people, and that it is merely a question of carrying it in boats from Sydney. 'Yes,' he said, 'they bought it in Sydney and paid the same price for it.' 'The freight was the same?' I asked. 'Yes,' he said. 'Well, if you pay the same money for it in Sydney and pay the same freightage, how can you give it at such a cheap price?' 'Oh!' said he, 'we unload the coal ourseives.' 'You mean that you did this free?' 'Yes,' he replied. 'How much cheaper did you yet the five tons you say you bought some time ago?' 'A dollar a ton cheaper.' 'That was $5 cheaper for the five tons?' 'Yes.' 'How long were you unloading the coal?' 'It took myself and my son a day to land the five tons.' 'How much do you usually get for your day's work?' 'Three dollars, or $1.50 each.' 'So,' I said, 'you lost three dollars by that transaction, while you gained five dollars, or in other words you really gained only two dollars.' 'Yes,' he said 'that is so.' 'And what,' I asked, 'did the other men make who went out fishing that day?' 'They got three quintals.' 'That is worth $15, isn't it? And wouldn't you have got the same?' 'Yes, I suppose so.' 'Well then, it comes to this, that you have saved two dollars and lost $15 by unloading that coal yourself.' Now that is how this thing is done. It is because a man does the work free himself that he gets the article cheaper. But this gentleman will never again unload coal in Bonavista—he is no fool.

Mr. Speaker, I undertake to say that if I had had an opportunity of seeing each man in Bonavista I would have reduced the majority of the hon. gentleman so small he would not have known it.

I think that I will be pardoned if I refer to one or two other points. First of all I shall say a few words with regard to the reduction in the price of sugar. All the Government were present when this measure was passed and even if they were not all present what did it matter. Supposing there were several members absent that would not make any difference. The point that we have to bear in mind is this that you and this House unanimously endorsed that policy. But as a matter of fact there was not a member of the Executive absent. Then the hon. gentleman states that it was a mistake to take all the duty off cube sugar because only professional people used cube sugar. That was the very reason why we took it off—that the poor man might have an opportunity to use cube sugar as well as the rich man. I undertake to say that I have been in nearly as many homes as the hon. member and I have had an opportunity of knowing how the people live in their homes One of the reasons why cube sugar was put on the free list was that every fisherman might be able to get it as well as the professional men referred to. Then the hon. gentleman alleges that Sectarian cries, cries of Socialism and of Godless schools were used during the recent election campaign in the Southern districts. I never

heard anything about them. I undertake to say that the hon. member cannot get a statement from the Opposition candidates in the West End that there was ever a reference to Godless Schools, Socialism or anything else in the West End. We went on our record and no reference to the schools my friend or his party that could be objected to in any way was made. Sectarian questions were put aside. I never heard of them in St. John's. We went to the country Mr. Speaker, entirely on a question of policy. We went on our past record. We went to the country four years before with a certain fixed policy and we claim to have carried out that policy. Never was there a party that did so much for the country. All the great features of our policy were carried out. When we came into power, we found a depleted exchequer; but we had a surplus every year. We added $100,000 to the Education Grant, we provided for the branch railways, we gave a vote of $60,000 to have Old Age Pensions. We increased the grant for lighthouses and for fog alarms by nearly $100,000 a year; and every important thing in our policy has been carried out. Our last and final act was to put sugar on the free list. This act of ours was not a mere election dodge.

In every district from St. John's to Bonne Bay we carried the country; but in the North we failed. The reason we failed is this, that the issue there had nothing to do with the public life of Newfoundland. The issue had no relation to the past or to the future. That is why we failed in the North—because the people down there, the great majority of them. took an entirely prejudiced view and were voting on matters and principles which had no relation to our record. In every district where the voters voted on the merits of the Government we carried the election.

Then there were other matters referred to. He referred to the Labrador water powers and to Bait Depots. As regards the Labrador Water Powers, nothing will be done without consulting the House. I am not aware that a request was made for an investigation into the whale fishery. Now that the matter has been represented to me, the Government will make an enquiry with a view to seeing whether the prosecution of the whale fishery is injuring the codfishery. But that is a very large order which has to be gone about in a careful way; competent persons will have to take charge of the enquiry, and information will have to be obtained from the fishermen of the country. I think that it is quite true that certain references were made in relation to the Bait Depots. A Government undertaking the responsibility in relation to these matters has to deal with the whole people; and you cannot hand over a sum of money to a person and get him to erect a few bait stations at random. If we are to have bait depots, we must find out from the fishermen where fish appear off our shores and we must have supplies of bait kept where they will be of most service. The hon. member will see that we are going about this matter in the right way. Norway is making greater strides in the department of fisheries than any fishing country in the world. The Government are ascertaining how the bait problem is being dealt with there. They have all sorts of up to date fishing appliances. The last few years the fishery has increased enormously through the introduction of motor boats. It would be of interest to us to know how the Norwegians are supplied with bait. Conditions will be different; but we can use the information and apply it to our own condi-

tions. This bait problem is of the utmost importance to us. In 1903-04 Sir Robert Bond dealt with it. A contract was entered into, a cold storage contract dealing with the holding of the bait supply. An American company came down here and we entered into a contract with them for five years. Again about 15 years ago, 1 collected $5,000 and formed a little company. We put up a cold storage plant at Petty Harbor, but it was a complete failure. The building is still there. The trouble was that when there was a supply of bait to be got, the fishermen would not buy our bait and you could not blame them. It is only when there is no bait in a particular place that you can get the fishermen to buy the bait.

In Fogo Mr. Hodge and Mr. Earle tried to work some small bait depots, but they have found that they could not be made to pay, and I understand they are giving them up. The trouble is that when bait is plentiful of course the fishermen will not buy the cold storage bait, and of course the depots cannot afford to wait perhaps several years and go to the cost of filling up with bait that is not needed.

It is perhaps only by getting steamers that we can get over that difficulty. We may be able to have several depots on the Labrador and in other places on shore. Then we can have two or three motor boats bringing around the coast supplies of bait to the various fishermen. All fishermen would be able to get some. However, these are only the details; the great difficulty is the working of your steamer so that it will not entail too large an expense on the country, and to have bait where it is required and whenever it is needed.

I think now that I have dealt with all the points, with the exception of Mr. Clift's who devoted nearly all his remarks to the Agricultural Department. We have thrashed that matter out before. My hon. friend is of course the father of that policy of the model farm, and anything that I might say would not convince him. Yet all the other experts in this country agree that the policy we are now pursuing is the correct policy. If the Boards and the Societies are differing, that is not the fault of the Government of the country. Professor Robertson of Canada stated that, with the same land the same seeds and with the same start, we would double our crop, and I myself have in many cases known it to be doubled. I have seen men get 15 barrels of potatoes where before they only got seven.

MR. KENT moved that the debate be adjourned until to-morrow. It was ordered accordingly.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred until to-morrow.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

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

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS gave notice that he would move the House into Committee of the whole on Supply on Thursday next, Jan. 22nd.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce (a) a Bill relating to the Inspection of Foods in the City of St. John's; (b) a Bill to amend the Newfoundland Dental Act; (c) a Bill to amend the law relating to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

The House then adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

TUESDAY, Jan. 20, 1914.

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

QUESTIONS.

MR. KENT.—To ask the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence and other documents between the Government or any department thereof in relation to the proposed visit of Professor Dunstan to this Colony; also, to state the arrangement, if any, under which such visit will be made and the examination of our coal areas undertaken by him.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I beg to say that I have written to London for permission to table the papers asked for.

MR. KENT.—To ask the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement showing name of person to whom, purposes for which, and date upon which each payment was made under the following headings, viz: (1) General Contingencies; (2) Section 33b of the Audit Act; (3) Order of the Governor in Council; from the 1st day of February, 1913, to date.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, that information is being prepared.

MR. COAKER—To ask the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister whether the Government have considered the Resolutions sent to the Premier by the President of the F.P.U. passed at the recent Convention of the Fishermen's Protective Union, held in St. John's; if so what decision has been arrived at regarding the prayers of those Resolutions, which read as follows:—WHEREAS the actual control and management of local affairs in this Colony, outside the City of St. John's, is exercised by boards and persons appointed by the Government; AND WHEREAS appointments are made in opposition Districts on the nomination of defeated candidates, and local affairs of such Districts are in reality conducted together by representatives of the minorities in such Districts; AND WHEREAS this practice tends to rewards and punishments for partisan reasons and is therefore essentially corrupt; AND WHEREAS the people at large have no direct control over those local matters which vitally affect their health and comfort; AND WHEREAS the control of such matters ought to be free from partisanship, political influence, and graft; RESOLVED that the Government be requested to pass an act establishing Municipal Boards enabling the people to elect Boards to expend all local, special, Main Line Grants and the Public Grants mounting to less than $100,000 and the per Capita Grant for public charities. FURTHER RESOLVED, that in all local matters not managed by Boards appointed under said Act, the elected representatives of the Districts to the House of Assembly ought to be consulted by the Government, and that appointments and expenditures ought not to be made on advice of defeated candidates.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I may say in reply, that I have not been able to identify the particular resolutions mentioned, and I would ask the hon. member to let me have a copy of them, and also a copy of his letter. I have found three resolutions sent me on Dec. 16th by the Secretary of the F.P.U., Mr. Halfyard, and I find a reply sent on the same date, in which I said that I would be very pleased to lay the resolutions before the Governor in Council. But I can find no record of having received the resolutions in question. I hope they have not been mislaid. I have ordered another search to be made. Meanwhile I should be glad if the hon. member would fur-

nish me with a copy of his letter and of the resolutions.

MR. HALFYARD—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing what money has been expended to date upon the Public Wharf at Fogo, and what amount was granted for that purpose.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I may say that this information is being prepared.

MR. HALFYARD.—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement, showing, in detail, all amounts paid or allocated in the Electoral District of Fogo, out of ordinary, special or surplus trust grants, during the year 1913, giving the dates of such allocations, the names of the parties to whom allocated, and also the purpose for which allocations were made.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to table that reply next week.

MR. STONE.—To ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the number of Motor Engines imported into the Colony in 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913, and the value of the same.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, that information has already been furnished, and will be found in the public records for the years in question.

MR. STONE.—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House, copies of returns for special and local grants, expended at Elliston, in the District of Trinity, for the year 1913.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, that information is being prepared.

MR. GRIMES—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the returns of all expenditures made by his Department in Harbor Grace South and Bryant's Cove, in the District of Harbour Grace, for the year 1913.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I may say the information is being prepared.

MR. GRIMES.—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the amounts paid for the conveyance of mails to Harbour Grace Island, and to whom paid.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, no money has been paid on such an account.

MR. GRIMES.—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing whether there has been recently, or whether there is to be at the present time, an enquiry into matters appertaining to the General Hospital, if such an enquiry is completed, whether he will lay on the table of the House a copy of the report, and. if it is not completed, whether he will do so when it is completed.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to say that no enquiry is going on by the Government in reference to the General Hospital. There will therefore be no report to table. All matters at the General Hospital are being dealt with in ordinary routine.

MR. WINSOR.—To ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing (a) the amount expended under the heading

of "Sheep Act" for the past five years and to whom paid; (b) statement of Contingencies Account for 1912 and 1913; (c) statements showing amounts of percentage on duties and Light dues paid sub-collectors at Fogo, Lewisporte, Twillingate, Greenspond, Bonavista, Catalina, Trinity, Bay Roberts Botwood, Carbonear, Exploits King's Cove, Labrador, La Scie, Nipper's Harbour, Rigolet and Western Bay for the years 1912 and 1913; (d) also, a statement of expenditures under the heading of Outport Supernumeraries, Boats, Boat-Hire, Yachts Tidewaiters, Travelling expenses of Department, and Marine Disaster, for the years 1912 and 1913.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—In reply to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, I may say: First, as to that portion of his question referring to the amount expended under the heading of "Sheep Act" for the past five years, and to whom paid: these accounts will be found in the Library in the Public Accounts for the past four years. There have been no expenditures during the past year. The statements asked for in the remaining portion portion of his question are being prepared.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House (a) a statement of expenditures under heading, "Insurance for Public Buildings" 1912 and 1913, and to whom paid; (b) travelling expenses voted 1912 and 1913, and to whom paid; (c) repairs on Public Buildings 1912 and 1913, and to whom paid; (d) statement for contingencies for his department for 1912 and 1913; (e) also, statements of expenditures under headings of Supplies and Maintenance, Fuel and Light for the Lunatic and Poor Asylums, General and Fever Hospitals, for 1912 and 1913; (f) also, a detailed statement showing amount expended for construction of Public Buildings during the years 1912 and 1913, where constructed and to whom paid.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—
—The answers to that question, Mr. Speaker, will be found in the accounts to be tabled by the Finance Minister.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay upon the table of the House a statement of Contingencies Account for 1912 and 1913; also, a statement of expenditures under headings of Petty Surveys, Supplies for Surveyors, Forest Fires and Fire Patrol.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—
Mr. Speaker, the statements asked for will be prepared and laid on the table of the House.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of money received during the last four years as wharfage of ships at Public Wharves throughout the Colony.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—
In reply to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, I may say that the Colonial Secretary's Department has nothing whatever to do with public wharves, either in the way of expenditure or in any other way.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, in reply to Mr. Coaker's question, on the order paper of January 16th, I desire to state that a Cod Liver Oil Expert was employed during the years 1910 and 1911. During the time he was employed he received $66 a month, and his expenses were paid on presentation of vouchers. In reply to another portion of that question, I desire to state that no moneys were expended under the authority of the Fishery Board.

In reply to Mr. Kent's question, on the order paper of January 16th, in

reference to the amounts paid or allocated in the district of St. John's East in respect to marine works, I beg to table the accounts.

I also beg to lay upon the table of the House the reply to Mr. Coaker's question in reference to lighthouses, and also the reply to his question as to what money was collected by the Inland Fisheries Board for 1912 and 1913.

INSPECTION OF FOODS BILL.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER asked leave to introduce a bill relating to the inspection of foods in the city of St. John's.

It was moved and seconded that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister have leave to introduce this bill. The motion being carried, it was moved and seconded that the Bill be now read a first time.

Bill was thereupon read a first time.

It was moved and seconded that the Bill be read a second time on to-morrow. The motion was carried.

DENTAL BILL.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER asked leave to introduce a bill to amend the "Newfoundland Dental Act."

It was moved and seconded that the Rt. Hon. Premier have leave to introduce this bill. The motion was carried.

It was moved and seconded that the Bill be now read a first time.

Bill was thereupon read a first time.

It was moved and seconded that Bill be read a second time on to-morrow. The motion was carried.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER asked leave to introduce a bill to amend the law dealing with the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

It was moved and seconded that the Rt. Hon. Premier have leave to introduce this bill.

It was moved and seconded that the Bill be now read a first time.

Bill was thereupon read a first time.

It was moved and seconded that the Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

SUPPLY

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS asked leave to move that Supply be granted to His Majesty.

It was moved and seconded that the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs have leave to move that Supply be granted to His Majesty. The motion was carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned Debate on Address in Reply.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to detain the House at any length regarding the Address in Reply, as I have already had an opportunity of addressing the House on the Speech from the Throne. Still, Sir, there are some matters to which I would wish to make reference before the close of the debate. The debate so far, Mr. Speaker, has covered quite a large and interesting ground. It has touched upon various matters which are of vital interest to the people of this Colony. The matter of the fisheries—the method of prosecution, the price of fish, and the mode and manner of handling and marketing the fish—has been commented on; our agricultural resources have also been commented on; we have also had our forest resources. their present position, and the economic effect which their development will have upon the prosperity of the country, dealt with; and other matters subsidiary to these have also been discussed. I think, Sir, that I should confine myself to one or two topics in this discussion. First of all, I propose to deal briefly

with the matter of agriculture. It has been stated here that the agricultural policy of the last few years has brought beneficial results to the people of the Colony, and that agriculture has improved throughout the Colony under the system that has been carried on by the present Government. Now, Sir, as I have said frequently in this House, I fail to see what beneficial effects have come to this Colony from the manner in which the agricultural industry has been dealt with. I think that if we are to judge this policy by results we will find that instead of accomplishing the object which the Minister of Agriculture and Mines of that day (Mr. Blandford) had in view when he inaugurated this policy, we have been moving in a retrograde direction in the matter of agriculture. The main object of that policy, as stated by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines of that time and as confirmed by the Prime Minister then and on frequent occasions afterwards, was to reduce the amount of agricultural produce imported into this country. That, Sir, is natural. The prime object of any agricultural policy is to produce those agricultural and farming products which our people consume, and render it unnecessary to import from abroad large supplies of agricultural produce. Now, I would like to refer to a general statement which was issued by the Government through the late Mr. Seymour, in which he gave a summary of the agricultural produce imported into the Colony in the year 1909. He gives there a total of $2,717,231, made up of such items as potatoes, cabbage, peas, vegetables, apples, butter, cheese and other items of that kind, amounting to $828,532; of meats and articles of that kind, $941,000; and sundries, $1,776,000. Taking the same items for the year 1912, we find that the total is $5,254,428. For such items as potatoes, cabbage, &c., the total is $1,245,651; meats, &c., $1,173,539; and sundries; $1,825,278. This means an increase of nearly 40 per cent. on the importation of these items; and if you take the articles item by item, you will find the same thing occuring. Now, this, Mr. Speaker, shows that the object for which the present agricultural policy was inaugurated has not been accomplished. I think, Sir, that the mistake that has been made has been in putting our sole dependence in one branch or department of a policy which has been successful when it has been put in force as a whole.

The policy of agricultural societies for the promotion of agriculture in the different localities is certainly one which would accomplish good results if other features were present. I think, Sir, that if we are going to have results in agriculture we have got to face the fact that agriculture, like every other department of knowledge, is a science; and that if we are to compete with other countries, and if we are to hope to produce an agricultural class in this country, we must ultimately come to the policy which was inaugurated here some five or six years ago by the establishment of an Experimental Station or Model Farm. That, Sir, is the foundation of the agricultural development of Canada. Throughout all the provinces of the Dominion you now have agricultural colleges. It was only the other day that the Province of British Columbia started three new agricultural colleges, something on the lines of the Truro College. These things are growing in Canada and this is what is making the foundation of the prosperity of Canada. All the men who have visited here—Mr. Thomas, Professor Robert-

son, Professor Zavitz, and others of high standing in this department of knowledge—have told us that our capabilities in this direction are very great; and that if we only pursue a policy which will bring out the best results that are attainable, there is no reason why we should not have in Newfoundland an agricultural class as they have in the Provinces of Canada. The mere distribution of seeds and stock is not in itself all that is required to make an agricultural policy successful. The soil has to be treated, and the seeds have to be adapted to the soil and to the climate. it is well known, for instance, that oats can be acclimatized; and a species of oats peculiar to the climate from which it comes, and giving better results than any other kind, can be attained. This has been effected in the Provinces of Canada by scientific enquiry and experiment. The same principle applies to potatoes. If you get a good seed which is suited to the climate and if your soil is properly prepared (and in this respect Professor Robertson pointed out that there is no country in the world better placed in the way of fertilizer and soil than Newfoundland) you will have a better yield of a better potato per acre than you can ever accomplish by the mere distribution of seed.

Another matter in connection with the agricultural position is the question of marketing. I think, Sir, that if we had better facilities for marketing, if, for instance, we had a market here in St. John's where the produce from the outports—not only the near outports but the more remote ones also—could be brought and disposed of easily, that you would then give an encouragement to the farmers which by co-operation amongst themselves they would be able to avail of. With a ready market, there would be a greater inducement to our people to go into the farming industry. We passed here a few years ago what is known as the Seed Act. That Act was intended to affect all seeds and to insist upon all persons dealing in seeds taking a license. That, of course, is a very good object, but in order to bring that Act into operation (and I don't think it has been enforced at all) and to get the results which it could attain and which it was intended to attain, you would have to have some person or persons throughout the Colony who could test these seeds. The ordinary man, or even the ordinary farmer, cannot tell a diseased seed by merely looking at it. It has got to be tested by proper means.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister insisted that the policy which he has advocated has brought about beneficial results, has improved agricultural conditions, and has brought other benefits to our people, yet, Sir, these general statements do not prove anything. I think that something more than mere statements of this kind ought to be advanced. We are spending a large amount of money on agriculture, more than we ever spent before, and I don't think that the results achieved are at all adequate to the amount of money that is being spent.

Just one word more, Mr. Speaker, in reference to our fisheries. It is well known, that we are on the eve of a change in the matter of our fisheries. Perhaps one of the means of bringing around this change is the effect which the opening up of the American markets will have. This, of course, is a new feature in our fishing industry, and, if the market is properly availed of, will have the effect of increasing the price of this product to our people. Fish during the past few yers has been higher in

price than for years previously, caused by the fact that foodstuffs all over the world have risen in price. Of course, Mr. Chairman, in considering this question of the price of food stuffs we should bear in mind the fact that this increase is due to economic causes.

At the same time in considering the price of fish we ought to bear in mind the strong agitation which is now going on in the world against the partly artificial increase in the cost of food-stuffs. Particularly is this so in the United States and Canada. If this agitation should have the effect of bringing down the price of food-stuffs we may be faced with the position that the price of our staple will fall in sympathy, with the reduction of the cost of living. This opens up the problem of the price of our fish. I think that the prospects of the continual free admission to the United States markets will help to maintain its price. At the same time I think there are other factors which contribute towards the increase of our present prices. We ought to have better information and better knowledge of the condition of our markets and of the manner in which our fish is handled by those who compete with us because our aim ought to be to keep what we have in the way of markets and if possible discover more markets. Unless we know the methods which prevail in other countries and the condition of the markets, we are very likely to lose in the race for those markets. I believe that one of the causes in bringing about the present prices is the Fishermen's Union, which was founded by the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker. That Union will be one of the factors which will help to maintain that price; and the fishermen of the country will benefit by its formation, for the fishermen will know what is going on in the foreign markets and what our competitors are doing. The fishermen will see that proper means are taken to avail of the information and to keep any Government or officials who are lagging in the race spurred up to their work. Again the fishermen will have all the power which all unions possess. If we look at St. John's we will find that this principle of unionism has accomplished more for a man who works hard for his living than any other factor during the last few years. It has enabled the working man to see that he gets a proper share of the wealth of the country and that his share suffices to maintain himself and his family in the position in which he moves and lives. This is one of the results which unionism when properly handled and wisely directed, has always accomplished. We had a discussion here the other afternoon on the question of Socialism. Now, Socialism is one of those indefinite things of which, we may take it for granted, few men have the same conception. But one thing is certain that unionism is the antithesis of Socialism. Unionism is the promotion of the private interests of the toilers of the land. Socialism is the very contrary. I think that one of the factors which will affect the distribution of the increased price of fish is the fact that the fishermen of the Union will have more information as to methods of handling and conditions of market than heretofore, which they will be able to discuss in an intelligent manner. They should be placed in possession of all facts concerning the fisheries of the country as they are shareholders in the voyage and partners in the entire business. In reference to the American markets which have recently been opened to us more freely than heretofore, although I may not have the information upon this subject that

some of the members have, I would like to say that it is one of those markets for which if we are to get the results we hope for, we must remember that we have keen competitors who will obtain for themselves if possible the cream of the trade and who will place Newfoundland fishermen in the position of hewers of wood and drawers of water, unless the Government and commercial men take good care that such a thing does not happen. We have Canadian and American competitors in our own waters competing for our fish; but we possess natural and geographical advantages and we must if possible beat them in the competition for these markets. Our people and our mercantile community must avail of these markets to the full extent, and the control of our bait supply is one of the means by which we hope to accomplish this result. It behoves the Government of the day to do all in its power to protect the bait fishes of this country. We know, for instance, that in recent years bait has been brought into Canada and Halifax in cold storage, and afterwards put on board Canadian and United States vessels for bait purposes. This is contrary to law. Every man who takes bait fishes from this country has to take an affidavit that they will be used for food purposes only and bonds have to be entered into that the cargo will be delivered for no other purpose. I consider that those who violate the act in this respect should be prosecuted promptly.

I notice that it is the intention of the Government to bring Professor Dunstan, a director of the Imperial Institute of London, to visit Newfoundland during the coming summer for the purpose of examining our coal areas. I said the other day that the present Government certainly deserved censure for not having dealt with this coal question during the past five years. They came into power five years ago and since that time nothing has been done in the matter. At that time the Government made it appear that there was going to be a series of explorations and borings for coal which was stated at the time, to exist in workable quantities and of good quality. Our geologist, Mr. Howley, has already given the opinion that coal does exist in large quantities in this country. The Hon. Premier had stated that the Company which previous to 1910 had entered into a contract with the Government for the development in this connection had, up to that time, done no work. I think that the next four years should not have been allowed to pass by without some serious effort being made to exploit our coal areas; the coal question is becoming more acute every year. During the past few days, we have been faced with an increase of 40 cents per ton on our imported coal and no one seems to know what the exact cost of this commodity should be in St. John's after allowing a reasonable profit to the importer. We are told that the cost of coal in Sydney has gone up, and I am not aware that the freight or the cost of handling of that commodity either here or in Sydney has increased. Surely we ought to know why an essential article of domestic use such as this has increased in price. I do not think that the Government will accomplish any more by bringing in a coal expert than if they were to send him Mr. Howley's reports on the matter, and ask for his opinion. Mr. Howley is a man who has full knowledge of our coal areas, and any expert coming here must necessarily consult him, and must be shown over the coal areas by our local geologist. I presume the reason for importing an expert is that "no man is a prophet in

his own country." Of course, Mr. Howley's knowledge and experience will be put at the disposal of this eminent man, but nothing more will be accomplished than he could accomplish. It would be far better for us, then, to rely upon Mr. Howley to make him feel his responsibility and act upon his reports. A peculiar position exists in this House at the present time. We are here to-day without a representative of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, which has the control of all matters affecting the natural resources of the soil of this country. There is also no representative of the Department of Justice. It is now over three months since the election and the Ministers who occupied those positions have had ample time to close up the work of their departments, so that other appointments could be made by the time this Legislature opened. It is a well known principle which it is unnecessary for me now to develop, that Ministers of the Crown ought to be in this Legislature representing all the principal Departments of the Government. The other day a question was addressed in this House to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and was answered by the Prime Minister, and yesterday Bills were introduced by that gentleman which should have been in charge of a Minister of Justice. We ought to protest strongly against the fact that these departments have no representatives in this House. The Premier stated yesterday that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and the Minister of Justice had resigned on the 2nd of Jan., and that nothing since had been done in the matter. I think something should have been done, and that those offices should have been filled before the meeting of the Legislature, particularly in face of the fact that a general election has recently taken place. As a protest against those offices not being filled, and against the failure in their duty of the Government in this respect, I intend to move an amendment to the Address. I therefore propose that after the word "legislature," the following words be added:—

"They, however, regret that measures were not adopted previous to the meeting of the Legislature, so that the Departments of Justice and Agriculture and Mines might be represented in the Legislative Assembly by their proper Ministers, responsible for the administration of these Departments,respectively,and they trust that the usual constitutional procedure will be adopted at once whereby they will be so represented during the remainder of the present session of the Legislature."

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a few observations on the subject of the Address now under discussion. In the first place, like the hon. gentlemen who have already spoken, I wish to extend to you, Sir, my congratulations upon the position you now hold as the unanimous choice of this House as its Speaker. I feel certain that during the time you will preside over the deliberations of this House you will be a worthy successor to those eminent gentlemen who have preceded you. I would also like to pay a tribute to the late Leader of the Opposition, Sir Robert Bond, upon his retirement from the political arena, and like other hon. members I regret to state that a permanent factor in the public life of this Colony has left the arena. In his letter of resignation he gave to the country sufficient reasons to show that his retirement was a forced one, and that it was impossible for him to continue in the position which he then held. In unison with members of both parties, I regret exceedingly his retirement from the pub-

lic life of this Colony, and I hope that at some future time he may see his way clear to give the country again his experience and ripe judgment. Last evening one of the hon. members for Twillingate stated in this House that he did not see any substantial results accruing from the policy of the present Government, or from the efforts of the Agricultural Societies throughout the country. That. hon. member concluded by telling us that the only way to develop the agricultural resources of the country was by the establishment of an experimental farm, an experiment which would involve an expenditure of something more than eighty thousand dollars. He also told us that he could not see any good results from the policy inaugurated by us five years ago. I feel that he did not give that same attention to this particular policy of the Government as he did to other matters which he thought fit to criticise. If he were particularly interested in this question of agriculture during the last five years he would not have made such a statement in this House. We have spent $40,000.00 per year, and we can give an account for every item—for every cent of that $40,000.00 a year. We can give you the name of every individual that has received anything through our Societies, and can account for all the live stock and all the seeds and everything that helped to make up this policy of agricultural progress. If you want the names of the individuals we can give them. We have 91 corporate bodies, 91 agricultural societies in the country today, and 15,000 men who are active participants in the policy which was initiated five years ago by the Prime Minister. We have been attacked—bitterly attacked—during the last four years, especially the Commissioners of the Agricultural Board, both from a personal and a political point of view, in order, I presume, to condemn if possible in the country outside the enormous amount of good that has been done for the fishermen of this country. We do not propose to make farmers of our people. We intend, if possible, to make it easy for them to provide—near their own homes and in their own localities—sufficient vegetables and cereals for their own tables. We do not propose to create farmers in a hundred thousand dollar mansion in the city of St. John's, in order that a few,—the favored few,—may receive a scientific education of three or four years' duration, and with what result? What result, Mr. Speaker, could be expected from a policy of that kind in a country like ours, except that after the three or four years were past, the natural result would be that these men, with the splendid imagination that education such as that would give, would leave this country, which would know them no more, and go to Western Canada or some other recognized agricultural country and display and put into effect the education which the poor fishermen of this country helped to place in their brains. Fourteen, or fifteen, or twenty-five at the most would be all that you could probably educate in an institution such as that. A political atmosphere would surround that institution just as it does and has surrounded all public institutions in this country and some other countries, and the result of it would be favouritism; and what chance would there be for the son of a fisherman from La Scie or the bottom of White Bay, or from Placentia Bay to acquire a scientific education in regard to agriculture in this country in the next century? The favored and important ones of the city would be the ones who would go there and acquire a scientific education at the expense of the very poorest taxpayers of this coun-

try, and they would carry their accomplishments to another country in order to help build it up and deplete their own.

The hon. member for Fogo seemed a little bitter, yesterday, especially in reference to the Agricultural policy of the Government. He told us there was no improvement, and there could not be, because those who were in charge knew nothing about agriculture. Now, the hon. member once occupied the proud position of Secretary of the Society down in Catalina. He was a paid Secretary, and received the money of the State, in order, as we assumed, to help advance the policy which was inaugurated by the Morris Government. He not only occupied that position for two years, but he sent in his Reports, and in his second Report he tells the Commissioners of the Agricultural Board, and through them he tells the country: "The seed potatoes received from the Board were distributed to the different places. The yield was about 12 barrels, of which a good percentage is being kept for seed. The quality was well liked by the people." And again: "The acreage of land under cultivation is increasing here, but only to a small extent." Yet this hon. gentleman told us yesterday that we were doing nothing, and that the waste lands of the country were in the same condition to-day that they were previous to this policy. That is not true. If the Government sent a proper Inspector through the country in the months of June, July or August he would find that there are not five hundred acres of uncultivated agricultural land in the country, owing to the impetus that has been given to agriculture because of this policy, and it will soon be necessary to help our fishermen-farmers by granting them an agricultural bonus for clearing land in order that they may take a greater advantage of the policy which is now in operation. "Doing nothing?" I am surprised at the hon. member. Last year this country did not grow more than fifty thousand tons of hay. Representations were made to the Government that they ought to take the duty off hay in order that the fishermen-farmers might give their cattle and sheep hay to save their lives, and in order that they might get this hay at fair prices. All this, entailing an enormous amount of work, was done without any noise. We placed that hay on the market at $20.50 a ton, and the year previous the ordinary price was from $28.00 to $35.00 a ton. The hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Jennings, also told us that it was not right that animals should be sent to individuals. We never sent animals to individuals. Not an animal, not a pound of seed, not a barrel of potatoes went to the District of Twillingate except through the regular channels, the Agricultural Societies, which were subsidiary to the Agricultural Board in St. John's. We know not individuals, and that is one of the chief reasons why the agricultural policy of the Government has been such a success. It is a broad, straightforward policy, free from politics. The advice and strongest arguments used by the present Prime Minister to the Commissioners five years ago was that we must not use or in any way attempt to introduce politics when organizing these Societies. That idea has permeated the Board ever since. The hon. member for Fogo knows it, because if these Societies were formed on political lines the hon. member would never have been one of the Secretaries. We did not attempt to elect one man in these Societies. We merely put the question before the people of a certain locality and had it discussed, and then the people of that locality elected their chairman and vice-chairman and com-

mittee and secretary. We gave the people the choice of selection in order that they might be free to give, out of their plenitude of local knowledge, their attention and regard to the question which we considered so vital in regard to the prosperity of the country. The consequences of that action are seen to-day all over the Colony with but very few exceptions. I need not tell this House to-night that in some parts of this country it is impossible to initiate any kind of farming. We know that the geographical positions of certain portions of the country and the nature of the soil are such that anything we attempted must be a failure; because some of these sections are nothing but rock, while others are something else; but where the Agricultural Board had a chance they did what was expected of them, and you will find a recognition from the people that all that could be done has been done, and the results can be easily seen.

Last year we had several agricultural exhibitions all over the country—one in St. John's, one at Trinity, one at Harbour Main, one at Brigus and one at Placentia. If I could bring you to any of these on the evenings on which they were opened, on the evening when the people around these centres were asked to come and view the results of their own toil, of their own intelligence and application of the advice that they had received from the Agricultural Board in St. John's, through their Societies, you would be delighted as a Newfoundlander, because you would feel that there must be a future for agriculture in this Colony, when we shall be able to supply not only our own needs, but also all the corporations that may come in here. Speaking of large corporations and their establishment in this country I may say that many at present established here are already being supplied with local vegetables. Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls, Badger, Botwood, Bell Island, Port au Port and other places are supplied by the Newfoundland farmer, who receives a very good price for the vegetables he has grown, and the crop of which he has increased because of the increase through the distribution of agricultural literature of all kinds, which we thought necessary and available in this country. The people of Kelligrews, Clarke's Beach, and especially the people of St. George's, the District represented by my friend, Mr. Downey, have sent thousands of barrels of potatoes and tons of cabbages and cereals into these great establishments out on our railway, such as these I have mentioned, and still there are some members in this House who cannot see any good result from the policy which has been gradually working itself out educating the people in an elementary sense in the science of agriculture. If any member would take the trouble to read our Reports received from all over the country he must surely believe, if he believed in the veracity of his fellow countrymen—that the higher criticism which has been directed at this policy cannot be true and the man who stands up and makes such statements is either doing it without sufficient knowiedge or is dangerously near a position which ought not to be occupied by any member of this Assembly. In the first year, 1910, we created 73 societies; in the next year there were 77; the next year 88 and to-day there are ninety-one, which gives an aggregate farming population of more than 15,000 people actively engaged reading our literature, meeting three or four or ten or twenty-five times a year discussing the question of agriculture and discussing the need of implements or of certain kinds of seeds or of live stock; discussing the question of the rotation of crops or

the utility of lime and the most pleasing feature of it all is the anxiety of our people to learn about these things.

If you go down to the Department of Agriculture and Mines you will find hundreds of orders for different kinds of fertilizer and hundreds of letters enquiring about different matters. In the first year of the existence of the Board no such questions were asked; nor even in the second year; but since then enquiries are coming in all the time because the people are becoming interested, because they find that all over the country the people who have taken the subject up and followed the advice and assistance given them as a result of the policy of the present Government have been successful.

To show what an active interest our people are to-day taking in the question of agriculture you need only go through the different exhibitions. At the exhibition held in Placentia there were seven hundred and forty-five exhibits; forty-five horses; twenty-five cows, twenty-three different lots of poultry; and ninety different lots of potatoes and so on. At Burin there were fifteen hundred and seventy-four exhibits; at Harbour Main nine hundred and twenty-four; at Bonavista six hundred and twelve and Trinity four hundred and eight. That must show you clearly that wherever we have had an opportunity to have an exhibition great interest has always been taken by the people in the work, and last year when I was leaving Placentia—the capital town of my district—I was asked by many of the most prominent citizens of that place to ask the Government to give them the privilege of having an exhibition there every year. They themselves were more astonished at the capabilities of that section of the country than even a stranger would be.

The average potato crop to-day is thirteen to one at the very lowest calculation, while in 1908 the average was only seven to one, and yet I hear men say that they cannot see any results from the policy which has been carried out under the auspices of the Morris Government for the past five years. We have had in live stock more than two hundred bulls received in this country during the last five years. They ought to produce five or six thousand. These must be worth taking the value of the calves at $10.00 and putting the figures as low as possible, at least $40,000.00 and surely no man who has given his attention to these matters and understands how they appertain to the welfare of this country will ever so far forget himself as to say that the paltry $40,000.00 vote for agriculture has been thrown away. Why thrown away? Is it because fishermen of this country who are two-thirds or seven-eighths of the population are receiving the benefit. Is that the reason so much criticism has been made against this policy the past five years? There has been a bitterness displayed against this policy which has been displayed against no other policy initiated by this Government not even by the railway policy. Is it displayed because this policy helps to make our people the most independent proletariat in the world. I feel the blush, almost of shame, when I hear men get up on a public platform and when I read the public Press about our poor people, our pauperised proletariat. There is no such thing in this country to-day. There is not a pauper in the country and the man that says there is does not know what he is talking about. Go to the outport, go to the simplest fisherman in the country and you will find him in his own little home, and still you will find here people creating a false sentiment by creating the idea that

our people are poor and ought to be considered as an immense expanse of pauperism. It is unfair to the country in which we live and even unfair to the people themselves who make these statements. Anyone who knows the people of this country and understands them in their avocations and who can enter into their thoughts in every particular must know that it is almost an infamy to cast such a reflection upon the mainstay, the bone and sinew of this country and yet this has been attempted by prominent men inside this Legislature and outside it. No better measure was ever carried through a Legislature and as a matter of fact, no measures worthy the name in British history was ever carried through to a successful conclusion without opposition, and without a large number of the population being bitterly opposed to it. In this case, I claim there are not such a large number against us, yet although we have the most democratic Government that ever existed in this country, it is incapable of destroying certain lines of thought that have come down to us for more than two centuries, and because our people have participated in and appreciated and welcomed this policy there are men who consider because of the position they occupy and because of the contemptuous regard they have always had for the fishermen and their sons they think they are safe in using any language however degrading or disrespectful, provided they are not liable for a libel suit. It is not the proper language to use and the last place in which it should be heard is in this House, which the people have created and which they own. We are but the oracles of the people and our duty here is to preserve the heritage of those whom we represent.

There is no man prouder than I am to-night that we have actual working fishermen in this House but we must not forget that there have been fishermen here before, good men and true, who endeavoured as far as they could to uplift the country in which they lived. Many of us have known and all of us have heard of the late Capt. Charles Dawe, one of the finest fishermen who ever stood on the floors of this House. He was here for years and years and was much respected by those who knew him. Capt. John Bartlett was also for many years in this House. There was also Capt. Mercer, as true a lover of his country as any man and Capt. Winsor, Capt. Kean, Captain Fred White and many others. They stood proudly here and did what they could to help forward the progress of their Colony while not forgetting their duty to the districts which they were elected to represent. I do from my heart welcome these fishermen to the House for it is here that some of them should be. It is their heritage, and the day will surely come, though not as quickly as some hon. gentlemen think, when the future Demosthenes and the future Cicero will be proud to proclaim that they are the sons of fishermen. God dwells with the people and in the people, and the day must come when they will come to the front.

It is not an unusual thing to find representatives of the working classes in Parliament. If we look at the House of Parliament in England today we find that some of the proudest seats are held by those who are the representatives of the labouring classes and some of the best men in the House of Commons to-day are those who have come from the labouring classes. Therefore, sir, while it is not a matter of singular congratulation to have these fishermen with us, I am glad to see them here

and I hope they will continue to be here.

My hon. friend, Mr. Coaker, the senior member for Bonavista, a district in which I spent many pleasant years, said during his speech yesterday that we consume twice as much sugar since the tax was removed as we did before that time. During the last session of the Assembly an hon. member gave us an expression of his surprise that one-third of the sugar used in the Colony was used by the fishermen and labouring classes. The hon. member for Bonavista now tells us that the fishermen are using twice as much as they did before because the duty has been taken off sugar. That must be true because my hon. friend says so. The fact is that until the duty was taken off sugar was being kept away from the fishermen and it was an article of food that evidently they wanted to have. Is that not in itself a tribute to the Government? If the hon. gentleman talked for the next three weeks he could not have given the Government a better bouquet than he has given them in that one expression.

He also tells us that he favours the taxation of everything that is imported through the Customs House. If that is so, the present Government has been doing wrong, the Bond Government did wrong and all the Prime Ministers, that we now look upon as great, did wrong. They did wrong, according to my hon. friend, Mr. Coaker, because they took from the shoulders of the fishermen and the labouring classes all the taxation that they could take from him. My hon. friend tells us in so many words that he does not believe in such procedure and that everything should be taxed, from the automobile that is imported by the rich man to the necessaries of life that are imported by the poor. I contend that this is wrong. I contend that if we allow in duty free everything that is used by the fishermen and everything that is required by him, we shall still be indebted to him. Without him there could be no revenue at all, for it is he who goes to the great Banks, to Cape Bonavista, to the Labrador or wherever it may be, and by the strength of his arm and the acumen of his brain, brings forth from the depths of the ocean the wealth of the Colony. As a representative of fishermen I am not prepared to listen to the man who tells us that the fisherman pays little or nothing to the revenue of the Colony for I contend that he practically pays it all. It is he who makes it possible for the country to be prosperous even if he does not pay the revenue directly through the Customs House.

There is another paragraph from the speech of the hon. member for Bonavista which I have taken practically **in globo.** This is a matter which to me is almost a personal one, for he has told us that he believes in the construction of all the branch railways except the Trepassey branch. The same remark was made last session by the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond, who is not here to-day. That remark, which he made then, went much further than he expected it would go. In saying it he had a meaning which if set forth in bold words would not do the individual who expressed it any good. He condemned most unfairly the Trepassey branch. It is true that he condemned the other branches but he condemned this one especially. The hon. member for Bonavista now comes here and he emphasizes the fact still more strongly that the Trepassey branch should not be built. I maintain the contrary and I tell him that in the course of eight or ten years he will find that

Trepassey will be one of the most important towns in the island. This will not be due entirely to the railway but because of its splendid geographical position. In its harbour the whole British fleet can be anchored. Its entrance is guarded on one side by the greatest light on this side of the Atlantic, Cape Race, and it is in touch with the great Marconi stations in Cornwall and at Glace Bay. It has a fog alarm and a lighthouse at the entrance of the harbour while at Cape Pine there is another lighthouse and fog alarm. The man who tells you that it is a mistake to have a railway to Trepassey must be ignorant of that part of the Colony for it is no mistake to build a hundred miles of railway so that we may be able to bring to our own shores in later years the great liners of the Atlantic. Trepassey is only fifteen miles from Cape Race and passengers may leave their steamer there and in two or three hours be in St. John's. In spite of this great possibility we are told that it is a mistake to build the railway to Trepassey.

I have occupied the time of the House a longer time than I expected. However, I am not sorry; in fact, I feel proud of the opportunity of claiming your attention and I hope that later in the session I may have an opportunity of referring to other questions that concern the district which I represent, for if I failed to do this I would be negligent in my duty to my constituents, to this House and to myself.

MR. DWYER.—Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the speech from the hon. member for Placentia and I think it is a pity that he does not spend all his time lecturing on agriculture in his own district. Even if he did that I am sure that some would be inclined to ask him if he knew a plough from a harrow; and yet we are compelled to sit here and listen to a man insulting the intelligence of the farmers and fishermen of the Colony by telling them what he has done for them. He claimed that he was a fisherman but the fact is that for five years he has drawn a large salary to show that a fisherman could not be a farmer. He has even tried to make use of his position by learning something about farming and agriculture. I have heard that when the position was offered to him he went to the Prime Minister and he asked that gentleman what he was expected to do and what the office was for. "Well," said the Premier, "we are going to make an agricultural expert out of you. All you have to do is to get up a lecture on agriculture and every now and then there will be an exhibition."

We had an experimental farm and, if my hon. friend had visited it as he ought to have done, he would have improved his knowledge a lot. It would have been much better for him than to stand up here and by his talk show that he is a permanent mistake in his position. We are giving more money to agriculture in proportion to our size and population than Canada is doing with her millions. There are a few fishermen-farmers in the Colony but they were here before the agricultural societies were formed. If you take up one of the reports of the Society that he talks about, you will see that they claim that they have expended money in prizes and in importing seeds and then the hon. member tells us that they have given literature to the people. Well, he ought to be ashamed to say so for it would be far better to give them object lessons in agriculture. It is impossible for a fisherman to be a farmer as well. He can take up any other trade while he is not fishing, such as mending boots and doing carpentering

work, but he cannot be a farmer. Yet my hon. friend would try to make us believe that he could and he talks so loudly that you would think he was in earnest. If he spoke like that throughout his district people who did not know anything about farming might think he was worthy of the big salary that he was getting but a farmer would know different. I never heard one of his lectures but I hope the lessons which he gives the farmers are different to that which we heard to-day. All they seem to do is to talk but it was never expected that they would do much for the farmers because of the example set them by the Government. It takes an honest man to be a farmer.

The agricultural show was certainly a great surprise with its cattle and produce from the different settlements and prizes for the lot of them. No doubt it gave much satisfaction to those who were responsible for it, but I think it would be far wiser on the part of the Agricultural Society to pay more attention to experimental farming and not make the commissioners the laughing stock of the country.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to speak in this debate and I rise to do so with much reluctance. My hon. friend, Mr. Devereaux, has traversed the agricultural policy of the Government that I do not think I need venture to repeat any of the points referred to by him. I shall confine myself merely to the criticism of my hon. friend, the member for St. John's East.

I am prepared to admit that the statistics quoted by my hon. friend show an increase in the importation of agricultural products during the past year but I am quite certain that if these statistics are analysed they will not show an increase in those products that are raised in the Colony. I am also certain that those products that it has been the duty of the Board to foster have shown a most remarkable increase, especially potatoes and cabbage. Consequently the argument of my hon. friend is nullified.

My hon. friend went further and questioned the wisdom of the methods used by the Board to increase the knowledge of agriculture among our people; and he contended that there should be an agricultural college or university in which a variety of subjects could be dealt with and expounded. When they were in an awkward position they went back upon the model farm policy, after $40,000 a year had been spent for the purchase of a farm. The Hon. Minister of Mines and Agriculture at that date stated that it would be insufficient for the proposition. I am not absolutely certain that I am correct in that statement but I speak subject to correction. With reference to the agricultural college, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a mistake. Let us compare the case of a child with our position to agriculture. He is first sent to a common school and then to a college. In the same way, we must proceed by gradual stages. Except in favourite classes of this country we have no man outside of St. John's with the experience acquired from years devoted to the farm work.

The Agricultural Board, I may say, has undoubted evidence that no other method would have worked in such a way as to bring the same results. In short, the agricultural societies have done much in the past four years. I will not anticipate what will be conveyed to this House, when the report of the Agricultural Board will be laid on the table of this House. This report will show a most gratifying state of affairs. It will show an increase in the membership of these societies;

and an increase in the crop of potatoes of some 90 per cent. over that of five or six years back. It will show an increased acreage of land under cultivation. I think the people appreciate the improvements made in the breed of live stock by the introduction of well-bred animals. There can be no question at all of the accuracy of this report, or of the correctness of these statements. I may say that, with regard to the evidence that will be producel as to improvement of the cattle in this country, the report of the Board for 1911 contains the report of the Catalina Society. It is an undoubted fact that in Catalina the people readily and gladly admit that the quality of these cattle is all to be desired. Some of the sheep in this part of the country weighed from 194 to 224 lbs. This is only one instance and I will not trespass upon the time of the House, because these facts will appear in a few days. Not only has the Agricultural Board furnished such evidence, but if necessary the Board can furnish an abundance of further evidence from the best possible sources. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we are all agreed that, as far as possible, the policy has been a success. I am further convinced from what I have seen in the past four years and from my personal knowledge of the facts that the great results and the great success of this policy will be more regarded in coming years than in the past. The educating of the people from crude methods to more advanced ones is not the work of a day. A satisfactory advance has been made during the past four years and we are in hopes of greater achievements in the future. The hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Dwyer, referred to the act that was passed some years back. Shortly after the passing of that act the Agricultural Board decided that possibly better results might be obtained by the introduction of good seeds.

In the three years since then, they have been introduced and in the past year seeds of all kinds were imported and sold at cost price to all who required them. Turnip and other seed has been imported into the Colony and all has been sold at cost price to the people; but, Sir, without the loss of a dollar to the Board's funds. The gain that has accrued to the country is most gratifying. I give in advance of the tabling of the report, this statement, that the increase of membership in agricultural societies has been about 800. In the past year the increase was very considerable.

I can see nothing whatever that can be anything but gratifying to the Government in its policy. Its policy has been well received and is being carried out. Production will increase as the years go on, and in years to come, we will reach the point when the proposal of organizing an experimental station may reasonably be considered. I hope that the hon. members on the Opposition of this House who now hold seats will then be still members of the House, and will recognize that their criticisms of today and their predictions were unfounded. They will then see that the wisdom of the present Government was due to adopting a policy that meant the making of a certain definite degree of progress before the purchase of the experimental station that is so great a load on the minds of our friends on the other side of the House.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the amendment proposed by my hon. friend, Mr. Kent. It appears to me that the two members who have just spoken on the other side of the House are apparently competitors for the vacant position of Minister of Agriculture and Mines. We ought to

have here a Minister of Mines and Agriculture to defend the agricultural policy. Yesterday, the Prime Minister took upon himself the work of that Department, and the day before he undertook the work of the Department of Justice. Both Mr. Devereaux and Mr. Downey have been trying to justify as much as possible the agricultural policy of the Government. Now, what have they shown? They have shown nothing, except that there are a certain number of agricultural societies that have increased in members, that something has been done to increase the growth of turnips, potatoes, etc. But they hve left carefully out of sight the fact that the Commissioners have taken $7,000 as salary for doing very little work. What was the first thing done in connection with the agricultural policy? Was it not to provide salaries for three hon. members on the other side? They stated that the recent exhibitions were the best yet held. The aspirants to the vacant position have done something. They took the duty off hay to prevent cattle from starving, yet we are told by members on the other side who are in receipt of pay, and who live on the policy, they object to our protests. We have been told that Professor Robertson approved of the agricultural policy. I should like to know where that approval is expressed. Professor Robertson may not have said one word against agricultural societies. I have myself nothing against the policy of forming such societies. But Professor Robertson's policy is one of agricultural schools and experimental farms. That has been his life work. I turn now, Sir, to another matter that has been debated in connection with this Address. Yesterday, we heard much on the question of fish. Who raised the price of fish? was the great question. Was it Coaker? This debate was introduced by the Prime Minister. He attempted to show that Mr. Coaker had nothing to do with raising the price of fish. The Prime Minister gave as evidence some very interesting figures, and I would ask the Prime Minister for a correct copy of these figures. The Premier asserts that the export of green fish to the United States in 1912 was 31,000 quintals, and in 1913 was 49,000 quintals. I have been following the figures carefully myself, and I challenge the Premier's representation. I want to point out that these figures are not for successive years. The first figures are for the year ending June, 1911, and the second quotation is for the year ending June, 1913. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that there is an increase in the export of green fish between the year 1910-11 and the year 1912-13, but he has missed out the intervening year. Now, Mr. Speaker, this may seem insignificant. His argument is that Mr. Coaker could not have had anything to do with the price of fish, because it depended on these factors, and more especially that it depended on the increased demand in the United States,which had been so great that 20,000 qtls. more fish had been taken last year than the year before, and he said that this increased demand for fish was the real cause of its price. But even so, how does that affect Mr.Coaker? Does it follow that because there is an increase in the price of fish abroad that the fishermen have got the benefit of it? That is where the Prime Minister's argument fails. That is where he did not prove his case. It may be true that the tendency abroad was to increase the price of fish, but it does not follow that the fishermen would get it. This is where the F.P.U. came in. The Union took care that the fishermen got the benefit of it. And I challenge anyone to go through the

whole of Trinity Bay and he will see that this is the prevalent idea based on facts. Now, Sir, I have not done yet. The argument of the Premier was that because of the increase of 20,000 quintals of green fish exported to the United States in the two years mentioned, therefore the tendency was to increase the price of fish. But why did he not go a little further. He was only speaking of green fish. What about the Oporto market? Is it not a fact, Sir, that there was a decrease of 20,000 qtls. exported dry to that market this year? Is it not further a fact that the tendency of an increase of 20,000 qtls. green in one market is destroyed by a decrease of 20,000 qtls. dry in another? Is it not a fact that the same class of fish that goes green to the United States goes dry to the Portuguese market? If that is the case, then an increase of 20,000 quintals in green fish exported to the States and decrease of 20,000 qtls. to the Portuguese market act as more than an offset to one another, and destroy whatever effect either might have on the price of fish. But I have even a stronger argument than that in connection with the quotations he made. It may be remembered that in speaking of these figures, 30,000 and 49,000 for the years mentioned the Prime Minister in the rough and ready fashion that he uses in dealing with figures, said that practically there had been a doubling of the export of green fish to the United States, and that was the reason of the increased price of fish. Mr. Coaker corrected him, and said that 19,000 or 30,000 was not doubling. But, Sir, there was a halt in the export to the United States that either the Prime Minister did not know anything about, or else knowing it, left it out. The export to the United States in 1911-12 was 97,000 quintals, and in the last year there was only 49,000, and therefore if we follow out the Prime Minister's argument the real fact should be that instead of there being a tendency, on account of the increased export to the States, to raise the price of fish last year, the tendency should have been to put it down as only one-half the amount exported the year before, was exported last year. I may be wrong in my figures. They are only thrown out as a challenge. These figures are the figures of the Department of Customs. If they are wrong, the Minister is here and he can verify them, and I challenge him to contradict them. But if the figures are correct, that destroys absolutely the argument advanced by the Prime Minister against Mr. Coaker in his contention about the price of fish. Mr. Coaker was right when he said that up to the beginning of the Fall of last year there had been not an increase, but a decrease, in the export of green fish to the States. But I will go further and deal with the figures which he did not present. The 49,000 quintals was the quotation of the export up to June 30th last. The remarkable feature of it is that the figures which I am about to quote come after all the election cries raised against Mr. Coaker. Figures come to light after the election particularly relating to the last two months of the year just gone, which show a remarkable increase in the export of green fish to the States; but these figures do not affect the question as raised by the Prime Minister. To sum up the matter, then, Sir, I contend that the Prime Minister's case falls through absolutely. The only position advanced by the F.P.U. was that their strength was sufficient to secure the highest price that could be obtained depending upon existing conditions abroad. The Union does not contend that they can control conditions abroad, or that they tried to do so.

They only tried to get what was due to them on the market prices abroad. They secured that by the force of combination. After all, Sir, fish is a commodity, partly controlled by the fishermen. The price can be controlled by the fishermen as well as merchants can control the price of other kinds of produce. Dealers in other kinds of produce combine to control the output and price. It is a fact that they can put up the price by combination. The whole world is an example that combination keeps up the price of things and if a combine of merchants can keep up the price of food products abroad surely it is possible for the fishermen by similar combination to do something to keep up the price of the produce they control.

I will now turn to matters generally in the Speech of His Excellency. The remarkable feature of this Speech is that it differs from every other Speech ever presented to this House. You may search the whole of the pages of this Speech and you will not find one single indication that a single bill is to be presented to this House. There is no foreshadowing of any legislation for this session. It deals with administrative measures, it is true. For instance there is somethng about Professor Dunstan being invited here to examine our coal areas. Now I have been curious about this statement and would like to know what exactly it means. By reference to the Speech we find that Professor Dunstan, Director of the Imperial Institute, has been invited to visit the country to thoroughly examine our carboniferous areas and so on. When I saw that statement I naturally looked to find out who that man was. I looked to see the Minister of Mines on the floor of the House to explain who and what he is. We are not able to see the correspondence even.

Professor Dunstan is coming to examine our coal areas. That is a remarkable statement and especially in connection with Professor Dunstan: because it is easily discoverable who Professor Dunstan is. He is an eminent man, a great scientist, a man who has done a lot of work in connection with Colonial Governments. But who is he? One would naturally expect to find that if a man is being brought across from the other side to examine our carboniferous areas that he would be an expert. What is an expert sir? One who knows from experience and knowledge something about the subject which he examines and explores into, Professor Dunstan is coming to examine these areas. What is he? Is he a geologist? Oh, no! He is not a geologist. Is he a coal expert? Oh, no, he is not a coal expert. Then what is he sir? He is a chemist. He is not a geologist, not a mineralogist, not a coal expert and not a coal miner, but a chemistry professor. Now what is his record? He is coming to examine our coal and oil shale areas. Why the two should be coupled together I do not understand. Why should a coal expert know anything about shale? Why should an oil shale expert know anything about coal? But what is Professor Dunstan's record? It is perfectly true that he is a great man. He is a great scientist He commenced as demonstrator at a university laboratory. He has been a professor at a medical college. He is a lecturer in connection with the chemistry branch of an agricultural college and that is the type of expert sent here to explore our coal areas, at least so we are told. But I think there is some misunderstanding about it. What I believe to be the facts of the case is that the Government found themselves in a hole, and they hope in this way to get out of it by fooling the

people. Five years ago the Prime Minister said that the price of coal was a national grievance and that if he was returned to power he would try to do something to deal with the price and reduce it. I believe he was in earnest about the matter. I believe that every man who takes up this question is in earnest because it comes home to everyone. We must all suffer from these exactions in connection with coal. I do not say the exactions are here in this country but they exist. The high price is blamed on the wages. Coal combines would be nearer the mark. It is a well known fact that the wages bill in the mining of coal does not exceed 18 or 20 cents a ton. Five years ago they promised to do something. They tried to do something and they set out with the firm determination to find once and for all if the coal areas were workable, whether there was any commercial possibility in mining the coal and thus reducing the price. There is no question about the coal being there if it can be worked commercially. I do not know how true it is, sir, but I have been told that an important corporation in this country have worked coal. They had all the facilities for doing so and they worked the coal. It cost them so much to mine the coal although it was close to the railroad, that they found it more advantageous to close down and go outside for their coal. It does not follow that because we have coal that we will be able to get it in commercially workable quantities. I cannot conceive, sir, if we have plenty of coal and it is commercially obtainable, I cannot conceive a greater advantage falling to Newfoundland than that we should discover it, and the earlier the better. All my early life I lived on a coal belt and I am in a position to know its worth. In England what do we find? Why coal is one of the greatest factors. The great shipping industry of South Lancashire is dependent upon the supply of coal. The West Riding of Yorkshire is on a coal field. The great woollen industry owes its existence and its continued existence to the fact that it rests on a coal seam. Tht same applies to the ship trade of Glasgow and the Tyne. All depend upon the coal fields. The great industries of Glasgow depend upon it. The same applies to Tyneside. The same to the pottery industries. All are dependent, and not alone dependent, but actually owe their existence to the coal fields. So that I would be the last person in the world to decry any investigation into our coal resources. I do not care how futile the investigation may be. It may turn out worth while to spend money to see whether we can build up a population upon our coal fields; because there are great possibilities if they are commercially workable. But this matter, what does it mean? I know what it means and I will tell you. It means exactly what the Leader of the Opposition said—Professor Dunstan, Director of the Imperial Institute, is coming here. He is a man who has been frequently appointed to report in connection with agriculture in various parts of the British Empire. It all points to this. He will report upon our coal. Here is one of his reports. I have studied other of his reports. But what does it come to. He is coming here to find what the Department of Mines has pigeonholed. He is coming here to find out what Mr. Howley can show him. He is coming to see what information we have here. That is all. But I am not the one to decry the visit of Professor Dunstan. I think it is a step in the right direction. But it ought to be put in its proper light. He is a scientist going to different parts of

the British world investigating and getting at the records of Colonial governments and when he gets the records, tabulating, getting the information together, issuing a report in connection with the Imperial Institute, such documents as I hold here in my hand. That is what it means. That is the benefit that will come from it. He will take the facts contained in our geological survey, he will take the information that Mr. Howley has at his disposal, sift it, tabulate it and lay it in the form of a report before the Colonial Office and the Imperial Institute, where it will be available to capitalists who wish to look into the matter. If I am wrong I shall be pleased to be corrected. As I said before, I do not wish to decry the value of the visit but it ought to be put in its proper light and not be understood as if an expert were going to explore our coal areas and find out what exactly we have. Professor Dunstan will merely gather together the information now in the Department and that is all.

I have spoken, sir, of the absence of any legislation. But I cannot take my seat without expressing my sympathy with the Minister of Finance and Customs. He may not believe it but I do so honestly. Perhaps he does not think so. I do express my sympathy, because if the Speech shows one thing it shows that he is in a very difficult position and I believe the difficulties of the position are not due to the Minister of Finance although he is the one responsible and although he defended the position as well as he could last year. He knew it was wrong. He did it despite his better judgment. Now the year before he laid down sound principles of finance. He was not going in for any heroic measures in connection with the reduction of the tariff. If anything was done it would be done gradually, a bit off this year and a bit off next. That was the position he took in 1912. But in 1913 owing to party exigencies he had to do something he did not like, something that was contrary to his better judgment. I can sympathize with the fact that he did not want to do it and that party exigencies made him do it. In any case it throws upon him the responsibility for the feature of the Governor's Speech and that feature is that there is a big shortage in the revenue. There is a great shortage already and measures must be taken this session to meet that shortage. That in itself might not matter very much but it matters a great deal in the position in which we are placed in regard to railway building and in regard to the floating of the loans. Here are the figures which have been tabled. I move now for the adjournment of the debate until to-morrow.

It is ordered accordingly.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the remaining orders of the day are postponed till Thursday.

MR. KENT gave notice of question.

MR. COAKER gave notice of question.

MR. STONE gave notice of question.

MR. JENNINGS gave notice of question.

MR. ABBOTT gave notice of question.

MR. WINSOR gave notice of question.

MR. TARGETT gave notice of question.

MR. GRIMES gave notice of question.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister it was ordered that when the House rise it adjourn until Thursday at three p.m.

The House then adjourned.

THURSDAY, Jany. 22nd.

The House opened at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY laid on the table of the House the Report of the Committee on Internal Economy for 1914; also answer to sections A and B of the question of the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, on the Order Paper of the 19th January, in connection with the extension of telegraphs, the districts in which the telegraphs were extended, and the cost of the same. The answer to the remaining portions of that question is in preparation.

PETITIONS.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker,, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Little Harbor Deep, asking that that place be made a port of call. Little Harbour Deep is about ten miles from Big Harbor Deep, and it is a very great inconvenience to the fishermen to have to bring their goods that distance. It would not be out of the way for the steamer to call in there, and would only mean a quarter of an hour or a half hour's delay. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition and would ask that it be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary. I also ask leave to present a petition from Hillier's Harbour. This petition is very numerously signed, and asks that a weekly mail service be established during the summer months between Hillier's Harbour and Englee. The residents there have to leave off their fishing in order to fetch mails or bring goods which they may receive from St. John's. The petitioners ask that James Dempster may be employed as mail courier. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition and I would ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates. I trust that the Government will see its way clear to establish this service.

Mr. KENT—Mr Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Thomas Coady and others of Torbay Road, in the district of St. John's East, asking for a grant for the purpose of building an agricultural road in the neighbourhood in which his farm is situated. I may say this road would be of great service to the people of that neighbourhood. It would also be an incentive to them to extend their farming operations, as it would facilitate them in the handling of their produce. I would ask that this petition be sent to the Department of Public Works, and that when the allocations for the district are being made that the Minister be good enough to bear this road in mind.

MR. DWYER—Mr Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition. I know the locality well. The people there are industrious fishermen-farmers, and anything that would help them to get their produce to town to market it would be a real good work.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Joseph Emberley and others of Channel, asking that the Government send the dredge there to dredge out some of the smaller harbours. I may say that I have had similar petitions from people all along that coast. A lot of the harbours in that vicinity are very shallow, and in

winter time the ice gets in there and freezes to the bottom and it is impossible to move it out, while if the water were deepened a little by dredging, the ice could be moved out. I trust that the Government may see its way clear to respond to the prayer of this petition, and also the request of all the people along the district of Burgeo and LaPoile.

QUESTIONS.

MR. CLIFT asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to cause to be laid on the table of the House a detailed statement of all expenditure mad out of the vote for Agriculture the 30th of June last to the present date.

RT. HON. PREMIER—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman I may say that the answer to that question is being prepared.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the revenue and expenditure of the Colony for six months ending December 31, 1913; also, a similar statement for the corresponding periods of the years 1912, 1911 and 1910.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentlemen I may say that the answer is being prepared.

MR. KENT asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House, a copy of all correspondence in relation to all increases in the membership of the Legislative Council, since March 1909; also, to state what the authorized number of members of the said Council now is, and whether there are any vacancies in such membership.

RT. HON. PREMIER—Mr. Speaker, as my learned friend knows, it is not usual to table correspondence of that nature. The same question has been asked here several times, both during the present administration and during the late administration. Personally, I do not see any objection to tabling the correspondence, but it has not been done in the past. I shall look into the matter. As to what the number of authorized members now is and whether there are any vacancies. I may say that the number is 24, and there is one vacancy.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to obtain from that Department and to lay upon the table of the House, a statement showing (a) the number of sheep and cattle distributed in Bonavista District during 1913; (b) when distributed; (c) to whom given; (d) also, the value of prizes awarded at Bonavista Agricultural Show which was held in October last.

RT. HON. PREMIER—Mr. Speaker, in reply I may say that the answer to that question is being prepared.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to obtain from that Department and to lay upon the table of the House, a copy of all letters sent by his Department since 1910 to prospective Saw Mill owners, in reply to protests received against the erection of Steam Saw Mills; also, copies of instructions issued to Timber Wardens in reference to the erection of such mills, and reports

of such Timber Wardens in reference thereto.

RT. HON. PREMIER—Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is also in course of preparation.

Mr. COAKER asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House, a detailed statement showing (a) Marconi Station Expenditure for the last two years; (b) traveling expenses for Government Engineer's Department for 1912 and 1913; (c) amount paid, as rent for Post Office at Herring Neck, and what arrangements were made by the Government concerning this building: (d) detailed statement of expenditures out of Contingencies vote for the departments of Postal Telegraphs, Public Charities, Casual Attendance, Emergency Cases, Conveyance of Poor, Conveyance of sick Fishermen and Shipwrecked Crews, for 1913; also, statement of expenditure on Tuberculosis vote for the year 1913; (f) amount paid as steamer subsidies for the whole of the Labrador services for 1912 and 1913.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member I may say that the answers to sections A, B, C and D of that question will appear in the public accounts when tabled. In reference to section D, a detailed statement of these different votes would entail an enormous amount of work, and I could not hope to have them ready for some considerable time. In reference to the expenditure in connection with tuberculosis, that can be readily prepared, and if details are required I can have them for the hon. member tomorrow or the following day. The same applies to section F regarding the amount paid as subsidies for the Labrador service.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House copies of returns for special and local grants expended at Fox Harbor and Little Heart's Ease, in the District of Trinity, for the years 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The answers are in course of preparation.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House copies of returns for all monies allocated by his department for the settlement of Champneys, in the district of Trinity, for the year 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—These answers are being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the number of sheep and other cattle distributed in Trinity District during 1913, when distributed, to whom given; also, a detailed statement of the amount of money spent in connection with the Trinity Agricultural Show, which was held there in October last.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The answers are in course of preparation and will be laid upon the table in due course.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the expenditure of $40.00, allocated to J. B. Osmond, of Moreton's Harbor, on April 19th, 1913, for a "Landing"; also, detailed statement of expenditure of allocation of $40.00 made to James Jones, of Great Chance Harbor on 28th of July, 1913, for "Landing."

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to inform the hon. mem-

ber that the returns for this expenditure have not as yet been sent to my department.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the following allocations to Richard Quirk, of Fortune Harbor, on account of wharf, viz.: Feb. 20th, $250.00; April 19th, $250.00; October 1st, $103.70; Total $603.70.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to lay on the table the information asked for.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House copies of returns for all monies allocated by his department to Hant's Harbor, in the District of Trinity, for the year 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—The answer is in course of preparation.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing (a) the amount expended by the Agricultural Board from its inception, in 1909, up to December 31, 1913, and amounts expended in each District each year; (b) the amounts expended on account of Agricultural Shows, for what expended, and to whom paid; (c) the name of Societies visited by each Commissioner during the years 1912 and 1913, and the number of lectures delivered by such Commissioners about Agriculture.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The information is being prepared and will be laid on the table in due course.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a copy of returns for any expenditures made by his department at Newman's Cove, in the District of Bonavista, for the year 1913.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to inform the hon. member that there were no allocations made from my department for Newman's Cove.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House, a copy of returns for all local and special monies expended at Newman's Cove, in the District of Bonavista, for the year 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—The information asked for is in course of preparation.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of the expenditures of all monies expended since 1909 upon the road leading from Valleyfield to Cape Freels, and accounts in connection therewith.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—The information asked for is in course of preparation.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of all grants expended in Bonavista District, issued by his department, from 1909 to 1913, both years inclusive and to whom sent.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The information asked for is in course of preparation.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing (a) amount expended on account of the dredge, Priestman during the year 1913, to whom paid and dates of such payments; (b) amount expended on account of the dredge Priestman from the time she was purchased up to the end of 1913; (c) to whom insurance premiums were paid, dates of such payments, and the amounts paid.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—The information asked for is in course of preparation.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing (1) the number of couriers engaged in the Winter Mail service in Bonavista District, their routes, the amount paid for each route and to whom paid; (2) a statement of places in Bonavista District possessing a Post Office, the name of Postmasters, and the salary paid each; (3) also, a statement showing names of places possessing Telegraph and Telephone Offices in Bonavista District the names of operators and the salary paid each at the present time.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the hon. member (1) the information asked for is being prepared; (2 and 3), if the hon. member will refer to the Year Book he will find the information asked for set out in detail and the salaries of the officials will be found in the estimates

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the returns for all expenditures of grants issued by his department for the year 1913, in Harbor Grace District, other than local grants.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—The information asked for is in course of preparation.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the returns for all expenditures of grants issued by his department for the year 1913 in Harbor Grace District.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—The information asked for is in course of preparation.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS IN REPLY.

DR. LLOYD—When the debate adjourned on Tuesday, I expressed my sympathy with the Government. I now wish to renew that sympathy in a more extended form because as I have already pointed out the only feature in His Excellency's Speech worthy of much consideration is the statement that there is a shortage in the revenue for the six months ending on Dec. 31st. We have already had speeches from hon. members on the other side of the House and an important one by the Premier but no information was disclosed beyond the fact that there was a shortage. We were not told the amount of that shortage. We have no sufficient information before us appertaining to the financial condition of this Colony, which we should have while discussing the various matters contained on the Speech from the Throne. We have asked for information regarding these matters but the only answer is that the information is being prepared and will be laid on the table in due course. The Government is in the painful position of not being able to do anythng and they are adopting the policy of marking time. The Government can do nothing at present for they are in a financial bog, the proof of which is contained in the Speech from the Throne. If we look from end to end of the Speech we cannot find any promise of one piece of new legislation, but we do know that the Receiver General will be obliged to put on more taxes in order to meet the shortage in the Revenue. The other day the Premier stated that the country was taxed at the present time about one million dollars less than it was thirty years ago. I must say that if he wishes his remarks to be taken seriously in this respect, he must remember that they can only bear a construction which is manifestly absurd, namely, that thirty years ago, we were taxed a million dollars more than we are at the present time, that is to say, five million dollars, while our present revenue was four million dollars. An adjustment of the tariff

has taken place and if the tariff nowadays is less in respect to some articles we are paying more duty on other articles and on increases in prices. All our revenue is raised through the Custom House and most of it upon the ad valorem principle, with the unfortunate consequence that as the cost of the imported article increases we are obliged to pay more taxes. For instance when textiles and other articles go up in price we pay more to the Custom House on the increased cost. It is absurd for the Prime Minister to state that the people pay one million dollars less in taxation than they did thirty years ago. The people are now paying twice as much in the way of taxes as they were at that time.

It is curious to see in the Speech from the Throne a paragraph commenting on the fact that the general election was marked by a continuation of good order and peaceful discussion. There is nothing remarkable about this statement and it seems to be inserted simply for the purpose of padding out the Speech. The balance of the Speech is made up of information about negotiations going on between British capitalists and the Government. For instance, there is the proposed construction of a railway from Green Bay to the Bay of Islands and a car ferry service across the Straits. Why is there nothing laid before the House in this connection beyond the information that negotiations were going on? Is not this scheme simply another form of the Fog Free Zone which was considered to be a joke some five years ago. Partisans of the present Government held it up to ridicule. Now we find the scheme revived by the Premier, but it is not revived under the old name. But we are told nothing in this connection beyond the fact that negotiations are going on for the establishment of a car-ferry service for a railway between Green Bay and Bay of Islands. At the time the Fog Free Zone contract was before this House some years ago it was supported by the Premier who used as one of his arguments that its operation would mean the marketing of over one hundred thousand quintals of fresh fish in the neighbouring countries, with the result that the prices in our foreign markets for dry fish would be kept up. We now notice that the main difference between the old Fog Free Zone contract and this one is that the present one is the substitution of a fresh fish fish service for a mail service. I remember some two or three years ago there were negotiations much on the same lines going on between the Government and the Booth Fisheries Co. of America who were going to take all our fish in a fresh state. The American press stated that company had acquired amongst other privileges the exclusive possession of the bait fishes of the country for 15 years. The Newfoundland Government denied the granting of any such concession. For some cause these negotiations fell through and one does not require to be a prophet to see that this present scheme will not come to anything in our day for it is well known that codfish does not retain its finest qualities when kept in cold storage. It is an article that easily deteriorates and varies very much in connection with the prices obtained. I have here a Review of the Commercial Fisheries for 1913, published in the New York Fishing Gazette. I just wish to draw attention to one feature of that, wherein it is stated that at certain periods last year fresh cod—not frozen cod, but the superior article—was sold in New York at one and a quarter cents a pound. Now with the market falling to one and a quarter cents for the

finest fresh cod, what are the commercial possibilities in relation to fresh fish in connection with cold storage? None so far as cod is concerned, and it seems an absurd proposition to talk about a line of Atlantic steamers and ferry boats across the Gulf linked up by a railway of cold storage cars in connection with a proposition that is not commercially feasible. As I have already said this is one of the paragraphs with which the Speech has been padded and it will be interesting to wait and see if anything comes of this scheme and if it is ever brought in here in the form of a contract, whether the anticipations put forward by the promoters will be realized. What is being placed before us would suggest that we are going to have something for nothing. Now commercial corporations are not in the habit of giving something for nothing. We are told that there is no demand for $70,000 a year for subsidies, but we shall find out if these negotiations are brought to fruition, whether we are getting something for nothing, because so far as I can understand there is something very substantial being asked from the Government that will put a very different complexion on the scheme from that put forward by the Government press and members on the other side of the House.

Then there is a paragraph with reference to Labrador. The past few years, sir, the policy of the Bond Administration has been reversed in connection with grants of land on Labrador, and I think if anybody is sorry to-day for the reversal of that policy the Leader of the Government is sorry, because much of the trouble he has gone through the past few years has been in connection with grants of timber land on Labrador. What I want to draw attention to is this: the policy adopted, so far as I understand, by the previous administration was that there should be no grants of land on disputed territory. Here I speak subject to correction, because the whole matter is in indefinite form—it appears as if negotiations were going on in connection with the establishment of industries on Labrador, and also in connection with the water powers there. So far as I can see, and it is a fair suggestion to put to the other side whether or not these industries are also to be on territories in dispute between Newfoundland and Quebec, and if so whether there are any possibilities connected with it. Is it reasonable to suppose that any body of substantial capitalists are going to invest in a law suit, because that is what it is, as the Government cannot give a clear title. The title is in dispute between Newfoundland and Quebec, and it is absolutely certain that if these concessions are on debatable territory then nothing is going to come of these negotiations until the question is settled, because men are not going to put their money into a lawsuit. It is all very well, maybe, for a few men to go into a speculation, as they have been doing in connection with Crown Grants on Labrador, putting in a little money into a speculating company in order to induce somebody to take it up. We know that nothing has come of these schemes so far, and it is impossible to expect anything to come of them until Newfoundland is in a position to give good titles.

I need not speak on the question of inquiring into the Whale Fishery, because that has already been treated of sufficiently. It is only a matter of filling up, as everybody knows that if the whaling industry has done harm in the past it has done harm to the full extent it can, because the industry is practically over and no harm is

likely to be done in the immediate future.

As I have pointed out, sir, this Speech indicates that the Government have no measures to lay before this House, and I will now come back to the crux of the Speech.

I have already pointed out that we have not before us the amount of shortage in revenue during the past six months, but we know there was a shortage because we are told in the Speech that means will have to be taken to cover it. But, sir, there is another feature in this connection,and that is in regard to Railway Loans. Last year was election year, and railway work went on to an extraordinary extent—to such a degree that every remaining cent of the loans was spent. The other day Mr. Kent asked a question in reference to Loans, and the Minister of Finance, Mr. Cashin, furnished the information. That information showed the amount spent on construction, and paid to the contractor for construction and for extras. It showed that $5,000,000.00 had been paid to the Contractor. Now the two loans amounted to something over $5,432,000.00, leaving a balance of $432,000.00. A perusal of this statement shows that in addition to the $5,000,000.00 paid to the Contractor the awards have had to be paid. The Minister of Finance has very candidly stated that there is nothing left, because in answering the question of what balance of the two loans there was and where it was he states that both loans have been expended for railway construction on the certificate of the Government Engineer and for Railway Arbitration Awards authorized under the Railway Acts.

Now, Sir, what does this mean? A great part of the Contract is unfulfilled. The Bonne Bay line has not been touched, the Fortune Bay Branch has just been started; much work remains to be done on Bay de Verde Branch, and as Mr. Kent has pointed out not one final certificate has been given in connection with any of the Branches. Not one Branch has been finished so far, and there is not a cent to go on with. That is not all, sir. Under the Agreement with the Railway Contractor the Government is put in an unpleasant position, because under that Contract both the Government and the Railway Contractor agree that fifty miles of railway shall be built each year during the term of the Contract. The Contractor is obliged to build and the Government to pay for this year fifty miles of railway. Now fifty miles of railway, even to construct, means three-quarters of a million dollars, and the extras will amount to at least a quarter of a million dollars, and if some of these Branches not opened are to be opened then it means that the Contractor will have to put rolling stock on the branches to be opened and the Government will have to pay for all this, and they have not got a red cent left. I say, sir, it is not an enviable position which was set forth by the Minister of Finance, who has been most explicit in his statement, as he has most candidly set forth the position when asked to do so. He made it quite clear that he and his colleagues have spent every red cent and they have to spend a million dollars this year or break their Contract. The Government is in the position that it must get money, it must borrow it somewhere, and the awkwardness of the position is that we will have to pay through the nose for it, and pay through the nose for bad blunders.

The other day the Leader of the Government waxed eloquent, and I was going to say virtuously eloquent, at a remark made by a member from

this side of the House. The member on this side stated that he had been sent here by his constituents to criticize, and he intended to speak and oppose the Government and criticise it. Now, sir, I would like to ask whether the Government feel that they are in such a position that they can do without criticism. The Leader of the Government exclaimed: "Sent here to criticise the Government! You are sent here to represent your constituents, and your duty is to represent them and do the best you can for them." Is not criticising the Government the best the member for Fogo can do. Why is this side of the House spoken of as His Majesty's Opposition. Is it not a fact that under the party system of Government there is always an opposition, and members on this side of the House are expected to criticize, because members of the other side will not; and if there is to be criticism at all it has to come from this side of the House, because we know that members on the other side of the House will offer no criticism, or if they do so it will be in the secrecy of the Party Caucus I have had some little experience of it sir, and can speak with some knowledge. My contention, sir, is that Mr. Halfyard, the member for Fogo, was correct; and was expressing a much higher ideal than that expressed by the Leader of the Government. Why, sir, we are a copy of the House of Commons, and the House of Commons from the very start has been a criticising body, even before party Government was introduced into the House it was one of its most ancient privileges to make criticisms, present grievances and ask for redress. The other side of the House abandoned that, and this most ancient function of parliament was left to this side of the House, and the honourable member was properly upholding it when he stated what he intended to do. And more than that, why should the present Government be exempted from criticism? Why, if any Administration that ever existed in the history of this country ever deserved criticism surely it is the Administration on the other side of the House, and the trouble is that in the past it has paid no heed to criticism. If they had listened in the past to the criticism of members on this side of the House they would not be in the hole they are in to-day. Did not the Leader of the Government come in here in 1910 and tell this House and the country that he was going to complete the five Branch Railways for $4,000,000 and was not criticism directed from this side of the House to the effect that he was not going to do it, that it was going to cost $7,000,000? Is it not a fact that criticism was directed from this side of the House against the policy instituted by the Government of paying in gold instead of in bonds, and have not subsequent events shown that these criticisms were justified. Was not criticism directed from this side of the House against taking the risks of the market; but the Leader of the Government took these risks and put himself in the hole that he is in to day? Did not the Leader of the House come in here two years later and state that they could not finish the work for $4,000,000.00; but that he was going to raise another $2,000,000.00 and that would pay for all. Yet he announced the other day that he was forced to seek another million and a half, and that he was going this time to complete the work. Well, I wonder if he will.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I never said anything of the kind,—that we could finish the Branches for $4,000,000.

DR. LLOYD—I am open to challenge the Leader on that point; and show that not only did he take that position but he elaborated on it and showed how much interest the country would have to pay in 1911, how much in 1912, how much in 1913, and how much in 1915, and in that year $140,000.00 would be the total annual burden for the completion of the railways. But that $140,000.00 was only the interest on the $4,000,000.00 Loan; $70,000.00 has been added since showing that the hon. member was very much out in his calculations and he was still more than that out in his calculations, because he has not yet finished one railway and he has spent every cent he borrowed. The awkward position that my Rt. Hon. friend and his colleagues are in is this, that they are going to have great difficulty in getting out of this financial bog, and indeed it is a question if he will get out of it at all. If we could get right down into the mind of the hon. Leader of the Government I think we would find that he would be much happier on this side of the House than where he is to-day, and he would have been much more gratified had he lost the election in order to escape from the trouble he has got himself into. But now, sir, he is in the unenviable position that he has to raise a loan, and under what circumstances? He must raise this Loan after the statement has been made in this House that we are short in our revenue, and that a blunder was made last year in connection with the financial calculations. How grave that blunder was we do not know because the Government have kept it to themselves. We know there is a serious shortage, but what it is they are keeping to themselves. We know we will have to face another loan. Now what are the conditions? It is a matter of common knowledge that conditions for Colonial Government loans have been adverse the past twelve months. Let me give you one illustration. The Rt. Hon. gentleman raised a loan in 1910 under very favourable conditions, and I think he deserved congratulations. But where is the Stock to-day of the loan he raised then? The issue was put on the market at 97½ if I remember rightly. Where was that Stock last month? A statement in the Empire Magazine sums up the position last month and the Debentures he raised are quoted here at 88—a drop of 9½. What is the position further? That was a 3½% Loan. The position to-day is that nc Colonial Government, no matter how strong, are able to go to the market and float stock at 3½%; but my friend took the risks of the market; and sir it was a profitable undertaking for the railway Contractor but not profitable for this country. No Colonial government to-day can float a loan at 3½ per cent. It is only a few days ago that it was recorded in the public press that the new loan sought by New South Wales was by no means successful. That was a four per cent loan but the public took only ten per cent. of it and ninety per cent. was left on the hands of the underwriters. Again, let us take the case of the great Dominion to the west of us with all its resources and strength. The Dominion floated a four per cent. loan at 97 and the public took 17 per cent. only while 83 per cent. was left with the underwriters. That is the history of every colonial loan during the past twelve months. So much so that not long ago the underwriters protested against further loans until the loans on their hands were put out and the tension relieved. The position, therefore, that the Rt. Hon. gentleman is in is that the market is adverse not against Newfoundland loans in particular but

against every colonial loan no matter how large or small the colony may be; that he must raise money to be able to go on with the contract with the Reid Newfoundland Company or else break it and to add to his difficulties, he has to go to the folks from whom he wishes to borrow and tell them that he has blundered badly with the finances of the Colony and that consequently he has to increase taxation.

Is it to be expected then that the Opposition will cease to criticize this condition of affars? It is our duty to criticize and it is the duty of the Government to listen to our criticism. During the past four years they took no notice of the criticisms of the Opposition, particularly concerning financial matters but went ahead recklessly, carelessly and indifferent as to the future. There could be only one end to this and that was a deficit in the revenue. This has come about but it would not have happened if the Rt. Hon. gentleman had heeded the criticisms of the Opposition twelve months ago. The present position demands plain talking and hon. members opposite must expect plain talking from this side of the House, for it will certainly be given. Let them disregard it at their peril. They have disregarded it in the past and we see the position they are in to-day. The Government will not get any criticism from their followers but from this side of the House they have received it and will continue to receive it.

Before I sit down I should like to say a few words in support of the amendment before the House. I criticized and condoled with the Government on the failure of their financial programme but the matter referred to in the amendment is one for which there can be no possible excuse. As long ago as November 3rd of last year the Government knew that two ministers of the Crown had been defeated and up to the present time they have not taken a single step to have the ministers replaced in this House or in the Legislative Council. It is a blunder that they have made with their eyes open and no possible excuse can be advanced to palliate the Government's conduct. The only case I have come across that bears the slightest resemblance to the present position is one that occurred seventy years ago in the House of Commons. On that occasion a defeated minister retained his office although he was out of the House of Commons for six months, but so strong was the criticism at that time that it has not been repeated since. What possible excuse the present Government can have for doing nothing in the matter I am at a loss to know. There can be no excuse except that of party expediency and surely this House is not to be bound by the domestic concerns of the party opposite. Surely if this House is to have an ideal it is to have its privileges secured from party politics. As it was pointed out the other day, we have seen instances of the disadvantages to members through not having a Minister of Agriculture at his desk in this House. We have the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister taking upon his broad but already over-taxed shoulders the management of these two departments. He has become the regular Pooh Bah of the Government owing to his conduct in this matter.

It has been remarked that it comes with ill grace from any member on this side of the House to support the amendment proposed by my hon. friend, Mr. Kent, because in 1909 Mr. Kent was himself in a smilar position. Mr. Kent was not in a similar position. The circumstances at that time were entirely different. The present administration is hot from the elections, when bye-elctions are expect-

ed; the other administration was in its last year. Furthermore, the hon. gentleman was not out of the House during the whole of a session but was here nearly all the time, being absent a few days only. In the present case with full notice, in a new session, with an utter disregard for the course that should be adopted, the Government takes upon itself to outrage this House by keeping the heads of these departments out of it. Yet no excuse has been offered and no explanation given. It has been done with an utter disregard for the usual course of Parliament and a disregard to the fact that those offices should be represented in this House by members who can answer for the two Departments and who are responsible to this House. We have now two departments without a head and we have this House left without control over the departments. No precedent can be found for such a course. If there is a precedent I should like to know what it is and have an opportunity of examining it. If there is a precedent the circumstances must have been extraordinary. I am sure, however, that no precedent can be found that will justify the Government in following the course which they are now following. I should like to change the tone of the amendment and make it a vote of censure on the Government.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the House long for I rise merely to answer one or two points made by the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker and the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, concerning the finances of the Colony.

Before going into an explanation this afternoon, I would like to say, especially for the information of outsiders who are not very familiar with the proceedings in this House and who may be here this afternoon for the first time, that they are not to go away from the House with the impression that hon. gentlemen opposite are thoroughly in earnest and believe al. they say when they make statements here. The members of this House and particularly the members of the Opposition are very much like a theatrical troupe, for they come here with their programme prepared as to what they will citicize but before coming here they discuss the matter in every detail. They come here and play their parts, some playing badly while some play well. I must congratulate the learned member for Trinity for so well has he played his part that he appears to be the leading man of the troupe opposite. He has painted a picture of blue ruin and I could not help thinking while he played his part if he was the Joseph sent to save his country. (But I forgot; it is not his country.) If the Doctor had not come here, what a bad hole the Colony would be in! I make these statements because the outside man who listens to the debates may go away with a false impression of the members of the Government and the Opposition. I want them to go away from the House convinced that the learned Doctor, as leading man of the Opposition, has made the splendid speech to which we have listened during the past two days, not in earnest but to endeavour to give the people a false impression of the position of the Government.

Certainly the hon. gentleman is too intelligent to be in earnest in what he says as to the hole the Government is in because of the reduction of taxation a year ago. If he is sincere in his argument that the Government did wrong in taking $400,000.00 off the taxes on the people, if it was a mistake to have done this, surely the benefit of it went to the people of the Colony.

However, my chief reason for addressing the House at this juncture was to place before the members a statement showing the export of dry and pickled codfish to the United States during the past four years, for this matter was discussed by my hon. friends, Mr. Coaker and Dr. Lloyd and the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister. My hon. friend, Mr. Coaker, stated to this House on Monday last that the export of dry fish to the United States within the past year was less than it was in the previous year. This statement is not of much importance but I wish to have it put right. It was made by him on Monday and by Dr. Lloyd on Tuesday for a purpose, namely, to show the country that something else was responsible for the increase in the price of fish. Some claim that it was my hon. friend, Mr. Coaker, who raised the price of fish and my hon. friend, Dr. Lloyd, on Tuesday, went so far as to say that Mr. Coaker did so. As a matter of fact Mr. Coaker had no more to do with the raising of the price of fish than he had with the rising and setting of the sun. The price of fish is governed like the price of everything else by the law of supply and demand. Where do we find ourselves to-day compared with our position of thirty years ago? Go down the history of that thirty years and consider what the legislature was trying to do for the fishermen. How many times did Sir Robert Bond go abroad looking for new markets for our fish? Who does not remember the Bond-Blaine treaty and other treaties that were made by him? When that treaty was being discussed we were told that if the American market was left open to us it would be of the greatest benefit to Newfoundland but it was thought by wise acres that it would never be accomplished. What has happened? When the matter was given up by Sir Robert Bond and others as hopeless, what happened during the past two years? Why, the position of affairs in the United States changed completely and they have opened their markets to our fish. The opening of the American markets was one of the platforms of Sir Robert Bond's policy and there was much disappointment when the treaty could not be brought about but now we have the open markets without asking for it and that alone is one of the principal factors in increasing the price of our fish. Of course there were other factors and that the opening of the American markets alone raised the price of fish I have no desire to attempt to show.

With your permission, sir, I shall read the table, to which I have referred, and I hope it will be of interest to members on both sides of the House:

Export of Dry Codfish to United States for following Fiscal Years:—

1909-10—8,865 qtls., Value $40,741.
1910-11—16,234 qtls., Value $84,574.
1911-12—34,425 qtls., Value $205,400.
1912-13—29,315 qtls., Value $162,235.

Export of Dry Codfish to United States for following Calendar Years:

1910—14,978 qtls., Value $74,200.
1911—21,944 qtls. Value $134,398.
1912—35,256 qtls., Value $210,634.
1913—18,108 qtls., Value $123,592.

Export of Pickled Codfish to United States for following Fiscal Year:

1909-10—3,278 qtls., Value $6,437.
1910-11—30,325 qtls., Value $109,958.
1911-12—97,805 qtls., Value $303,076.
1912-13—49,556 qtls., Value $157,394.

Export of Pickled Codfish to United States for following Calendar Years:

1910—443 qtls., Value $1,310.
1911—69,841 qtls., Value $214,368.
1912—51,788 qtls., Value $164,888.
1913—104,197 qtls., Value $368,935.

The fiscal year and the calendar year are two different things alto-

gether, especially in regard to the trade of this Colony. The fiscal year is merely created by the Government but all business men carry on their business by the calendar year.

The fiscal year is called so only by the Government. All business is done in Newfoundland from the 1st of January to the end of December. This statement shows the increase from 1910 in the amount of pickled fish sent from this Island into the United States—an increase from 443 quintals in 1910 to 104,197 quintals in 1913. I think that the increased demand for fish and the increased amount sent out of the country are reasons why the price of fish has increased in Newfoundland. As to the number of quintals shipped to Canada, during the first two years from 4,000 to 5,000 quintals were shipped to Halifax and last year over 8,000 quintals. There are other reasons why the price has been kept up. Look at the number of fishermen who were catching fish 30 years ago and compare that number with the number of fishermen to-day. Take the number of fishermen from France and the number of ships at St. Pierre thirty years ago and compare those numbers with to-day's. Then look at the Gloucester fleet of twenty years ago. Where are they to-day? Where are the hundred and odd vessels that were between Placentia and Catalina? They are out of existence to-day. Where, I ask, are the men that manned these vessels? Some are gone to the States and others are making money in other walks of life, because industries have been opened up and railways built around the Island. Why compare at all, sir, the conditions of 30 years ago with those of to-day? Why that dark picture this evening? Dr. Lloyd tells me that thirty years ago we were a happy people in Newfoundland; but I ask the Doctor to turn up the list of imports into Newfoundland thirty years ago. The principal item, Mr. Speaker, was Indian meal. It is not in existence to-day. I asked myself when the Doctor was on his feet this evening whether he was not one of these men called hypocrites, because no man of any intelligence, no man in Newfoundland of any intelligence can swallow that argument put forth by that gentleman to-day. Where is the man to-day receiving pauper relief in Newfoundland? Was it not a fact, sir, thirty years ago that the principal men in this Legislature were the merchants of Water Street? And the principal reason of this import was to provide supplies for the fisherman in the fall of the year, for, if he did not hand over a sufficient quantity of fish, he was doled out Indian Meal and Molasses. Compare that thirty years ago with the position in which we are to-day. I am not oppressed in any way in my position, nor am I in any hole in the position which I hold to-day. When I explain my financial statement in this House, I am prepared to hold up my head, as well as any have done so in the past. Who increased the price of fish? The demand that exists has increased the price of fish. The number of men who have left the fishery, even the men who are in it have helped to increase its price. Mr. Coaker may be a good man; but, when I am told that he is the sole man who increased the price of fish, it is ridiculous. Every man has done a little and you are not worthy of the name of man, if you do not do the same. No man, however, has done it all. But, sir, let me get back to this fish question again. Dr. Lloyd told us that he did not know anything about fish; but you were told by a merchant on the other side of the House that a great deal of this pickled fish went to the Oporto market. Well, it was the first time that

I heard that green fish was sent to the Oporto market. But, sir, that is another reason why fish has increased in price,—the shortage in the Oporto market and in the other markets abroad. Compare the trade during 1904. You would find stored in this city in 1904 nearly 300,000 quintals of fish. What will you find in Water Street stores to-day? Very little is held in stock to-day. I hope to see in Newfoundland empty stores and I hope that there will always be a market to eat up the fish. Not till then will you obtain good prices. The principal fishing port in the United States is Gloucester. One would imagine that one was entering a forest, so numerous were the masts of fishing vessels in Gloucester 15 years ago. But you might go around to the fish stores in Gloucester and you will not find 5,000 quintals. As soon as the fish was landed it was rushed inland and sold outright to the consumer.

We are going to have some drawbacks. We cannot come down here with statements to please everybody. The codfishery is not the only fishery, for there are other fisheries in Newfoundland. What is the herring fishery to-day? What did the past Government do for this fishery? My answer is that they did nothing. The herring fishery of Newfoundland will be one of its best assets in the near future. Is not the herring fishery a great asset to Scotland? The Americans are coming here and taking our herring to the United States. In many cases within the last two years, they have been putting up these fish as Scotch cured in all sorts of attractive parcels. In the near future, this fishery will be one of Newfoundland's principal assets. It amounts today to more than I thought it did. I was surprised to learn that a merchant in this city has invested a capital of $40,000 in herring this year. That did not happen within the past 20 years in Newfoundland. The herring that are going out of Newfoundland are going to the New York market as Scotch herring. They are taking the place of Scotch herring and $9 a barrel is being paid for them. The price of fish, I hope, will remain as it is. The causes of that price are the natural causes of demand and supply. No one man has control over the price of fish. Some people think that Mr. Coaker has raised the price of fish; but such a belief is absolutely ridiculous. I am here this evening to prove, beyond all contradiction, that no man has increased the price of fish or has helped to do it. The whole thing is done by demand and supply. If Mr. Coaker could raise the price of fish, why does he not reduce the price of other articles? Why does he not reduce the price of flour? He has done nothing for the fishermen of Newfoundland to-day. The Government has done everything possible. The fishermen have got everything free. They have their provisions such as salt, pork, beef and molasses, etc., free. The only thing that is not free is their clothes. It is not possible for this Government or for any other Government to increase the price of fish in Newfoundland, you will not get credit for it. Is there a man who can convince this House and this country that there was anything that could be done within the past 4 years which Sir Edward had not done? Now, I hope that I have convinced this House that the price of fish has increased on the natural lines of supply and demand. If one man could increase the price of fish, then that man ought to be able to get up and tell us how he did it. If he can increase the price of an article, then he should be in a position to increase the price of another article. Our predecessors, in speaking of the

herring fishery, tried to do something, but accomplished nothing. Did they not bring out Scotch men and build an establishment in Green Bay? They were going to bring out Scotch steamers; but within three years they did nothing except build an establishment at Green Bay and another at the westward and purchase a vessel from Goodridge's on Water Street. They accomplished nothing; but spent thousands of dollars. We have heard a great deal this evening tabout the railroads in Newfoundland. The hon. member Doctor Lloyd told us that our railway policy was going to ruin us. He asked where we are now. The same old story that we would go into Confederation within 12 months was told 20 years ago. The railroad was built to Harbour Grace. What happened? Another railroad was built to Placentia and, when there was one built to Port aux Basques, that was the end so the Opposition said. These railroads were built because they would develop the country. Look at the Trepassey Branch. Before the railroad was little over half finished, 3,000 people have travelled in the month, from St. John's to Renews. Freight was brought in proportion. Why should we stop there? If the railroad is a benefit for Harbour Grace and for Placentia, why should we not extend these benefits all over the Island? It is a bold statement to say that a railroad to a place will be a failure, without giving a reason. I believe that the railroad to Trepassey will be a great benefit to the people of that district. Go back ten years and ask yourself what has happened since. How many of you, twenty-five years ago, knew of the Marconi system? Are there any? It was unknown. What do you know of what will happen in the next 10 or 15 years? By opening railroads, you will accomplish one of the best things that it is possible to do. What do you find in Canada? It was the same story when they started to build railways. Ruin was going to follow. Is it because we owe a few hundred thousand dollars that ruin will follow? I am trying to picture here to-night the improvements, the benefts that will accrue to your children from the building up of this country. What difference does this interest about which we hear so much, make to us? Can't we afford to pay a little more interest in exchange for the benefits of branch railways, so that our children's children will bless Sir Edward Morris as the one and only practical Premier that we ever had in this House. Take the record of his predecessor. While he sat on this side of the House did he build railways? No, sir, he never built one mile. He did nothing but collect the revenue and spend it and when he left office he left behind him about $300,000 worth of bills unpaid. But that amounted to very little. We raised a loan and paid them. Now we have to pay the interest while we are getting the benefits of the expenditure and when we pass out we will pass it on to our children to pay it.

We were told by Dr. Lloyd that our fish sold in New York for 1¼ cents a pound. If fish is sold at that price in New York then it is sold at a dead loss. In any case the point that we are interested in is the fact that it is bought by the Americans at Bay of Islands for 3¼ cents, and I would ask my friend Mr. Downey to verify that.

MR. DOWNEY—If my hon. friend would excuse my interruption I would say that sold in New York at 1¼ cents a pound means that it is fish with the head on it and with the entrails and sound bone in it. That would be equal to 7½ cents a pound of clean fish.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Exactly. If Dr. Lloyd had explained what he was talking about matters would be better. It is probable, however, that he did not know what he was talking about. The buyers are giving 3½ cents a pound for it on the West Coast with the head and entrails and that would probably cost them four cents at New York.

I must apologize, Mr. Speaker. I did not intend when I rose to use the time of the House to such an extent but the inducements were too great. My learned friend, Dr. Lloyd said that there were awards made that were unpaid and that the Government had no money to pay them. I know of no claims outstanding and if my hon. friend does know of any awards certified by the arbitrators that should be paid and he will let me know of them I will see that they are paid in the morning.

DR. LLOYD—How?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—By a cheque on the Bank of Montreal.

DR. LLOYD—Out of what fund?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Out of the railway loans.

DR. LLOYD.—You said just now that you had none left.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—No, I did not. I was making allowance for outstanding claims. That is the difference.

In regard to the statement made by the learned Leader of the Opposition concerning the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, it is apparent, sir, that when he spoke a few evenings ago he seemed very distressed over the fact that these ministers have not seats on the floor of the House. Yet, sir, he seemed to forget the fact that in 1906 he himself held the portfolio of Justice for nearly a year from January to November without a seat in this House. This is merely a case of history repeating itself.

In conclusion, I hope that when I bring down the financial statements and give the explanation that I shall then give with regard to the financial status of the country I will be able to show the people of Newfoundland that the gloomy picture painted by the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, is but a creation of his own imagination.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few remarks in connection with the Address in Reply, and in regard to a few statements made by the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs. In the first place I would like to follow in the footsteps of previous speakers and congratulate you on the position of trust which this House has imposed upon you, and I hope that you will carry out the functions of your high office with justice and impartiality and to the satisfaction of both parties in the House.

The Minister of Finance and Customs made reference to the price of fish and to what kept it up. If we take the remarks of the Premier we will find that he claims that the Government deserves a great deal of credit for having opened up new markets. When he spoke of Mr. Coaker he did not know what he was talking about. While we know that Mr. Coaker cannot control the foreign markets, we know that he was instrumental in getting an advance in the price for the fishermen, and we give him credit for that now, because we are in a position to prove our statements.

The Minister of Finance said that the members on this side of the House were something like a theatrical troupe. Well, Sir, we have not been here long enough yet to be up to all the points of parliamentary practice, but we hope to be able to do some-

thing before we have been sitting here eight years.

The Speech from the Throne refers to the Agricultural policy and says: "The Agricultural prospect viewed in the light of last season's operations, is most gratifying." I may say, Sir, that I do not think that the agricultural outlook is gratifying, and the present Government's policy is not to the general benefit of the country. While thousands of barrels of potatoes are being distributed, the country is getting very little benefit. And I will show you how. I have a case in point myself of something I saw. Last spring, but a very short distance from St. John's, there were a thousand barrels of potatoes which could have been bought for a very small figure. But they could not sell them. There was no market. And yet there are thousands of barrels imported every year and the people who try to raise them cannot get any sale. Why did not the Agricultural Society try to find a market to relieve the situation? This was only within a very short distance of St. John's, so that there must be hundreds of thousands of barrels of potatoes undisposed of, so that the work of the Agricultural Societies should be to get markets for this produce. It is true, Sir, that these Societies have distributed seeds. They were the very worst quality. I have seen them and I know. I do not think the Agricultural Society deserves any credit whatever. I think that there would be more prosperity if the agricultural societies got busy and established markets in St. John's, where the produce could be sent from the outports. That would be helping the people to get something for what they have to sell. I noticed that the hon. member for Placentia, Mr. Devereaux, stated that last year, owing to a shortage in the hay crop, tons of hay had to be imported. If that is so, then I think the agricultural policy is of no credit to the Government, because the Premier stated a few years ago that should he be returned to power, two blades of grass would grow where one grew then. Why do we have to import hay? The reason is this, that this two blades of grass business did not amount to much. We do not get much advantage from these Agricultural Societies, because those at the head of them are not experienced men and they do not understand their business, because it requires experts in that particular line to run such Societies.

I hope that the time has arrived when the Government will take an actual interest in the affairs of the people at large, and work for the benefit of all concerned. I do not intend to say any more, as this is my maiden speech. I trust, however, that the invitation extended to this side of the House to go over to the Government benches is not going to be accepted. We came out on an independent platform and decided to come here. The Government is surprised to find us here in such numbers. However, we are delighted to be here and delighted to be on this side, because we represent 4,000 more voters than the Government.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words upon the matters before the House. I would like, first, to congratulate you upon the high position in which you have been placed by this House. I think you will do your duty impartially by both sides.

I would like to refer briefly to what has been known as the Fog Free Zone Scheme. I was a member of this House when legislation in reference to the Fog Free Zone Scheme line was brought in for the first time, some five or six years ago. That Fog Free Zone Bill was introduced by Sir Robert

Bond, and I think that at that time the hon. members, Messrs. Lloyd, Clift, Kent, Clapp and Dwyer supported the project. In its then form I did not consider there was anything in it; in its present form it is better and more likely to be practicable.

A few words in reference to Agriculture would not be out of place. I admit that I do not know much about the subject of Agriculture itself, because I have always confined my energies to the fish business. I have never gone in for agriculture, but I think the present programme of the Government is the right and proper one. My reason for so thinking is that by this policy we are introducing into the country better breeds of cattle and better seeds. That is a great benefit, and if at any time we find that we have enough good stock in the country, we can stop the annual payment of $40,000, which is granted. We can always do that. We are not permanently bound to it. Not only can we stop it for one year, but we can stop it for five or six years, and when the breeds run out we can grant the amount again. Now, let us look at the other side of the question,—the Opposition policy of the Model Farm,—and see what that means. In the first place it would take so much to build and equip it. Then it would take a great deal to run it and to educate the people who came there. After you had educated them they would leave the country, because there are very few opportunities in this country for farming upon scientific lines on any large scale.

In regard to Branch Railways, I agree with previous speakers that twenty years ago the same predictions were made in regard to the ruinous cost, and these predictions were wrong as time has shown. How would you like to go back to the conditions of twenty years ago? I was always a supporter of railway building, and I am to-day. Look at the facts of the past ten years. I remember when it was said that if we built the railway to Hall's Bay we would be bankrupted. And I believe that ten years from to-day we will say that we could never have done without Branch Railways. I understand that upon the estimates of cost of building the annual cost will be about $240,000 a year. Now, that is not a very great sum in view of the additional earning power which these railways will give to the country. It has been said by members on the other side that these lines would not pay. While I wish to see them pay, it is after all no business of ours if they do or not. It will be the business of the Messrs. Reid to make them pay. It is their loss if they do not. That is how I look at the railway building under the present contract.

Now, regarding bait freezers, hon. members on the other side were talking about shortage in bait and the building of freezers. In Sir Robert Bond's time there was introduced into this House a Bill offering a bonus for this work. Any man who built a freezer was to get 30 per cent. of the cost of building, and 20 per cent. of the cost of running it. I have had some experience of bait freezers. At one time I had charge of a bait freezer in the United States, in Boston in fact. But when I returned to Newfoundland I did not enter the business. I knew too much about it. I never attempted to get that bonus for building. I knew better. A few people on the West Coast thought they could do it. They tried it and it did not pay. They could not sell the bait. When I was in Nova Scotia I heard the Canadian Government was spending large sums of money on bait freezers. I was talking to a manager of one of those freezers, and he told me that it did not pay.

They sank money every summer. I have no objection to freezers if the Government can build them, but they had better experiment first and see if they pay before launching into expenditure of large sums of money. That is my experience with regard to bait freezers.

I understand that enquiry is to be made into the whale fishery. That is righting itself. The various factories are gradually dying out. For the past seven or eight years there have been no caplin, while last year there was an abundance of them, although whales were as scarce as ever, and I do not think the Government need trouble itself in making any enquiry into the matter.

With regard to the price of fish the hon. member for Trinity took up considerable time on Tuesday talking about this subject, and we all expected that he would tell us the person who raised the price of fish, but he beat the bush without in the end improving our knowledge on that matter. He knew better than to say that any one man raised the price of fish. To-day the foreign market is the place where the price of fish is controlled. When we are giving $6 and $6.50 for fish in this country it will cost another $3.50 to ship a quintal of fish into the foreign market. After giving $6.50 here add $3.50 for cost for putting it into the hands of the consignee and you have the price in the foreign market. I do not mean to say that this is the exact price in every country, but that is the average cost to-day for freight and insurance charges. The shippers will tell you that that is about correct. And that will give you some idea of what the fish cost is to the ultimate consumer to-day. I say that no one man in this country can raise the price of fish. He may sometimes get 5 or 10 cents more per quintal than is being ordinarily given when large quantities are being bought, because very often merchants cannot afford to keep fish on their hands, but it is absurd to expect us to believe that he can raise the price of fish in the foreign market. It is competition that rules prices of fish in the same way that it rules prices of other provisions. I do not mean to delay the House any longer, but before sitting down I would like to say a few words about coal. We all have heard a lot about coal, and I for one would be glad to find that we had a lot of coal in this country, but there is one thing we should remember, and that is that when we do get coal in quantity we are up against a costly proposition. We have to pay to take the coals off the grounds down to the seaboard, and then we have to pay to bring it to St. John's or wherever it goes. Now, from Sydney there is only one freight straight to its destination. In the case of our coal we shall have two freights—one to the sea coast and one to the different points round our coast. I do not wish to dampen the spirits of those seeking coal, but I say that with these freights it is a question which should be considered, whether we can get it cheaper from our own mines than from Sydney. To load it on board vessels and take it all around the country would cost as much as bringing it from Sydney. In Sydney they are in this position, that they have the coal on the seaboard. A vessel can go in and take it almost right from the mouth of the pit, and in that way the cost is small. I do not want to say anything to discourage the search for coal, but I think it is only right that the diffculties which we will have to face in the event of coal being found in workable quantities, should be pointed out.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I wish first to congratulate you upon your election to the office which you are

now filling, and I feel sure that you will maintain the high traditions of your predecessors in this House. I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a few words in reply to the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs in relation to the fisheries. I note that in the Speech from the Throne, delivered by His Excellency the Governor, very little is said about our fisheries, which are the chief industry of our country. I understood a few days ago that the Prime Minister had taken upon himself and his party the credit of the opening of the American market to the free entry of Newfoundland fish, and, through that, of raising the price of fish. Now, I want to disabuse the minds of any friends who might have been listening to the hon. Minister upon that point. The opening up of the American markets up to the present has had, in my opinion, no effect whatever upon the price of Newfoundland codfish. And the Prime Minister of this country has no more right to take upon himself the credit of the opening of the American markets than has the Prime Minister of Canada, and I have never yet heard that Premier Borden has made any such claim. Canadian fish goes into the United States on the same terms as Newfoundland fish, and to neither Government belongs the credit of having accomplished this. No more credit is due to the Prime Minister of this country in connection with this matter than to the President of the Republic of China. The opening of the United States market is due to the recent change of Government in the United States from Republican to Democratic and the consequent change of tariff with a view to the cheapening of the means of living to the masses of the United States.

The Minister of Finance quoted us figures from the export of dry fish and the export of salt bulk during a period of four years. He has given us the export of fish during the fiscal year and during the calendar year. Why the export for the calendar year should have been given I cannot understand, unless it is because the fish export during the last calendar year is larger than that of any other calendar year, and that his object is to make people believe that that is the cause of the high price of fish at the present time.

HON. MIN. FINANCE.—I explained the difference between the fiscal year and the calendar year. Business men do business in the calendar, between the 1st January and the 31st December.

MR. HICKMAN.—What I wanted to point out was this, that in the year 1911-12 there was more green fish or salt cured exported to the United States than during the year 1912-13, or than there will be during the year 1913-14—almost fifty per cent. more—and at that time there was a duty on fish going into the United States. When we speak of 50,000 quintals of salt bulk fish going into the United States it must be understood that that would only represent about 25,000 quintals of dry fish, because one quintal of dry fish is equivalent to about two quintals of salt bulk fish. Therefore, when you speak of fifty or eighty thousand quintals of fish being exported to the United States in a year, that only means twenty-five thousand quintals of dry fish taken from our catch of 1,400,000 qtls., and that is neither here nor there. The reason why the figures are large for the calendar year of 1913 is this: The most of our fish that goes to the United States in salt bulk is caught in the month of October by banking schooners from Burin, Grand Bank, Fortune, Belleoram, St. Jacques and all along that coast. These schooners have been fishing all summer, but during

the early part of the season they do not sell any fish; they bring it home and dry it and pay 30c. a quintal to have it made, and export it to the European markets; but in the fall of the year, up in October, the season is too far advanced to dry fish for the European markets, and they are very glad to sell it to the Americans who come down here to buy it. The exports of salt cured fish are consequently greater from October to December than at any other part of the year, and that is the reason why the figures look larger for the calendar year; but you will find at the end of the fiscal year—June, 1914—that very little will have been added to the quantity exported during the past six months; the only quantity that will be added is what is caught during the winter fishery on the West Coast. Supposing that fish was not sold green or in salt bulk and exported to the United States, what effect would it have on the markets? None whatever. That fish would be kept all winter partially dried, or in the salt bulk, dried next spring and shipped to the Oporto markets, the only market it is fitted for, not being suitable for Italy or Brazil. It would have no effect whatever on the markets at the present time. The cause of the advance in the price of fish is due to the supply and demand. Any person who knew fishery conditions around the coast of our country during the past season knew that our fishery was short. The Shore fishery was short; there was nothing got worth while after the trap fishery was over; and the Labrador fishery was short; and that being so, the price in the foreign markets had to go up; and go up it did; and I believe it will continue to remain up because there is no stock of fish, or at least very little, in the country just now.

In reference to our salt fish which is being exported from the West Coast. In 1911-12, when the largest export was made, I made it my business to follow the fish and see how it was marketed. I saw it discharged in Gloucester, and saw it go into the manufactories there, and I have it from the lips of one of those interested in one of the largest concerns at that place that not one-third of the fish bought in this country in the year 1911-12 was fitted for the market for which it was bought. The fish was not properly salted and had turned red under the bone, and therefore it had to be re-dried in Gloucester and shipped to the market of Porto Rico, which in the end cut into us, because that fish had free entry into Porto Rico, while at that time we were subject to duty. Therefore, they crowded the market, and we were shut out. Now, there is no reason in the world why our salt bulk fish should be shipped to the United States as it is at the present time. The Americans come down here and buy fish. In addition to the price which they pay our people for the fish, they pay a commission to the man who buys it of 10 or 20c. a qtl., then they pay 50c. a qtl. freight, marine insurance, and other expenses amounting in all to perhaps $1.00 a quintal. Now, there is no reason why that should not go into the pockets of our own people by having the fish put up in this country the same as it is put up in Gloucester in tins and packages. If the Government wishes to do something for which it would really deserve credit, let it induce the United States Government to take duty off fish put up in these packages, and then it would be put up down here without any encouragement from the Government. If you travel through Massachussetts or Gloucester by rail, you will see fish advertisements all along the line of route, advertising our fish put up in various forms by companies and people who make big money out of it.

My hon. friend, Mr. Cashin, also referred to conditions existing in Newfoundland twenty years ago, and compared them with present conditions. He compared the price of fisu at that time with the price now given. One of the principal reasons why fish has advanced in value is because at that time all our fish went out in bulk and in drums to the Brazils, while at the present time we have a steamship service and we can have fish transhipped to any part of the world and sold to customers anywhere. I don't believe that fish will ever be as low again as it has been, because new markets are opening up all the time—people who never took Newfoundland fish before are enquiring for it this year.

Now, in connection with agriculture, I do not know very much about agriculture, but during the course of my campaign in the district of Bay de Verde last year, I was very much interested in the Partridge berry, better known in the United States as the Fox berry. That is the part of the country where most of these berries come from. As far as I can understand the output of these berries has decreased. Their value has gone up from $4 a barrel to as much as $7.50 and $8 a barrel this year right here in St. John's. I regret that this industry has been neglected, and I think the matter should be taken up by the Department of Agriculture and Mines —and I am sorry that that Department is not represented on the floors of the House this afternoon. I contend that there are enough Partridge berries in the district of Bay de Verde to maintain all the people in the district. Some years ago, around Cape Cod, there was growing a cran-berry, since known as the Cape Cod Cranberry. These were growing wild upon the barrens, trod upon, and neglected, nobody giving them a thought. The Government took the matter up and got expert knowledge in connection with the matter and showed the people what their possibilities were, with the result that from a small product of 20,000 barrels, worth about $100,000, there were produced last year several million dollars worth. There is a college to-day in Massachusetts called the Cranberry College, where the cultivation of this berry is taught. I just mention this matter. It appears to be very insignificant and is not regarded seriously by the people of this country, but it has a future.

I understood from the Prime Minister a few days ago that the Government intended to obtain some knowledge from Norway in connection with bait fishes, and that some person was to be sent there to look into the matter. I don't know if I understand correctly, but that is my reading of the statement. Now, there was a man in the employ of the Government named Simonsen, who I regret to hear has resigned his position. I followed up that man's work as far as I could and know what I am talking about, and I believe that no more practical man than he was could be found for this work. I understood from the Minister of Finance and and Customs a few days ago that he was getting a salary of $66.00 a month. Now, we had in that man a practical man, a sea captain, a fisherman, and a man that spoke English well. That man could go anywhere in connection with this work. He went into our manufactories and taught them how to improve our codliver oil. He was sent, I understand, on a visit to Trtnity Bay with the object of looking into the matter of mussel bait, which is the chief bait used by the fishermen of Norway. He found a mussel there similar to that used in Norway, but in small quantities. He went from there to Connaigre Bay, Fortune Bay, and found on the one side of the Bay which he visteid the

right mussel in large beds. He estimated that one bed contained sufficient mussels to be worth $3,000 in Norway. He made no further exploration, but was told that on the other side of the Bay these mussels were in abundance. He showed the people how to make little dredges and take mussels off the bottom, put them in sacks, and utilize them. Nothing was done in the matter, so far as I can learn. If I remember rightly, an article appeared from him in the Hr. Grace Standard about two years ago in which he outlined the way to cure squid for bait purposes—not the way we cure them here. He told the reason why the squid soured and how to cure it. I never heard of that report being published or given out to the fishermen. Now, Sir, I think that this man was as good a man as could be had, and the Government should have used its very best endeavours to hold on to him. If you get a man out from Norway it will cost you ten times the amount that you were paying that man, and ten chances to one he will not be a practical man. As the time is nearly up, Mr. Speaker, I will not continue.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I crave the attention of the House for a little while. I first wish to congratulate the last speaker upon his splendid address. Only that he would be such a distinct loss to our side of the House, we would gladly give him to the Government for a Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I am sure that the suggestions which he has offered are practical and show that he has studied the question minutely and would be an acquisition to any department. My object in rising, Mr. Speaker, is to support the amendment. We are in a very ambiguous position just now. I think it is imposing upon good nature that we should have to ask the Prime Minister for replies to our various questions concerning matters appertaining to these Departments. Our constituents are continually asking us to enquire into various public matters. They want everything ventilated, and it is our duty to get them the information which they want. As has been said by the learned member for Trinity, we are here to criticize because the mouths of the Government members are sealed, and they have to do what the Prime Minister and his Executive want them to do; and therefore if there is to be any debate at all, we must do something on this side of the House. Of course, if they think they are beyond criticism, well, then, all I have to say to them is that they should take unto themselves wings and fly away from this mundane sphere altogether. It has been stated here that Mr. Coaker did not have anything to do with raising the price of fish. I contend that Mr. Coaker, as head of the Fishermen's Protective Union, has had a great deal to do with the raising of the price of fish. The hon. member for Bay de Verde might have elaborated his statement and opened the eyes of the House in connection with this matter. I was surprised to find that the Minister of Finance and Customs did not know in what condition our fish is sold in the American markets. I had thought to come here and learn something, but I find now that the members on this side of the House have to throw out practical hints for the benefit of the different heads of the Departments. We are here, Mr. Speaker, to ask questions. You cannot expect new members just coming into the House to know much about the public accounts. Our constituents want the information, and that is the reason why we ask questions. There is a time in the history of every country, whether the commercial or political history, when questions must be

asked, and now that we find a depleted treasury in this country we want to know the cause. We were told by the Minister of Finance and Customs that we had no money; that every cent borrowed for the purpose of building railways was spent; and still a little later he told us that he could go and draw a cheque for any amount that might be required for any purpose. Now, if I were to stand up here this evening and say nothing but pleasant things to the Government, I would be a very nice fellow, but the physician who only prescribes pleasing doses, and the lawyer who keeps the true condition of things from his clients, deserve neither confidence nor respect. And we are here to investigate the true codintion of things. The country at the present time is in a hole, and it has been brought there by the blundering tactics of men who will do anything to retain possession of the emoluments of office which they now possess.

I was very pleased with the remarks of my hon. friend Mr. Moulton. He said amongst other things that if we found out that this agricultural policy which we have is no good, that we have not entered into any contract with respect to it, such as we have with the Reids, and that we can withdraw the grant. Well, it has been proven to him that this agricultural policy is of very little good. The hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's, Mr. Devereaux, and also Mr. Downey, read some extracts from a report which I happened to make in 1911, but they did not read the whole of it. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the agricultural industry of this country is next to the fishing industry, and that if we find that the money allocated for this purpose is not spent wisely and that the country is not getting returns commensurate with the expenditure made that we should turn right-about face and try to attain the object which we have in view in some other ways. I don't find fault with the Government for allocating $40,000 a year for agriculture, but I do find fault with them for the way in which it is expended.

It being now 6.30 p.m. the debate was on motion, adjourned till to-morrow.

It was moved and seconded that the remaining items on the Order Paper stand deferred until to-morrow.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY laid upon the table answer to question of Mr. Abbott re mail matters affecting Bonavista Bay; also answer to Mr. Coaker's question in relation to telegraph office at Herring Neck

The Speaker named the following as a Library Committee: Colonial Secretary, Mr. Moore, Dr. Lloyd, Mr. Currie.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER tabled correspondence asked for by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Coaker gave notice of Question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of Question.

On motion the House adjourned until 3 of the clock to-morrow.

FRIDAY, January 23rd, 1914.

The House met at 3.15 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

PETITIONS.

HON. MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of English Harbour West in Fortune Bay who ask that that place be made a port of call for one of the coastal boats. This petition sets forth that trade and business at English Harbour have increased very much during the past

few years and the absence of a coastal boat regularly calling there is a great hardship for the people not only of that place but to those belonging to neighbouring harbours. I also present to this House two other petitions one from the inhabitants of Coomb's Cove and one from the people of Mose Ambrose which set forth that a coastal boat calling at English Harbour would be of great advantage to them. Under the present arrangements passengers and freight for English Hr. West, are landed at St. Jacques, this entailing serious delay and expense before arriving at the points of destination. Business has so increased and conditionshave so changed on the West coast that the people living in places where a coastal boat does not call are asking for a re-arrangement of the schedule of the Portia and the Glencoe. Both steamers call at several places along the coast, and people are arguing that such a arrangement is very unfair while important places are left out altogether. I trust that this matter will be taken into consideration at an early date so that such an arrangement will be made that important places like English Harbour West and Balena will be placed on the regular schedule as a port of call for one of the Coastal boats.

MR. MOULTON.—I have much pleasure in supporting the petitions presented by the hon. member for Fortune Bay. In order to get over the difficulty I would suggest that the Government appoint a commission composed of the representatives of the western districts and the owners of the steamers with a view to making an equitable re-arrangement of the schedule so that important places may not be left out as ports of call. Today we have two or three steamers calling at certain places every week or ten days while other harbors equally as important are left out altogether. If this matter is considered by commissioners in a proper spirit I have no doubt that an arrangement could be arrived at for the steamers plying along the coast to touch at all important places. There are some ports of call between Placentia and Port aux Basques where two or three steamers call every week while an important fishing centre like Isle aux Morts is entirely without coastal facilities. This point should certainly be added to the schedule of one of the steamers without delay. I trust that the prayers of the petitions will be acceded to.

MR. PARSONS.—I beg to present a petition from the Rev. Canon Noel and others of Harbour Grace on the subject of the drainage of the North and South sides of Harvey Road. As this is a very important matter I ask that the Petition be brought under the notice of the Government, and that a small sum of money be allocated for that purpose at the earliest possible moment. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my hon. colleague and I trust that the matter will receive every attention at the hands of the Government.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Hant's Harbor, in the District of Trinity, setting forth that the petitioners are in need of a line of road from the main line. They ask for the sum of $840 for this work. With the permission of the house I shall read the petition. (Petition read.)

QUESTIONS.

MR. KENT asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence with His Excellency the Governor and other documents in relation to the tenure by the Hon. D. Morison and the Hon. S. D. Blandford, of the offices of Minister of Justice and Minister of Agriculture and Mines, respectively, since the date of the General Election, or in relation to their retirement from the said offices.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—There is no correspondence beyond the mere letter acquainting His Excellency the Governor of the resignation of the Ministers,(which I shall produce,) further than a reference to the matter in connection with other matters in a communication from His Excellency the Governor which I shall ask his permission to table. In other words the Ministers resigned without being asked and I communicated the fact to His Excellency. About a month before I had occasion to write to His Excellency on other matters and reference was made to that question. I shall ask the Governor to allow me to table that whole correspondence.

MR. KENT asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing all amounts paid for awards for lands taken under the Railway Extension Act, 1910, and the amendment thereof; also, of all monies paid for arbitration fees, solicitors fees, travelling expenses or other expenses connected with the arbitrations arising out of the said Act, giving in each case the names of parties, amounts and date of each payment.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have given instructions to have this prepared and it is now being prepared by the Department.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the Banks in this Colony with which the Government has had financial dealings in the year ending Dec. 31st, 1913, and whether any balance sheet showing the condition of the various accounts between the Government and each such bank has been furnished to the Government by these Banks, if so, to lay on the table of the House a copy of such statement showing all and every account.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—In reply I beg to say that that information is being prepared.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister under what circumstances, and for what price. £100,000 face value of India 3½ per cent. stock script were purchased by the Savings Bank, and what is the value of the said stock scrip at the present market price; also, whether the difference, if any, between the price paid and the face value of the scrip was carried by the Savings Bank into Profit & Loss; also, whether the sum of £940,500 for Colonial Debentures, included in the statement of Assets of the Savings Bank at the end of 1912, was face value or contained an allowance for depreciation; also, what provision,if any, has been made by the Savings Bank for the difference between the current value of Colonial Debentures and India stock scrip, and the face value of the same.

MR. COAKER.—In that question it should be 940,500 dollars instead of 940,500 pounds.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—As to the first portion of that question, in 1908 under the administration of Sir Robert Bond who was a director of the Newfoundland Savings Bank when that amount was invested in India Stock at a little below par. I think

the last quotation was about 90. It varies a little but I am endeavouring to obtain the last market quotation from the London Stock Exchange. The other matters I have asked the Cashier of the Savings Bank to prepare and I will be able to furnish them at the next sitting.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing, in detail, all amounts paid or allocated in the Electoral District of Fogo, out of ordinary, special or surplus trust grants during the year 1913, giving the dates of such allocations, the names of the parties to whom allocated, and also the purpose for which allocations were made.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table the answer to that question.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing (1) the number of couriers engaged in the Winter Mail Service in Fogo District, their routes, amount paid for each route and to whom paid.

HON. COLONOIAL SECRETARY.—I now beg to table the information asked for.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of the Inland Fisheries Board expenditures for 1913.

MINSTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to inform the hon. member that information will be tabled in a day or two by the Auditor General.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of expenditure on account of fire sufferers in Bonavista Dstrict in the year 1912.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—For the information of the hon. member I may say this informaton was included in the Public Accounts for this year. I understand that they are now in the Finance Department. I will have them brought here and placed on the table of the House. He will find the information under the head of "Forest Fires."

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. HALFYARD.--Mr. Speaker, the great question at present, as far as I can see is "Who raised the price of fish?" The hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman, in his remarks yesterday said that the Government of this Colony had no more to do with raising the price of fish than the President of the Chinese Republic. Now that much is settled, because we are told that Mr. Hickman endorsed the Government's policy. If Mr. Hickman,in his remarks yesterday, endorsed the Government's policy the only policy they can have at present is that the price of fish wholly and solely depends upon the law of supply and demand. That satisfies the Government in every particular. Now, Mr. Speaker, the matter that should engage our attention in this House this session should not be the mere bandying of words from one side to the other, but we are here to debate matters affecting the interest of the country. Now if the Government is so perfect that they need no criticism let them get down to work and bring their measures before the House and have done with them so that those who are here from the outports can go home. I look upon the matter of occupying a seat in this House as no child's play, because there are most serious matters to be dealt with in this Legislature, matters affecting the interests of this country which should be dealt with at the present time. I take no pleasure in sit-

ting hereand criticising the actions of the Government in connection with the Agricultural Policy. The people who sent me here did not send me here simply for that purpose and that alone; but realizing that that policy of the Government is not all that is commendable I would be lacking in my duty to my constituents if I did not to the best of my ability, though my efforts may be very weak, and, perhaps, in the opinion of the House fruitless, criticise what I conceived to be the faults of that policy. But I digress. I was speaking of the rise in the price of fish and what caused it. I do not think anyone in this country will take to himself the credit of the price our fish may obtain in the foreign markets. When we speak of the law of supply and demand governing the price of fish we are speaking only of the foreign markets, and in these markets that certainly applies to a large extent. But even in these markets local arrangements and local organizations might have something to do with the price obtained by our fish merchants. But here you are winking out of sight local conditions, and the prices obtained by the men who catch the fish.That is the point we are most interested in. We know what the fishermen think about these matters as we are here representing them, and we know what is the opinion of the fishermen as to the work that has been done for them by the Fishermen's Union. We know that here the very name of the Fishermen's Union is treated with scorn and contempt. Why is this so if the Fishermen's Union is no good or if it s harmless. Why are the great interests opposed to us, and why are so many of the great firms on Water Street opposed to us if we have nothing to do with what they will have to pay for a quintal of fish. Now I only speak in this particular to disabuse the minds of hon. members opposite. Our people know the difference. We have been told and I think it is a true statement, that anything anybody else does will be treated with envy and jealousy if we believe that we cannot do the same thing equally as well. Now we know that Mr. Coaker, President of the F. P. U., is treated with envy and suspicion. Why is this? It is because the fishermen believe that he has done something that no other man in this country ever did. They have a faith in him that they have never had in any other man. I cannot wonder that men who by accident of birth have all they wish and who are out of touch with our labouring classes should be opposed in some way to an organization of fishermen or a union of working men; but I do wonder at certain individuals who, as soon as they have obtaned money and position forget the pit from whence they were dug and who treat with scorn and ridicule an attempt by our fishermen and workingmen to improve their condition. Everyone knows that in days gone by the working classes have not had their rights, and men who are leaders of this Government have spoken of this matter, even though it might have only been before an election and was promptly forgotten afterwards; but this we know that the fishermen did not get their rights. Now that they are organized and are looking for their rights in a law-abiding manner they are abused in every way. They are called fools and illiterates. I would like a man to go to the Districts of Bonavista or Fogo and make these remarks.

Has the F. P. U. nothing to do with the price of fish? Go ask the men of Placentia and St. Mary's. Ask the men in the North or in the West. Men from Placentia and St. Mary's have come into our office on Water Street

and said we would be ingrates and unworthy the name of men if we did not come and express a word of appreciation of the benefits we have received from reading the "Fishermen's Advocate." Last year we watched its columns and were told to hold our fish for $6.00, whilst numbers were selling for $5.50. They reasoned that Mr. Coaker seemed to have a knowledge of what the price should be, and that he had not been far out in the advice he had given to the men of the North. They followed the advice of the "Advocate" and got the $6.00, whilst numbers in their localities only received $5.50. Does this not prove that the F. P. U. has done good. Still you come in here and say that it was not a factor in the prices obtained by the fishermen. Do you mean to say that in the past our fishermen received fair value commensurate with what the merchants got in the foreign markets. Mr. Hickman yesterday was too modest or he would have told that he himself in conjunction with the President of the F. P. U., had quite a lot to do with the price obtained by our fishermen, and I take this opportunity of giving Mr. Hickman this meed of praise that is due him. Many of the Water Street concerns were reluctant to buy our fish. But Mr. Hickman was a man who understood the conditions and factors that go to make the price and he knew what he could give for fish. He gave it and benefitted by it, and the whole country benefitted, and the fishermen of the country, North, South, East and West, Union men and non-union men benefitted by it. It is enough to make one's blood boil with indignation when we hear the accusations made against the organization that the fishermen hold so dearly to their hearts. It is a matter of business with them. What do they care what Mr. Coaker is or does or anyone else does if they do not derive a benefit from the organization. In past years they had to take their fish from wharf to wharf and finally accept the price that the merchants were prepared to give. They had no one to consult for information or advice. Now they can get satisfaction. Fishermen however, are reasonable men, and if they really believe that a man only can give $6.00 they are satisfied; but if they have any idea that fish is worth $6.50 they are dissatisfied. Now what was the condition of things that formerly prevailed with regard to the price of fish. Perhaps in the Spring fish would open at $6.00 or $6.50. That would be all very well. Then about the tenth of August some circulars would be sent out saying that fish had dropped fifty cents or a dollar a quintal. The fishermen got scared and sold all their fish, and then up went the price again. That condition has not prevailed during the last three years. Now through the organization of the F. P. U. the fishermen know when to hold their fish and when to sell it. Of course the foreign markets may have something to do with it; but formerly the law of supply and demand was no criterion of what the fisherman obtained for his fish, and at present it is only partly so. Supposing the fish-merchants meet in the early summer and decide that $4.20 shall be given for Labrador fish, is it not the merchant that makes the price. Then on the other hand if the fishermen refuse that price and demand $4.70 who makes the price then? The fishermen. That the F. P. U. is a factor with regard to the price that fishermen obtain for their fish no one can satisfactorily contradict. I speak of this because a false impression may get abroad that the F. P. U. is of no use with regard to the price obtained by the fisherman and for the products of the fishery. I know of cases

where fishermen have obtained five dollars a tun more for their oil because of the organization and because the head of the organization resides at St. John's where the oil is sold.

It is the work of Unions all over the world to obtain for their members the best recompense for their labour and because we are doing this we are described as men of no brains and as cullage. It is impossible to say how much good has been done by the F. P. U. for the advancement of fishermen. Ithelps to bind them together and to break down the old prejudices that existed. It helps them to work squarely and honestly together and to obtain the best price for their fish. That is the very foundation on which the existence of the Union is based. That is the reason why we were sent here. Look at the sealing agreements that were made some time ago. They were agreed to by the merchants but there is no legislation that the fishermen will obtain the advantages of these agreements. The improvements were obtained by agreement but there should be a law to make these improvements compulsory. The work of the Union to the present time has been among the men of the North but the idea is spreading to the West and all over the Island and soon those who are holding seats in districts where the Union is not yet established will have to fall in line with the organization and give it their support or else they will lose their seats.

If the Union has any defects, do not try to kill it. I do not know any defects that it has but I may be blind to them just as hon. members opposite are blind to their faults, for that is only human nature, but if it has them, we shall do our best to remedy them when they are pointed out to us. We are prepared to accept honest criticism for we do not think we or any other organization can possibly be above suspicion, like Caesar's wife.

All I shall say about the price of fish with regard to the question of supply and demand is that the prices In the foreign markets in the past have not been the whole and sole basis of the price which was obtained by the fishermen.

Next to the question of the fishery comes the question of agriculture and I am glad to avail of the opportunity of referring to the agricultural policy of the Government. I happened to be Secretary of the Agricultural Society at Catalina and at the end of 1912 we had to make out our Report. In this report I stated that agriculture was increasing in that place but only to a small extent. The hon. member for St. Mary's wants to believe that the agricultural policy has been such a great movement that since its coming into force land was cleared for the first time. In my report I did not say that the improvement in agriculture was in any way the result of the Government's policy, for people at Catalina have cleared land once in a while when they had the opportunity. Land was cleared there before the policy was brought into force and it only weakens the arguments of my friend opposite to say that the clearing of land at Catalina was due to the policy of the Government. To listen to the members opposite one would be led to believe that no land was cleared before the present Government came into power and that the people all over the island were living in a wilderness but I venture to say that not one acre of land has been cleared during the time the agricultural policy has been in force more than was cleared before that time. We do not find fault with the Government for the grant of $40,000 for agriculture but we do find fault with the allocation of that amount among dif-

ferent societies when it is plain that no good can result from it. Each society could do a great deal of good if it had the necessary money but the amount which each receives is so small that it is impossible for them to do anything. What is the opinion of the different people as gathered from the reports? The idea is that much better results would be obtained if a bonus were given for the clearing of land. It would be far better to give money for that purpose than to give it in prizes for fancy work that perhaps was done by the winner's great grandmother. Is fancy work any criterion of the advancement of agriculture in the Colony? Yet if you will look at the prize lists at the exhibitions you will see that money was wasted in that way. Through the courtesy of my hon. friend, Mr. Downey, I have in my hands a paper in which the Trinity exhibition is referred to and I find that one-third of the prize money was awarded for fancy work. I shall read some of the prizes that were awarded to prove this contention. (Hon. member reads list of prizes). I look upon an expenditure of money in that way for the advancement of agriculture as simply ridiculous. If the Government wishes to improve fancy work and knitting, they should do so under the right heading and not take the prizes from the grant for agriculture. I speak of this matter because throughout the country the exhibitions are looked upon as a joke and I hope that, although the law is now in force, it is not too late for the Government to see that their whole agricultural policy is so ridiculous and unwise that they will discontinue it and inaugurate some policy that will benefit the people of the Colony.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few observations in reply to some of the remarks made by the gentlemen opposite, particularly the hon. member for Trinity, Dr Lloyd, and the hon. member for Bonavista Mr. Coaker, and as the debate has dragged along for a considerable time I shall be as brief as possible in my remarks.

Let me first join with the other speakers in extending to you my sincere congratulations on your attainment to the high honor of Speaker of this House, and also in the congratulations to my hon. friend, Mr. Currie, and my hon. friend Mr. Higgins, on the excellent speeches which they made on the opening day. Let me also welcome the gentlemen of His Majesty's loyal opposition, especially the gentlemen in the back row. I must congratulate them all on the maiden speeches they have made. We see some old faces in the front row, particuarly the learned member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd. I did not hear all that gentleman's speech but I must confess that I was disappointed with what I did hear of it, for we expected great things from the learned doctor and we got nothing. In a very noisy manner he criticized the agricultural policy of the Government and wound up by insulting every member of the agricultural boards of the colony for he said that they were all bought. He accused them of being bought body and soul. The learned doctor, however, did not tell us what his own price would be if through any accident his own party had been elected to this side of the House. It was rumoured that he had in his vest pocket the position of one of the Commissioners of the Agricultural Board.

DR. LLOYD—That is not correct.

MR. MOORE—If that is not so, it is probably correct that he would receive a departmental office with a salary of at least $2,000 a year. My learned friend will not deny this and we must take it for granted that he wished to have a better position than that of Commissioner of Agriculture. I thought the learned gentleman was a patriot and that he had buckled on his armor to save the Colony, but I beg his pardon.

In a very loud manner the learned gentleman went on to endeavour to show that everything else that the Government did was wrong. In dealing with the question of the price of fish he showed that he knew no more about it than he knew about agriculture, for we were as wise at the end of his argument as we were when he began it.

However, there is one gentleman in the front rank of the opposition whose speech settled forever the question as to how the price of fish was raised. I refer to my hon friend Mr. Hickman, and I must compliment him on his manly speech, which completely upset the argument of the learned doctor that any one man put up the price of fish.

That was all I heard of the learned doctor's speech, and I must go on therefore, from Trinity to Bonavista.

My hon. friend Mr. Coaker, was annoyed the other day as to the manner in which the campaign was conducted in the district of Ferryland. I can set his mind at ease, for in that district it was conducted on the broad question of policy. We went to the country on the record of the four years and we laid our case before the electorate fairly and squarely. They went to the booth room and voted on a question of policy only, and how well they did it can be seen by anybody who looks up the returns from the district for the last election, for those who opposed us did not save their nomination fees.

The rt. hon. the Prime Minister stated here that Mr. Coaker's name was not mentioned in St. John's West during the campaign. If that be true (and there can be no reason for doubting it), we can go further in the district of Ferryland and say that not only was his name not mentioned but his picture was turned to the wall.

The hon. member for Bonavista also stated that, if he had been in this House when the branch railways were being voted for, he would have voted against the branch line to Trepassey. I ask him in all sincerity if the people of Ferryland through which this railway passes, are inferior in intelligence or industry to the people of Bonavista. Have they not the same right to a railway as the people of other districts, for do they not pay as much towards the revenue as the people elsewhere? Most certainly they do, and they have as much right to be brought in touch with civilization as anybody else. I was in this House when the branch railway resolutions were brought in and I voted for them all, and all that I am sorry for is that it was not possible to build a hundred branch railways for the benefit of the people. I am in favour of branch railways for they help to open up the country and to develop it and to bring our

people in close touch with Canadian and American cities.

The people also are in favour of these branches and I can only say in conclusion that the day will come when they will receive in abundance the benefits that will accrue from the policy of a wise and far-seeing administration.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, as a representative of Harbour Grace, a district in which there are a large number of fishermen, I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. mem. for Fogo to go unchallenged. He spoke as one of the representatives of the fishermen on that side of the House and it is well to point out to him that there are many worthy representatives of fishermen here who are not prepared to take for granted the reasons which he has given for the present high price of fish. I stand here to prove that the price of fish is not governed by any one man, but by the law of supply and demand.

I remember that in 1880 there was but one codtrap in Conception Bay, and I was one of the four men who worked that trap for four years. I shall quote a few figures to show the steady growth of the industry. In 1901 throughout the country there were 33,000 nets and seines and in 1911 this figure had increased to 275,000. In 1901 there were 4,000 codtraps and in 1911 this number had increased to 6,500. These figures show that year after year there was an increase in the implements of the fishery, for after all these are the fishermen's stock-in-trade. The total value of these in 1901 was six million dollars and their total value in 1911 was nine million dollars. This shows conclusively the steady growth in the fishermen's appliances and this was brought about not through the work of any union but because the price of fish had increased, because of supply and demand.

I may be pardoned if as a son of a fisherman I do not allow my friends opposite to give the public the impression that they alone represent the fishermen of the Colony, for there are other fishermen here who know what governs the prices and who took part in that industry before many members of the F. P. U. were born.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words on the questions that are before the House and in doing so I should like to join the other hon. gentlemen who have spoken in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to the high office that you hold. I am sure that you will do your duty like a man and treat both sides of the House fairly.

I do not expect that what I shall say will have any effect on the hon. gentlemen opposite, for I am one of those whom the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs referred to as cullage.

Some years ago there was a strict cull of our fish and there was often a question as to which was merchantable and which was madeira. I wonder if there was such a possibility as a cull of men if my hon. friend would be found to be number one or would he be classed inferior to some of those whom he has referred to as cullage. I am very sorry that he made this statement and referred to those who supported us

as ignorant men. I think he would find among those who supported us in Bonavista Bay as capable men as could be found in any other district in the Colony. The very best men there were in line with our Union and they are not ashamed that they supported us.

We are not as ignorant as to the reasons for the price of fish as some gentlemen opposite seem to think that we are. We know that the prices cannot be high here if they are low in the foreign markets. However I do not think the time of the House has been wasted in discussing this question for it is not out of place to discuss it here. If more of the time of previous sessions had been spent in discussing the industries of the Colony we would be the better off for it.

The rt. hon. Prime Minister has stated that it was the condition of the market abroad that set the price of fish. He also stated he was in communication with these markets and in touch with the conditions there. This is what he promised the people for he said that he would give them a weekly report of conditions abroad. If he did get these reports they were no good to the people for he kept them to himself.

I know from personal experience in the past that the conditions of the foreign markets and the law of demand and supply have not raised the price of fish. I know about this, because I have had dealings with both buyers and settlers. A few years ago we could not get an offer of more than $5.60 for our fish. By Mr. Coaker's advice, some five or six hundred of us in Bonavista held back our fish and refused anything less than $6.20 In the end the merchants were forced to offer us $6.20 for our fish. Now Sir, these are facts, and these things have been going on since the organization of the F.P.U. Some people put forward the argument that, if the F.P.U. raised the price of fish why don't they now raise it to $10. We do not want $10; we want what the fish is worth. We do not want an exorbitant price for it.

Mr. Speaker, we are wiser today than we were in the past. Years ago, Sir, we were told that the current prices were such and such, and we had to take whatever price was given us; but now, Sir, we can demand a better price for our fish and get it too. If these arguments are not correct, why is it that other unions are raising the price of products? Go to any employer today and he will plainly tell you that the laborers' union has raised the cost of labour. Now then, Sir, if that is so, everybody must admit that the F.P.U. raised the price of fish. If the labourer raised the price of labour why did he not raise it to $10 a day? It is just as reasonable as asking why the F. P. U. did not raise the price of fish to $10. A man must ask for a fair price and no more. When we get the value of our produce, we want no more. We are no longer going to believe that what somebody else said was correct. That reminds me of the story of the man who went into a bar-room and asked for a glass of whiskey. The bar-tender told him that he had no whiskey; but told him to take a glass of gin and persuade himself that it was whiskey. He drank the

gin and was about to go when the bar-tender asked for the price of the gin. 'Oh!' he said, 'you made me believe that I was drinking whiskey, now make yourself believe that you have been paid.' It seems to me to be the same kind of thing.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have said sufficient about the question as to who raised the price of fish. Now I want to say a few words about the Agricultural Societies, but I don't know where to commence. There are so many wrongs in connection with it that it is a puzzle to know just where to start. I don't altogether blame the Rt. Hon Sir Edward Morris. We know that he has other things to think about.

Lack of knowledge and lack of interest are the chief reasons for the failure of the Agricultural policy. My hon. friend stated that he did not want to make farmers out of fishermen. I don't think that he intended to make farmers at all. I think that the differences in the soil throughout the country have contributed a great deal towards that failure of the agricultural policy. Take, for instance, soil of Bonavista Bay. The soil of the Southside and of the centre is altogether different from that of the Northside. These good Commissioners would send down so many sheep and you had to do what you thought best with them. The Society at Greenspond received only $75 instead of the $100 promised them. The greater part of this money was spent on the official. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is great room for improvement in this agricultural policy.

A man in Wesleyville received some sheep from the Agricultural Society. He put the sheep in his garden and a few days later went to look at them. By accident the garden gate had been left open and the sheep escaped to the hills. The people tried to catch them; but the sheep went from one hill to another and withstood capture. Accordingly the people said that they were the Tory sheep looking for the two blades of grass and trying to carry out Sir Edward Morris's promises to whiten the hills with sheep.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I am voicing the sentiments of us all in expressing our appreciation of the very entertaining speech of the hon. member for Bonavista Mr. Winsor. I must congratulate him on his very humorous banter and hope that as the time goes on, we shall hear more from him. There is a great deal in his arguments.

Before making any remarks on the matter before the Chair, permit me Sir, to extend my hearty congratulations to you on your appointment to the high position of First Commoner of the Land. I don't know of any member of this House whose election to that office would have received such universal approbation as yours, Sir. You have demonstrated to the satisfaction of all the members your impartial judgment and your intention to do so in the future. I would also like to take this opportunity of expressing my personal regret—even at the risk of being considered a hypocrite—at the resignation of Sir Robert Bond. I think that the loss to this country has indeed been great. I had the honour to sit on the same side of the House as the hon. gentleman

for the best part of four years. I had, moreover, the privilege to sit on the opposite side of this House to him. His presence here meant a great deal of wisdom and a great deal of industry. All his interest was brought to bear on a subject. I might say that this country has lost in him a faithful assistant, and I hope the day is not far distant when he will return to fulfill again the duties that he has so ably fulfilled for over a quarter of a century.

We may not always have agreed with the late leader of the Opposition; but I think we can say with safety and with truth that he was sincere in his convictions. Although the realization of his convictions were not always considered in the interests of his country, yet I believe that he was true and sincere in his intentions. I would, therefore like to add my regret at his departure.

The question as to who raised the price of fish seems to be the main point of the speeches of this evening. I feel that I should be treading on dangerous ground if I attempted to express my views on the question, because I know that there are many critics in the House this evening who have suggested a wide and varied knowledge of the subject. I am not prepared to say that Mr. Coaker had nothing to do with the raising of the price of fish, or that the F.P.U. had nothing to do with it. It is only a matter of common sense to realize the fact that the large number of fishermen combined together for the purpose of mutual advantage should in a certain way and on certain occasions be able to influence the local market at any rate. Therfore, I have no doubt of the fact that the combination headed by Mr. Coaker had a little to do with the current price of fish during the past year.

But I would also like to point out that the price realized for fish during the past twelve months was not unique. We have had occasions when the price of fish was as high if not higher. I remember the time when, right here in St. John's fish was $7 a quintal. That was in 1905. The next year the price was something similar. Mr. Coaker was not in evidence in these years and the F. P. U. was not formed. I am not going to say that it was not conceived; but it was not in active operation. Therefore there must have been other agencies in operation besides the F.P.U. I think I am right in agreeing with Mr. Hickman that all kinds of food stuffs are regulated by the impersonal system of supply and demand. The great trusts and corporations in the United States may offset that argument; yet, in this community at least, the prices of our foods are subject almost entirely to the question of the supply and demand. If there is only a limited market for our fish. the price naturally goes down. Whereas if the demand is greater than the supply the price naturally goes up.

There are one or two matters touched on by the different speakers in reference to other matters which are referred to in the Speech. There was one thing to which I would call the attention of the House. My hon. friend, Mr. Kent in his remarks said that the fact of free entry for our fish into the United States would

have a beneficial effect upon the price of fish in this country. It is a new market with great possibilities. I agree with him, Sir. The Leader of the late Government made it his life work to try to bring about a treaty with the United States to obtain free entry for our fish into that great republic. There are nearly 100,000,000 people there and we have a food that they require. And it is only a matter of getting the fish into the market and they will take great quantities of it. A great many suggestions have been made as to how that matter should be handled. I am sure the Opposition will agree with me in welcoming every addition to our fishery. I am of opinion that it is not enough for us to put up the fish in salt bulk and ship it away for further handling and improvement in the States. We should so handle that market that every bit of labour, every bit of employment that it is possible to get in the preparation of that food should be kept to the people of this Colony. I feel sure that the members on the other side of the House will welcome such a prospect and will assist the Government in every way possible to bring about such a condition of affairs. I know the Leader of the Government has always had this matter uppermost in his mind, and in every election that he has gone upon he has advocated new markets for fish and new methods for getting up the article in attractive forms. I think it was the hon. member for Trinity who suggested pink ribbons, but despite this sarcasm I think he will appreciate the advantage of having the fish done up in attractive packages and in such a manner that when it comes into the hands of the consumer he will know that it was caught and prepared in Newfoundland.

While on the question of fish I would like to refer to the F.P.U. While I do not agree with a great many of their statements, I believe that in itself it is a great thing. I certainly believe that the Unions in St. John's have done a lot for the people of St. John's. I believe the condition of the working man has been much improved and it would be a bad thing for the people had they now to return to the conditions which existed previous to Unions. I do not think that the F.P.U. have been right in everything they have done. I do not think that the members of the F. P. U. should imagine that they are the only people in the country. There are many good and worthy people outside the ranks of the F. P. U. and I am sure that the members of that body and their representatives in this House will admit the fact. I believe they mean well, and that their representatives are going to do good for the country. To work in the interests of the fishermen, they are in the right place to make that effective. On the other hand I am not prepared to admit that in previous governments the fishermen of the country have not been well looked after. I am not prepared to admit that this government has not done every thing possible in the interests of the fishermen. In fact everyone will admit that every plank in the platform of the present Government has been in the interests of the fishermen. Who gets the benefits of the establishment

of branch railways? Who benefits most by the extension of telegraph services? Who benefits most by the building of fog alarms and lighthouses? Who benefits by the granting of old age pensions? I contend that the leader and members of this Government have used the most disinterested enterprise in advancing the affairs of the Colony far more than any previous government, and I doubt whether their endeavors can be bettered by any future one. It would be simply absurd for anyone to say that the fishermen have been neglected, and I am not prepared to sit down, although not representing a fishermen's district absolutely, and accept the conclusion that this government has not done its duty to the fishermen of Newfoundland. A great deal has been said by this Opposition and the Opposition that sat here last year, against the agricultural policy of the government. Of course, I think that every action of the Government should be criticised by the Opposition. It is their duty. But taking the present policy of the Government on a broad principle I think in a country like this, it is the policy that will recommend itself to the people far more than did the policy of our predecessor. The agricultural policy of the late Government, meant the establishment of a model farm in St. John's. My hon. friend, Mr. Dwyer, who is an authority on agriculture is second to none in the Colony, endorsed that policy, but I think that he will admit that there has been much improvement in the agricultural conditions round St. John's during the past four or five years. I know, in St .John's West, I have been round the agricultural parts of the District and I saw vast improvements especially in the methods adopted in reaping and sowing the crops, the labour saving devices. It may be contended that this is not the result of the agricultural policy of the Government but a moment's reflection will show that the increase in crops due to better seeds has created renewed confidence and vigor and induced the farmers to go more strenuously to work to make their farms pay. I have seen crops raised in my district that I do not think can be surpassed in any part of the world. It may be that we cannot all see the immediate results of this distribution of seed. We spend only $40,000 a year and this expended over such a large territory, cannot but mean distribution in a small way but in the years to come we will see the benefit of the policy that will have accrued. The policy that has been referred to, the policy of the past Government, would have meant nothing but a model farm in St. John's. They would have prize stock and a place for people to come to get information. It would cost a great deal, probably over $20,000 a year and would benefit but very few and as my friend, Mr. Devereux pointed out would be of no value to the people of White Bay and Green Bay and other parts of the Island, distant from St. John's. In addition to this we now have the agricultural College at Truro available to our people, where they can go for instruction and information and where we can get our soils analyzed. We can send and get all the information we want and can get it all free of cost. Therefore I say no matter what you say against the policy of the present Government, the principle underlying it is good and is such that in the future it will reflect great credit upon the administration that inaugurated it.

Another very important matter has been referred to during the debate and that is the price of coal, a matter particularly important to everyone living in St. John's and a very important matter to those that represent them. I am very glad to find that the F. P. U. have a steamer landing coal in St. John's at a price very much below the market price. I congratulate Mr. Coaker upon selling his coal at $6.80 and I hope he will make it pay. But this is not a matter for which a Government is blameable or responsible. It is a matter purely commercial. It would be more than difficult for this legislature to pass legislation to compel any man to sell any commodity at a certain price but I believe that if Mr. Coaker can continue to sell coal at the figure quoted he will have done a great benefit to the poorer people of this town, because even at that price it is very expensive. I have endeavored to get information on this matter and I have asked one or two of the coal dealers how it is that Mr. Coaker can land coal here and sell it at the lower price. They tell me that it cannot be done and that it will not pay. I make this statement subject to correction but figures were given me to show that the present cost to the buyer is $7.20. These figures are as follows:

Cost at Sydney	..$3.48
Duty	70
Freight	$1.35
Insurance	5
Discharging	30
Carting	60
Storing	26
Delivery from Store	10
Fire Insurance	5
Upkeep of Premises	6
Incidental Expenses	15
Cartage Home	10
	$7.20

Of course we all appreciate the fact that there are some of these charges not on his cargo. For instance, he has no charge for storing, 26 cents, delivery from store, 10 cents, insurance, 5 cents, upkeep of premises, 6 cents, Incidental expenses, 15 cents, totalling 62 cents. Furthermore all coal dealers sell their coal practically on twelve months credit, whereas Mr. Coaker is selling it for cash. Another consideration is this, that if the F. P.U. is going to sell coal at the ship's side the labourers of St. John's are going to lose considerable labour. Take Morey & Co. for example. They get a cargo of say 1,000 tons. That cargo has to be discharged, stored and labour is engaged to put it into carts for cartage. The same things applies to other coal dealers. The labourers get something out of it. However, as I say we all welcome the information that coal can be brought here and sold at that price and while on this subject I would like to make a few remarks about my friend Dr. Lloyd. The other afternoon he criticised the policy of the Government as outlined in the Speech from the Throne as regards this question. He referred to the fact that Professor Dunstan was coming out to investigate the possibilities of our coal areas. He took great pains and research in finding out that Professor Dunstan was not a coal expert while on the other hand he was fair enough to admit that he was one of the most eminent chemists and scientists in England to-day. A man who is Director of the Imperial Institute is a man of no mean calibre and as Dr. Lloyd admits he has given reports upon different parts of the Empire in regard to this question. And I have no doubt that if he comes here and from knowledge and information that he will be able to obtain from the sources that have been identified with this work,

if his report is favourable it will have the very best effect upon the financial world, not only in England but in the United States and that we will have every chance of developing our coal areas once we have an opportunity to interest capitalists in its possibilities. The first course is to get a man like Professor Dunstan, a man whose eminence and undoubted abilities and integrity will forever settle the question of whether we have coal in commercially workable areas. The learned Doctor admitted the other afternoon that he thought the Government had done the right thing and I believe this move will have the effect of settling the question one way or another and I hope to the benefit of Newfoundland so that we may get coal if possible at less than $6.80 per ton.

I would like to refer once more to the agricultural policy of the Government. The learned Doctor made a remark that was grossly unfair, unjust and uncalled for. He accused the Government when they started the agricultural societies in the various parts of the country of trying to buy up the school teachers and making them Secretaries. That, sir, is a serious accusation and it is certainly a serious reflection upon the teachers of the country to say that they can be bought up. If it is true, sir, then we bought up the present member for Fogo. To think, sir, that it would be possible in the first place to buy up the men who accepted these positions at the salary of $20.00 per annum. He said, sir, as a fact that the Government had bought up the teachers at $20.00 per annum. That is not fair. It ought to be retracted. It ought never to have been said that the Government had attempted to so insult the school teachers, even if they did not get one to turn a pencil point, by saying that they are not worth more than $20.00. I could not allow any such statement to go without contradiction and without being challenged.

The hon. member for Port de Grave in the course of a very interesting speech made a remark that I cannot allow to go unchallenged. He said that the Government were representing the minority; that the Government are not representing the majority. I have taken the trouble to go into the late Census, 1911, for the purpose of finding out how the relative parties stand as regards population. For the information of the House I would like to read the results. I will give them denominationally. Those districts that returned representatives as members of the party led by Sir Edward Morris, number 10. Ten districts returning 19 members. These districts are St. John's West, H. Main, Hr. Grace, Carbonear, Ferryland, Placentia, Burin, Fortune, Burgeo and St. George's. The population of these districts according to the last census is 53,085 Catholics and 57,126 other denominations. There was one district that returned one man on each side, Bay de Verde. I take half of that population and give it to the Government party, that would be 1,147 Roman Catholics and 3,959 of other denominations. One district, St. John's East. returned one member for Sir Edward Morris and I consequently take a third of the population of that district, which gives 4,062 Roman Catholics, and 4,316 of other denominations; making a total for the 21 members of 58,294 Roman Catholics and 65,401 of other denominations. The Opposition, led by Sir Robert Bond, secured six districts, namely, Port de Grave, Trinity, Bonavista, Fogo, St. Barbe and Twillingate, which six districts represent 12,503 Roman Catholics and 80,548 other denominations; in one district, Bay de Verde, I give the same as I gave the

other side, namely, 1,147 Roman Catholics and 3,959 other denominations; in St. John's East I give two-thirds, namely, 8,124 Roman Catholics and 8,632 other denominations; making a total for the Bond Party of 21,774 Roman Catholics and 93,139 other denominations; or a total for Sir Edward Morris and his party of 123,695 as against 114,913 for the other side. That is per population.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some members on the opposite side have said that questionable means were used and false assertions made at the last election in order to catch votes. I say, sir, that so far as I know, that statement is absolutely untrue, and I challenge any member on the other side to say that any such thing happened in the district that I represent. And I want to take this opportunity to disabuse the minds of the hon. members on the other side, at least as far as the district which I represent is concerned. We did not use any undue influence or questionable means, and I refer them to the gentlemen who opposed us for corroboration of that statement; and I might say in passing that I don't believe these gentlemen used any means that could be construed as unfair or questionable. I believe that the vote in St. John's West was given entirely on principle and policy. We did not get as large a vote in 1908 and 1909 because some people were doubtful as to whether Sir Edward Morris could carry out the policy which he had laid down, but they had had an opportunity of judging during the four years, and the people that know him best were the most emphatic in endorsing his policy. He is accused all over the country of belonging to a certain denomination. It is not possible, sir, for us all to worship at the same altar, but it does not follow that because a man differs from me in religion that he is not as good a man as I am. Unfortunately the people of this country are too apt to sink out of sight a man's qualities as a statesman and a leader if he happens to worship at a different altar from theirs. I say without fear of contradiction that there is not a more broad-minded man in the country than Sir Edward Morris. He is a man who never makes a distinction on religious lines, although it is said and used against him that he does. Since Sir Edward Morris has been in charge of the Government no man can say that he ever asked him at what altar he worshipped. He is a man who deserves well of his country, and the only regret that I have is that the whole people of the country don't know him as well as those who elected him in St. Johns' West at the last election. The Northern districts did not support the gentlemen who sit in the back seats of the Opposition because they thought that the Morris Government had not done its duty. In Bonavista district, my friends Mr. Morison, Mr. Blandford and Mr. Winsor were elected in 1908-9 with large majorities. Since that election these gentlemen one and all worked hard and did the best that lay in their power for that district. The first thing they got for the district was something for which the people had been calling for years, namely, the extension of the railway; and they insisted that the first thing the Government should do after its return to power, was the commencing of the construction of the railway to Bonavista. All the public works of the district were better looked after during the past four or five years than ever before. And yet these men went down to the district and were turned out. And what is true of Bonavista is also true of Trinity. I think the great majority of the people of Trin-

ity will admit that Mr. Squires was the most hardworking member they ever had. There was nothing in reason that he did not do for the district. All that it was possible to get from the Government he got for Trinity Bay. He is a man whose absence from the House is to be regretted. Clever, energetic and industrious, a credit to himself and to his country; a man who always spoke fair and gave fair play. He was turned out. The reason was that the Fishermen's Protective Union said that he should not go in. It was not because he did not do his duty; it was not because Mr. Blandford, Mr. Morison and Mr. Winsor did not do their duty; but because the Fishermen's Union wanted to put their own men in the House. Well, as I said at the start, the Fishermen's Union is a good institution, and will do a great deal of good for the fishermen of this country if kept within reasonable bounds; but I agree with Sir Robert Bond that it would be an unfortunate thing if any Union or any class of men, with only one ideal and only one desire, should control this Legislature. I am glad to see the representatives of the Union here, and I care not whether, after the next election, I am here personally or not, but I say that I think it would be an unfortunate thing if this country were governed or controlled by any one organization or any one body of men. The fishermen of this country are deserving of and entitled to every consideration, to the unqualified attention of this Legislature, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, whilst giving the fishermen every credit and recognizing them as the bone and sinew of the country, that there are other people in Newfoundland who are entitled to consideration and representation also.

As I said at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of pleasure and interest to the hon. members from the other side who have taken part in the debate, and I am sure that we are all pleased to know that they can sustain their side of the argument so well; and I hope that as the session goes on we will all keep in view the one object for which we are here, and that is the general advancement of the country

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief remarks, and before doing so would wish to follow in the lead of the previous speakers and congratulate you upon your election to the high office you now hold as Speaker of this Assembly. The first statement that I would like to refer to is one made by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister. He stated a few days ago that he was at Bonavista and came in contact with an intelligent and prominent member of the F. P. U. He also went on to say that after considerable conversation with this intelligent and prominent member of the Union he learnt from him that by buying coals through the F. P. U. he lost $3.00 and gained $2.00, and also lost $15.00 worth of codfish.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I did not make that statement. What I stated was this, that this man told me that he had made $5.00 on coal, but afterwards when I had argued the matter with him he admitted that he had lost $15.00 instead of making $5.00.

MR. ABBOTT.—I would like to state here that all coals bought at Bonavista through the F. P. U. were got at from fifty cents to a dollar less per ton than they could be bought at anywhere else; and I would also like to state that the man to whom the Rt. Hon. Premier referred is not an intelligent and prominent member of the F. P. U. but one whose whole

heart's desire is to see the Union go to the wall. Hence the result. From the statement made by the Rt. Hon. Premier one would feel inclined to believe that the F. P. U. was damaging to the welfare of the individual members, but I say, sir, that the Union has put thousands of dollars into the pockets of the fishermen since its organization in Bonavista, and not in Bonavista alone but in all the towns where the Union has been organized. As to who rose the price of fish, I say that W. F. Coaker, now the hon. member for Bonavista district, was instrumental in raising the price of fish in Bonavista Bay and all the northern districts. I will tell you just what happened in Bonavista in the fall of 1912. On September 10th of that year Mr. Coaker sent a message to me at Bonavista, saying, "Tell your Council hold back fish until $5.80 is given." At that time only $5.50 was being given, with a strict cull. He told us that if we would hold back our fish until February month we would get far more than $5.50 for it. Two days after that date he sent another message, saying: "Don't sell fish unless you can get $6.00 for it." At that time he made a contract with certain merchants in St. John's to buy 1,000 quintals of fish from Bonavista Council of the F. P. U. at $6.00. After the contract was filled and the merchant had his 1,000 quintals, he sent another message, saying: "Don't sell any more for $6.00; worth $6.50". He had a deputation wait on the various fish-buyers of the town, with the result that we got $6.30 and $6.40 talqual; whereas a few days before the merchants could not possibly give more than $5.50 for it, and according to themselves they were then buying at a loss. Did not the fishermen of Bonavista, Union and non-Union gain thousands of dollars by that action on the part of W. F. Coaker. I say, sir, and I say without fear of contradiction that no Government that this Colony has ever had have done as much for the fishermen as W. F. Coaker and the Fishermen's Union.

As far as the policy of the present Government is concerned, I may say that my personal opinion is that they have promised much and performed very little. In 1909 they went before the electorate purporting to represent the toilers under the name of the People's Party. They were going to open up new markets, establish bait depots, get weekly messages from the foreign markets as to the price of fish, build five branch railways for four million dollars, establish an Old Age Pension scheme which would embrace the whole country, and not make chalk of one man and cheese of another, whiten the hills with sheep and make two blades of grass grow where one grew before. In fact, they were going to make Newfoundland a garden of Eden without the serpent. And what do we find? Absolutely nothing has been done to help the fishermen, or enable him to catch more fish or get more for the fish which he caught. The People's Party under the leadership of Sir Edward Morris, has served the few and enriched that few at the expense of the many. The effects of their policy led a large number of the electorate to present petitions to this honourable House for a general election in 1912, which petitions were ridiculed as having been signed by a number of men who did not know what they were doing. They were only a lot of fishermen too ignorant to know anything; but I would like to tell the gentlemen who made these statements that wisdom often walks in patched clothes and that there are learned toilers as well as learned boobies.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few

words in reference to the Speech from the Throne, and I would also like to refer briefly to some of the remarks made by our worthy friends the gentlemen on the other side. In the first place, I would congratulate them upon their maiden efforts, and I think that after a little while they are going to develop into very good speakers.

Before I proceed, sir, I would also like to follow my colleagues and my friends on the other side, and congratulate you upon your election to the position of the First Commoner in the land. I regret to note that Sir Robert Bond has resigned his seat in this House. I have been acquainted with that gentleman for twenty years, and I feel safe in saying that he was a man that both sides of this House and the country generally looked up to with respect. His ability was unquestioned, and I hope that within a few years he will be back here again to give us the benefit of those attainments which were always the admiration of this House.

The question of the price of fish was dealt with at the beginning of this debate, and it was shown by the Prime Minister that the price of fish was entirely governed by the law of supply and demand, and he was surported in that contention by the hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman, who suggested that the position taken by the leader of the Fishermen's Union in that connecton was incorrect. He is a man who has been connected with the business for a number of years and he is so thoroughly acquainted with it that I think we surely ought take him as an authority; and he stated in effect that the Leader of the Fishermen's Union had no more to do with the raising or lowering of the price of fish than had the King of Denmark. I am sure that every member of his Party must have been thoroughly convinced, from what he said, that such is the case, and I also feel that the public at large will now also be convinced that that is the true position. The F. P. U. have no more to do with adjusting the price of fish than I have, and I have nothing whatever to do with it. I would like to remind the Leader of the Fishermen's Union that when there was a strike on the Labrador, amongst the fishermen there, about two years ago last fall, they telegraphed to him asking if it were possible to get a higher price for their fish than was then being offered, and he replied, to Indian Harbor, I think, that he could do nothing for them. The current price on the Labrador that fall was $3.50; they stood out for $4.00; but they did not get $4.00, and Mr. Coaker could do nothing for them. Now, if he could raise the price of fish, why did he not do it then? The result was that the fishermen down there lost confidence in him. He has been putting up a little political bluff during the last few years amongst the northern districts, but he cannot bluff the people all the time.

Now the policy of the Government was founded on the immediate requirements of the fishermen and workmen and I would ask what man has ever achieved in so little time so much for the general good and comfort of these people, more than or even as much as, our Premier. Has not prosperity and content reigned over the Island ever since he took charge of the Government? It seems more than apparent that the criticism of the members of the opposition arises from their unsatisfied desire to get the control of the Government moneys. It must be avowed that there is no member in the House today worthy to be the successor of a man of the calibre of our Premier, for no one has his attainments and ex-

perience. No man ever yet in the history of our Colony issued so daring a manifesto and no man here could have carried it out as has been done, in its fullest detail, as has Sir Edward Morris. He did not gain his position by catch-cries and means that some might term unfair, but by the issuing of a progressive policy which would give the country a dignified position in the doings of the world to-day. Some say he has gone a step too far. He has, they say, been too venturesome in his eager wish to promote the interests of the Colony. Our friend, the hon. member for St. Barbe, signified some years ago by his vote his disapproval of the railway policy. But I question whether he will take that same position to-day. Would the hon. member stand up in this House and support the views and sentiments to which he gave utterance at that time. I know, Mr. Speaker, he will not dare to disapprove of the policy of railroad extension in his own particular district, nor will he condemn as worthless the railway extensions to Fortune, Trepassey or any other branch. Now, if we are really and earnestly to work for the country's welfare we must work in unison. There are many members across this House who are well-wishing and in earnest but it is my belief that they never will sit on the Government side of this House and that they never will have the complete control of the Government moneys they so desire. I believe also that Mr. Dwyer's criticism of the present policy of the Government would vanish if he were offered the position of Professor of Agriculture with a comfortable salary, say of two or three thousand dollars a years. And, moreover no matter what can be said about the present agricultural policy of the Government, it can not be denied that in the district which I have the honor to represent products such as hay, potatoes, &c. have increased in quantity and quality during the past four or five years to an extent of probably fifty per cent. The good effects of this policy may not perhaps reach from one end of the Island to the other but certainly in this part one can see the good benefits that have been derived from its inauguration.

While I am thoroughly in accord with the policy of the Government I would like to see it extended and to embrace the giving of a bonus to people who raise cattle and clear land. We must all recognize the fact that some years ago the granting of bonuses for land-clearing had the effect of extending operations in this country, and while we must admit that the privileges at that time were abused in some instances, we must not blame all those who received bonuses for the faults of the few.

MR. CLAPP gave Notice of Question.

MR. DWYER gave Notice of Question.

MR. STONE gave Notice of Question.

MR. TARGETT gave notice of Question.

MR. HALFYARD gave Notice of Question.

MR. GRIMES gave Notice of Question.

The House then adjourned until Monday at 3 o'clock.

MONDAY, January 26th, 1914.

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from certain of the inhabitants of Middle Cove in the District of St. John's East, asking for a sum of money to repair an agricultural road at that place. I understand this road is of very considerable importance to petitioners and others in that locality in connection

with their farming work. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and would ask that it be referred to the proper department.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the people of Trouty in the Dstrict of Trinity, for a sum of money to build a wharf and deepen the cove there. I am acquainted with this place and have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Canning's Cove, Goose Bay and vicinity, asking that the Government take steps to have the Dundee call there twice weekly, Wednesday going and Monday coming. This matter of the steamer calling at the various places in Goose Bay, Mr. Speaker, is very important and has been brought up before the House in petitions for the past three years. The people of Goose Bay ask that a motor boat be put on there. There are six or seven important settlements there and it is impossible for the Dundee to call at them all. I think if a motor boat were put on there connecting with Brooklyn and the railway, it would be all right. The mail and passenger service by motor boat could be run for a couple of hundred dollars and the Dundee could be used to call at other important places she cannot reach now. If the Government or Reid Newfoundland Co. ever contemplated altering the route of the Dundee it would be a great help if this motor boat were on Goose Bay. I would ask that this petition be referred to the proper department.

I have also a petition from the same places signed by pretty much the same people, asking that telephone connection be given them from Musgravetown. It would be about four miles. The people are isolated and have no communication with the outside world. It would not cost very much to put up four miles of wire. They also ask that a sum of money—$500—be granted to complete the road from Musgravetown. I would ask that these petitions be referred to the proper departments.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Little Heart's Ease asking that a Money Order Office be established there. They have to go about ten miles to get a money order.

They also ask that $600 be granted them to build a wharf and they ask for $200 to repair the road from Little Harbor to St. Jones Without. They also want $150 for repairing a road They also require $100 for repairing Long Bridge Road at the head of Little Hearts Ease.

PAPERS TABLED.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In answer to a question on the Order Paper of January 22nd, I beg to table a statement re Contingencies in the Public Charities Department and Postal Telegraph Department, to Dec. 31, 1913, and also a statement re the travelling expenses of the Government Engineer.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to table the information re the Inland Game and Fisheries Board asked for by Mr. R. J. Winsor, on January 23. Also I beg to table information in answer to the question of Mr. Abbott on January 22nd, re Marine Grants in Bonavista, from 1909 to 1913, and also information in answer to Mr. Grimes' question of January 26th. Some of the returns, however, are not yet in. I also table the information asked for by Mr. Abbott on January 22nd. The answer will be found in these sheets, marked A B and C. The other questions are being prepared.

QUESTIONS.

MR. CLAPP asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House all tenders furnished that department, or any other department. for the carriage of the Winter Mail from Cow Head to Daniel's Harbor, District of St. Barbe, and to whom the contract was awarded.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to lay upon the table the statement asked for.

MR. CLAPP asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House all tenders furnished that department, or any other department, for the carriage of the Winter Mails, and when tenders were called for, from St. Anthony to Quirpon calling at St. Anthony Bight, Big Braha, St. Leonard, Griquet, Noddy Bay, and Quirpon, and to whom the contract was awarded; also, if any order from the Postmaster General was given to M. John Peyton to carry the aforesaid mails this year as he had previously done,and, if so, to lay a copy of said instructions on the table of the House.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to lay upon the table the statement asked for.

MR. DWYER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the amount paid to the purchaser of the farm recently owned by the Government for the keep and maintenance of Government stock, the amount paid to those who cared for the stock, the names of the men employed there, and the amount paid to each, and if any man or men are still employed there now and paid by the Department of Agriculture and Mines, and in what capacity.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER.—The answer is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House copies of returns for special and local grants expended at New Perlican, in the Dstrict of Trinity, for the years 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—The statement is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the amounts paid by his department for printing each year from 1909 to 1913.

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

MR. STONE asked the Minister of of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of (a) Contingencies account for 1912 and 1913; (b) statement of expenditures under heading of General Lighthouses, General Repairs, and Up-keeping Lighthouses; (c) also, statement of expenditures under heading Vote for Fiona, travelling expenses of his department, lobster labels, cold storage for bait, enforcement of bait laws, propagation of lobsters, bonus for shipbuilding, for the years 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The statement is being prepared.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Minister of Justice to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the amounts paid by his department for printing each year from 1909 to 1913.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to lay upon the table of the House the information asked for.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement showing the amount paid by his department for printing each year from 1909 to 1913.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to table the statement asked for.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table

of the House a statement showing, in detail, all amounts paid or allocated in the District of Port de Grave out of the ordinary, special and surplus trust grants, from February 1st, 1913, to date, giving in each case names of the parties and purposes of each payment, also a copy of the returns of each such payment.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—The statement is being prepared.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fsheries to lay upon the table of the House, a statement showing in detail all amounts paid or allocated in the District of Port de Grave out of the ordinary, special and surplus trust grants from February 1st, 1913, to date, giving in each case name of the parties and purposes of each payment, also a copy of the returns of each such payment.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The statement asked for is being prepared.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege when the House last adjourned of making a few references to the objections raised by my hon. friends opposite to the policies of the Government and the question on which I was then speaking was the Agricultural policy. It seems to me that the gentlemen opposite have failed to prove in spite of their many references to it that the policy is a failure. They have failed in this as they have failed in proving that the price of fish was raised by the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker.

I listened with much pleasure to my hon. friend, Mr. Hickman, when he dealt with the possibility of raising an industry in cranberries in the Colony. The hon. gentleman's speech was very interesting and he certainly showed the House that he had a very intimate knowledge of this industry. I hope something will be done in this direction, for many of our people are in the habit of going on berry-picking excursions and an industry of this kind might help to increase their efforts and give employment to some of our young people that will be healthy as well as paying. In the East End of St. Johns there are vast fields of partridge berries and thousands of gallons are allowed to perish every year. Members must be indebted to the hon. member for Bay de Verde for his intersting and instructive speech. Those on this side were disappointed, of course, when he defeated our friend, Mr. Whiteway, a gentleman who has no superior in the Colony and who represented his district faithfully and well, but it is pleasing to know that in the new member for that district there is one who is well informed in the industries of the Colony and who is not afraid to give his opinion. This was shown in the debate a day or two ago when the hon. gentleman proved conclusively that the price of fish was fixed by supply and demand.

He has impressed strongly upon our minds the fact that the price of fish was not raised by my friend, Mr. Coaker, who has claimed the credit for raising the price. I am not sorry to see the hon. member for Bonavista in the House, for he is in his proper place. If the hon. gentleman had seen me previous to the election I would have given him very good advice and he would not have opposed the policy of the Government, which is a progressive policy for all the people and not for one class only. I differ with my hon. friend when he includes in his party one industry only and not others. Were he to devote his energy towards the betterment of all classes he would have more support than he now has, for now he can-

not expect to receive the support of many workers because his policy does not include them.

I see a vacant chair in the Opposition seats and I am reminded that my hon. friend, Mr. Dwyer, was very strong in his attack on the agricultural policy of the Government and in his remarks he stated that the people of the island were against the policy. Other gentlemen opposite have said the same but, as a matter of fact, the people have banded themselves into agricultural societies all over the island and many reports have been sent to the Department of Agriculture expressing the gratitude of the people for the work that the Government has done in this connection. In spite of this fact, the Opposition members have stated one after the other that the policy was not a good one but in doing this they have merely acted as they have done in other matters, that is to follow their leaders blindly and to criticize without suggesting any remedy that will improve the present condition of affairs.

My hon. friend referred to the Commissioners as men who were paid for their work and that for that reasou they were compelled to speak in favour of the policy. That is not correct for I shall read a few extracts from reports from different districts, which will prove that the people are in favour of it also. (Here the hon. member read extracts from several reports of agicultual societies, showing the satisfactoy state of agriculture in their districts.)

Such a game of bluff as Mr. Coaker's policy of taking the credit to himself for raising the price of fish and lowering the price of coal will surely come to an end. Mr. Coaker is not known yet to the people of this country. The hon. gentleman went in the political fight behind closed doors. He told everybody that, if they did not vote for him and his policy, dire things would happen to them. I contend, sir, that, when the people of Bonavista Bay find out the game of bluff that he is playing on them, he will run as hastily from Bonavista as did Napoleon from Waterloo. His policy is really a game of bluff. What right has he, sir, to come to my district and tell these people that he is interested in their welfare; and that he is going to remove, as he stated in his Advocate, the capital from St. John's to Catalina, Port Rexton, Trinity or Bonavista. What right has he got to do that? Does the hon. member who has a few fishermen of the north backing him, think that the people of this section will have nothing to say to this? No, sir, we, the people of this locality will not allow Mr. Coaker, the President of the F.P.U. to dictate to us; I think, sir, we will have a say in that matter when the proper time comes. I think, sir, that when Mr. Hickman. the respected member for Bay de Verde, begins to consider this question closely, he will agree with us to the extent of walking across the floor of the House. I think that we will have no more of that kind of nonsense. St. John's is the capital, and it will remain so.

The question, Mr. Speaker, of who raised the price of fish and who lowered the price of coal is settled for all time. The hon. member, Mr. Hickman who knows what he is talking about settled the question when he stated that the law of supply and demand controlled the prices of fish and of coal.

I am going to read a few extracts from the agricultural reports for the past year, from the districts that these gentlemen represent. I wish to call Mr. Stone's attention to this fact sir, that at St. Brendan's sheep have in-

creased 50% and potatoes yielded 12 barrels to the barrel. The Channel Society reports that sheep have increased about 45%. St. Mary's Society reports that potatoes yielded 15 barrels to the barrel. A large quantity was kept for seed and the birth of about 100 calves showed the improved breed of bulls introduced by the Agricultural Board—an increase of nearly 30%. This is in answer to the question asked a short while ago by Mr. Jennings and Dr. Lloyd. Musgrave Town says horned cattle have increased about 20% during the last five years. My own district says that sheep have increased 50%. The seeds obtained from the Agricultural Board this year were the best ever used here, as the results obtained from the agricultural exhibition at Harbour Main show. Yet, those opposed to the Government say that it is doing no good and that its agricultural polcy is a failure. We will now continue. One gentleman says the potatoes are the best he has had in his life and that 15 barrels to the barrel have been raised, on account of all this magnificent seed that the Board has sent out to the country. Then we will go on to a settlement in Bonavista Bay whose society says that the number of sheep has largely increased, that the Society intends spending cash on sheep and that potatoes yielded 32 barrels to the barrel. I will ask any commonsense man in the audience for an opinion, and yet my worthy friends opposite will stand up there in their places and condemn the agricultural policy. I hope now, Mr. Speaker, that the members on the other side of the House are convinced that the agricultural societies have been doing some good in this country.

My hon. friend, Mr. Stone, referred to the agricultural policy of the Government. Well, sir, what better policy could you have than the distribution of good breeds of cattle and good seed throughout the Colony. The F. P.U. ask for money to be expended on motor engines. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to see every fisherman in the Island provided with a motor boat. But, sir, this Government is not prepared to drop its agricultural policy.

The hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, the Leader and President of the F. P. U. laid claim the other day to the credit of raising the price of fish. What nonsense, sir. No individual had anything to do with it. Mr. Hickman told us the other day that the price of fish is regulated by the law of supply and demand and Mr. Hickman is a man well able to judge. And I challenge Mr. Coaker to disprove Mr. Hickman's statement. Mr. Coaker's statement was nothing but a continuation of his campaign to try and get on this side of the House and control the Government. But this plan will fail as it failed in the election. The present Government under the able leadership of Sir Edward Morris was sustained. To his policy and to his leadership we are indebted for the present stable Government Find his equal if you can. You cannot find his superior in this country. He stated his policy to the country and the country endorsed it. He will carry out that policy as he has done in the past.. And the idea that Mr. Coaker has that he will some day be a leader of the Government is absurd. The people would not stand for it. I see my friend Mr. Clapp is chafing in his place. I imagine that he is going to make a speech and I am very much afraid he is going to wipe up the floors with me. Well, sir, I would ask him to explain how it was that he voted against the railway policy of the present Government when it included the branch to Bonne Bay. He voted against it but the Government

is nevertheless determined to build it They have embarked on a policy of developing the resources of the Colony and they will carry it out despite Mr. Clapp's wishes. Reference has been made to my worthy friends Messrs. Downey and Devereaux, in connection with the agricultural policy of the Government, and it was stated that they were holding on to their jobs for the sake of the money they were making out of it. Well,all I would say is, miserable pay it is. Ask any of the gentlemen who held departmental offices under the late administration how much money they succeeded in saving out of it. It must be remembered that if a member of the Government received two or three thousand dollars a year, he has got to give a considerable portion of it back again. He must subscribe to all kinds of public functions and to all kinds of private charities, and at the end of the year he will find that if he can make ends meet it is as much as he can do.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to occupy the time of the House as long as the last speaker. He said at the beginning that he was going to make a short speech. Well, all I have to say is, Providence protect us from a long speech.

With regard to this agricultural policy that has been so much discussed, the hon. member interested us by reading some extracts to convince us over here on this side of the House of the good effects of that policy. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that during the past three years I have mixed around with the people of my district more than possibly any other man in that neighborhod. I never gave any particular attention to criticising this particular policy, but I want to say that I have never heard one word spoken in support of it. It may be said: Well, possibly, you did not get up against the right people. Well, perhaps I did not meet the few who may have benefitted something from this policy,but I do wish to say this, that personally I have never seen an agricultural seed potato and never saw an agricultural animal of any kind in the district except one bull, and that was a very poor animal indeed and not worth anything. I heard of one man who received a quart of agricultural potatoes two years ago, and I heard of another man who received a pint last year, and it can be understood from that that there was not a great deal of potatoes raised in Twillingate district last year from seed received as a result of this agricultural policy; and if this policy is the success which the Government claim it is, then the district of Twillingate has not been treated fairly and has not received its share. Now, in the district of Twillingate practically every man raises his own potatoes, and if I might be allowed to make a few suggestions with regard to what could be done to help the people out, I would like to say that the greatest trouble that the people who raise that kind of vegetable is up against is rot. They can raise the potatoes alright but they are unable to keep them afterwards, and if the agricultural society would do something for the people on that point and teach them how to keep the potatoes after they have raised them, then they would be doing something which is really worth while. As far as other seeds are concerned, I did hear of a woman who was short of seed calling upon the agricultural society to get some turnip seed. They said, alright, they would give her some seed. They gave her a thimbleful; but the trouble was that when it grew up and she went to plant it she found that it was called cattle-feed. Now, that was not a very good recommendation for

agricultural seed. Now, those gentlemen who are more especially concerned with the agricultural policy, stated that there has been an increase of 90 per cent. since the year 1908 in the growth of potatoes. I would like to tell them that that increase has not taken place in the district of Twillingate, wherever else it has been done.

I will pass on from that to something else which has been discussed more or less in this debate, one side of which seems to me to have been entirely overlooked. I refer to the duty taken off the articles chiefly used by the fishermen. I was under the impression that every man, woman and child in this country used to some extent flour, sugar, tea and possibly a certain amount ot meat, so that the fishermen were not the only ones who benefitted by the duty being taken off those articles. Everyone in the country benefitted by it, and I don't think there is any justification for throwing it all over on the fishermen. A remark was made by the Minister of Finance, I think, in defence ot what had been done by the Government in that direction, and he said something to this effect: That thirty years ago there was a greater duty collected on Indian Meal brought into the country and given out by the Government to support the poor, than there was on flour. Now, I would like to see the figures in proof of that. I question that statement. I can personally remember quite distinctly 45 years ago, and very distinctly 30 years ago, but I cannot remember any such condition as that to which he refers existing. It did not exist where I was born and bred. I never saw but one family in my life using Indian Meal as an article of food. I have seen people buy it for pigs, but not to use themselves—especially receiving it as poor relief from the Government; and I say that it is an insult to the people of the country to make such a statement unless it is proved.

There is another point that has been referred to a good deal that I would like to touch on—regarding the Union and the price of fish. A great deal of stock has been taken in what Mr. Hickman said, that supply and demand have been the chief factors in raising the price of fish. Now it might be no harm for me to use another quotation, that competition is the life of trade. The Union has come into this country as a competitor in trade, and I am perfectly satisfied that it has had an effect upon the trade of the country. Two years ago, in Twillingate district, they were paying from fifty cents to a dollar more for fish than was being offered in St. John's, and the reason was there were independent competitors in that Bay, and those who wanted the fish had to pay the higher price for it. The result was that the merchants here sent out circulars to that part of the country offering, as I have said, from fifty cents to a dollar a quintal more than was being offered here in St. John's. Another thing with regard to supply and demand is that a great deal of incorrect information is telegraphed over this country with regard to the catch of fish. The year before last about 10 per cent. of the traps down in Twillingate did very well with the fish in the early season. News was telegraphed all over the country that there was fish in heaps down in that part of the country and that the fishermen down there were doing all they wanted, while as a matter of fact 90 per cent. of the traps were doing nothing. The persons who send the information do not take the trouble to make certain that it is correct, and, of course, the people interested are guided by it. Now, Mr

Coaker, as President of the Union, is in a position to get exact information from his Councils. He knows exactly what every harbor gets, and he is in a better position to know just what fish is likely to be on the market than any merchant in St. John's. His sources of information are correct and he can depend upon them. There is another thing in relation to the fixing of the price of fish that I would like to know about. Who is it that fixes the price of flour? I understand that it is the farmers up in Canada. The flour mills do not come to the trade and ask what price they are giving for flour; they say: Flour will sell this year at such a price; and that is the price which they get. Now, why cannot we stand in the same position with regard to the price of fish? Instead of asking the foreign markets what price they are paying why not we fix the price here?

I will pass on now to something which probably the members on the Government side think we know nothing about—the railway policy. I think the opinion of every conscientious man in the country is that we cannot afford to build branch railways. Their usefulness cannot be questioned, but the expenditure is more than the country can afford. We should realize the fact that there are only a handful of people in this country—a mere quarter of a million and then look at the tremendous expenditure of money. Where is it coming from and how is it going to be paid? The people cannot bear a great deal more taxation, and if the building of those branch railways means increased taxation, then we are up against a difficult proposition. If it is possible to build them without increased taxation, then it is alright, and the railways will be a big advantage, but I understood from one who is admitted to be one of the leading authorities in the country on these questions—the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond—that the time is coming when those tremendous loans are to be called in and when the country will be called upon to pay back this borrowed money. If that is so, it is going to be a big proposition. I don't think that we should undertake responsibilities which will mean heavy burdens on those who will come after us. But we shall probably hear more about this matter when it is being discussed later on.

I don't want to occupy the time of this House unnecessarily, but I think it would be cowardice on my part not to stand up and resent the insult to the fishermen of the North—of whom I am one—which was offered here a few days ago, and I want to say that the words used were unworthy of the man who uttered them and a discredit to him, and they will be remembered long after the six feet of earth that he will occupy will be forgotten; and I am sorry that I shall have to go back to the district of Twillingate and tell the people there that in the Parliament that they regard as a sacred place I had to listen to insults thrown across the House by men occupying responsible positions in the country—statements that I never expected to hear here, and which I hope I have heard for the last time. As far as the position that I am occupying and the policy and the man that I am supporting is concerned, I will tell you what I told him, and that is that I will follow him as long as I consider he is right, and when I think he is not right he need rely on me no further. Mr. Coaker has known me for three years in his councils, and when he and the district of Twillingate asked me to be their representative they knew what kind of man they were asking. Mr. Coaker knew that he could not lead me by the nose.

And I will say this with regard to W. F. Coaker ,that there never was a man who gave more attention to the advice of his Councils than he does.

MR. KENNEDY.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks before this debate is brought to an end. In the first place I would like to con gratulate you, sir, upon the exalted position which you have attained as the first commoner in the land. I have been intimately acquainted with you for a number of years, and I know that this House has made no mistake in its choice, for I feel confident that in your decision will uphold the great traditions atached to your office. While I extend to you my congratulations, sir, I regret to see the place on the other side of the House formerly occupied by Sir Robert Bond not now filled by that gentleman, for although there were times when we did not see eye to eye with each other still I think that the country has suffered a great loss by reason of his resignation. We are now passing through an era in the history of this Colony when the absence from this House of a gentleman whose ripe experience and longstanding acquaintance with the conduct of public matters cannot but be regretted by everyone. With regard to the policy of the present Premier it must not be forgotten that when he issued his manifesto five years ago, there were very few who had faith in his ability to carry out that policy but time has proved that the people acted wisely in selecting him as the head of the Government. At that time things generally were stagnant and suffering from dry rot, and it required a man with the determination and ability of Sir Edward Morris to bring about the prosperity which has been in vogue during the past four years. The Govenment led by Sir Robert Bond had been in power for nine years and during that time notwithstanding the fact that large revenues were collected, not one mile of railway was built or any public works of any magnitude inaugurated and carried on. Our people to a large extent had abandoned the fisheries, and were obliged to leave the country to work in the Sydney mines and elsewhere away from home. When the present Premier had issued his Manifesto and disclosed his policy to the country, one of the greatest financiers in our land had tried to show by facts and figures that it could not be carried out without heavily burdening the people with oppressive taxation; but what was the result? Not only did he not increase taxation but he brought about such a condition of affairs that the fishing and labouring classes of the country could now partake of a free breakfast. But this is not all, for the carrying out of the policy of the present Government has meant that people are receiving higher wages for their work, and that labour is now at such a premium that employers find it hard to get men for their factories and other businesses. Owing to the carrying out of that policy many people to-day have gold in their pockets, and prosperity generally abounds. What a contrast is the present time to a period some years ago when many of our people, owing to lack of energy of the Government of the day, were obliged to feed on meal and molasses. I trust that such a condition of affairs will never occur again. I am sure it never will occur while Sir Edward Morris is at the head of affairs. It has occurred to me during this debate that there is one very serious question affecting the minds of hon. members and that is, "who put up the price of fish?" And this reminds me of the question asked by everyone a few years ago, "Who

stopped the Sunday gun?" I am afraid that we cannot fully determine who or what was responsible for present price of fish. I do not say that the hon. member Mr. Coaker had nothing to do with it; he may have contributed to some extent to bringing it about, but the remarks of the hon. member Mr. Hickman, made the other evening, cannot be passed idly by. That hon. member had given us facts and figures which showed that the present price was largely brought about by the law of supply and demand. The business of this country is not conducted at present as it was thirty years ago for conditions generally have largely changed, and are changing, and whilst good wages were now given in the operations of other industries, the fishermen if they could not obtain a good price for their product would seek employment in other branches of life. Since this debate began we have heard a great deal about the agricultural policy of the Government, and it is only reasonable that some hon. members on the other side of the House do not see eye to eye with the Government in this connection. By this agricultural policy new life and new energy has been instilled into farming operations, and if the hon. Premier did not make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, he did something in the matter of giving agriculture a progressive movement. I extend a hearty welcome to our friends on the other side of the House and especially to those sitting on the back row, who say that they came from what is known as the bone and sinew of the country. If some unkind words were spoken during this debate I feel sure that nothing serious was meant. We often say things in the heat of debate which we would not give utterance to in our calmer moments. I am glad that the fishermen are so ably represented in this House, and I feel sure that when those hon. members return to their respective districts they will tell their people that Sir Edward Morris and his policy were not so bad after all. I am sure that some of those hon. members are honest enough to say that. The hon. member Mr. Coaker made a remark here the other day that if he had been here at the time the Railway bill was before the House he would not have voted for the Trepassey branch, although he would have voted for the other branches. Why should the hon. member single out that particular branch line for his opposition? Surely the people living between St. John's and Trepassey are just as much entitled to railway facilities as the people of Bonavista or Trinity. Are they not paying the same taxes as the people living in the northern bays and why should they not receive the same consideration? Does the hon. member for Bonavista mean to say that if the time should arrive when he would find himself in control of this House that he would withhold from any particular section of the country that which was its due? I should be very sorry to keep from Bonavista or any other place any advantage of a public nature. During the past campaign we heard of a great deal of catch-cries being used in different districts, but I can assure this House that the election in St. John's West was won on matters of principle

and policy which were put before the people, and they gave their decision accordingly. There were no catch-cries indulged in in that district. I am sorry that the hon. member Mr. Coaker so far forgot himself as to state that he would penalize any one section of our country if he had the opportunity. I trust that at some future date the hon. member will regret having made such a statement and will take his words back. Probably it was only a slip of the tongue on his part, for I believe the hon. member has a good heart but was carried away at the moment he gave utterance to such an expression. I am here as a workingman and will always favour a policy which will have as its object the benefitting of all classes of our people. The hon. member for Harbour Main, Mr. Woodford was accused to-day of dealing in personalities, but I feel sure that hon. members will take his remarks in good part for that gentleman is incapable of saying any unkind words to any hon. member of this House.

MR. GRIMES.—I have been listening with much attention to the remarks made by the hon. member for St. John's West, in which he referred to the great things done by the present Government, and I must say I do not altogether agree with some of the remarks of the hon. members on the other side of the House in regard to the railway policy adopted. I do not think they have produced all the benefits to which they lay claim. Has the hon. member a very thorough acquaintance with the existing conditions of the management of the railroads? Had the hon. member been working on the railroads he would have seen that actual state of affairs is somewhat different to the account given by the members of the Government in this House this session. I myself have been on the Trepassey line and am cognisant with the actual conditions on that particular branch line. The men are paid one dollar and fifty cents a day. This is a very good wage on the face of it. I notice, however, that the members of the Government do not state that the price of food-stuffs on that line is so much higher than the price of food-stuffs in the shops on Water Street that in its practical effect the daily wage of one dollar and fifty cents really amounts to about one dollar. And again what has the Government really done with regard to the Old Age Pensions? It is true they made a step forward in this direction but how much they might have added to the little they did. How few of the promises made in this direction did they ever succeed in fully carrying out. They were armed with the largest revenue the country has yet produced and with this they could easily have provided the old women and wives of the fishermen with a small sum each year. But it is to be said to their disgrace that this one thing they utterly neglected to do. I fear if the truth must be told they did more for the Reid Newfoundland Co. than for any fisherman during their five years' tenure of office. The hon. member who has just sat down referred to the fact that people were so well off nowadays that nearly every fisherman had gold in his pockets. I have no hesitation in saying that this statement is not borne out by facts. How many people were fed here by charitable organizations such as the St. Vincent de Paul and the Salvation Army this winer. Did the number not amount to nearly three thousand people and is this fact alone not a contradiction to the statement that the hon. member made when he stated that nearly every fisherman had gold in his pockets. Mr. Coaker had brought

about such a condition of things that he was able to control the local market to such an extent that the fishermen could obtain from thirty to eighty cents more for their products. The hon. member for Harbour Grace said the other day that the increases in the number of codtraps in Conception Bay had had something to do in increasing the present price of fish and he tried to make it appear that that was the only reason for the present price. I can tell the hon. member that when fish was $5.50 in Conception Bay the fishermen got $6.20 and $6.80 for it by taking the advice of Mr. Coaker. At that time the fishermen were going to sell it at $5.50 but they were advised by the President of the Union to hold on, the happy result being that they afterwards got $6.20 to $6.80 a quintal. The same principle exists with regard to the wheat growers and cotton growers in other countries, they were in the same condition as our fishermen were until the Union was formed, but now those growers have their dfferent unions with the result that they obtain a good price for their products. And with regard to the increase in the price of fish. Now whether Coaker had or had not anything to do with this can be judged from the facts as they stand. In spite of the fact that the hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman made a very able statement endeavouring to prove the price of fish to be resultant upon supply and demand, you will find that Mr. Hickman will stand by and support the statements made by Mr. Coaker. The hon. member's statement is true as far as the foreign markets are concerned, and I believe it was on the subjects of foreign markets that Mr. Hickman was talking. The hon. member, Mr. Moore said the other day that certain persons had turned the hon. member, Mr. Coaker's picture to the wall. In answer to that I must quote the remark of a friend of mine to whom I told this story that we will always find a certain section of the electors who cannot look au honest man in the face. Mr. Woodford also remarked that if it had been in the hon. member, Mr. Coaker's power to raise the price of fish why had he not availed hmself of his ability wth regard to Labrador. Well, I may say in reply that as yet the Union does not extend to the Labrador coast but there is no doubt that it will in time. There is still a great deal of scope for it in this Island ,as unions are not settled in every district yet. The hon. member, Mr. Cashin has asked the question that if the hon. member Mr. Coaker had increased the price of fish why had he not put down the price of flour. This is a reasonable question and the answer is that the President of the Union did put down the price of flour and I am prepared to prove to the hon. member that the price of flour has decreased in the outports by the efforts of the Union to the extent of eighty cents a barrel and not only flour but also molasses has also decreased in price. Every citizen knows that the Union has been the means of reducing the price of coal by eighty cents a ton.

With regards to the much discussed Agricultural Policy. I confess I do not know a great deal about this subject but I have been making enquiries in the district which I represent and could only find a very few who had any thing favourable to say about the matter. Those who had cattle received a few articles free of cost but the benefits of these donations do not amount to much, as they were only advantageous to the few in particular. The Societies gave little or no encouragement to those who tried to gain a livelihood by agriculture. The new interest in agriculture

arises more from the benefits attendant on the opening of the Grand Falls paper mill and the working of the mines at Bell Island than from any direct good act of this Agricultural Policy. Some people got a quart or a pint of seed but what does this amount to? And it is the conviction of most of the fishermen of this Island that the whole matter caused useless expenditure and was devoid of any justifiable good. I believe that the agricultural exhibition was an election dodge. Whether it was right or wrong I cannot say; but it was wrong to carry on such an exhibition. The reason was plain. The hon. member, Mr. Devereaux also made some remarks in reference to what has been said by the Leader of the F. P. U. with regard to the interests of the poorer classes of this country. I am surprised at his speaking in such a manner because I did not think the gentleman could be sincere. What do we mean by poor? We mean by poor people those who lack the comforts and necessaries of life, and there are thousands of such in this country to-day. I am not going to say that all these people are lazy, for there are some who are industrious.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House very long. I shall confine myself to remarks which concern my own district. On the question paper I gave notice on Friday to ask the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House the tenders furnished for the carriage of mails in the winter from Cow Head to Daniel's Harbour. I have here the reply. "The following tenders were received," but no figures were laid on the table. Now, sir, I stand here an Opposition member, who is practically helpless in the discharge of his duty to his country. My hands are tied. For the past five years I have been trying to get improvements made in the condition of my district and I can get no information from heads of departments. If I am not to have the information I want for my constituents, then I had better not represent them at all. I am told that instructions have been given to give no information to Opposition members. I bring this matter before the House. This man Samuel Payne had been carrying the mail from Cow Head to Daniel's Harbour for 12 years. I made enquiries from the officials at the post office and asked whether the man had before done his duties faithfully, or what was the reason why he had been dismissed. His tender was smaller than that of the man who has been awarded the contract. There was no fault to find with him; but evidently for political purposes the job was given to Norman Payne. That man, Samuel Payne, had done his duty all through the summer and had kept his dogs to be ready for the winter and now for political purposes he is turned out in the street. Is that fair? The people say it is not. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that all tenders be placed upon the table of this House.

I have been furnished by the Colonial Secretary with the information in reply to my second question of today. Tenders were called for to carry the mails from St. Anthony to Quirpon, including St. Anthony Bight, Big Braha, St. Leonard, Griquet, Noddy Bay and Quirpon. Contract was awarded to Henry Weir. I have just received a letter from John Peyton in which he states that he had instructions from the Postmaster General on Nov. 18th last, to carry the mails as formerly. I have his letter of the 10th inst and note that his services have not been continued. That man was instructed by the Postmaster General on the 18th of November to resume the carrying of

the mails and to carry it on through the winter months as is shown in this information. Why was this man thrown over? Because he voted against the defeated Government candidate is the real reason. I have here the letter of the Postmaster General giving the contract to John Peyton.

Now, sir, I will say a few words as regards the agricultural policy of the Government. No one will say that such a policy should not be inaugurated. But the $40,000 of the grant is gone—every cent of it The Commissioners have no doubt received their quota. Now you have to come and ask for more. In all only $89.33 was allocated for the district of St. Barbe with a population of about 10,000 people and a coast line of 600 miles. Harbour Grace with a population of only 5,000 people, received $200 from the Grant.

I move on to the Bonne Bay line. I have been accused of having voted against the Bonne Bay Branch railway line. I did not; I voted against branch railways as a whole and I gave my reasons for voting against the five branch lines because they entailed such an enormous outlay upon the country. The Premier said they could all be built and equipped for four millions, and now they have cost six millions and are not finished yet. The people know I did not vote against a line to Bonne Bay, and they have showed it by sending me here again. When is the Bonne Bay line to be begun? Why was the line to Bay de Verde touched before the Bonne Bay line? Why should Bonne Bay be left to the last? It had just as much right to be first as the Trepassey or any other branch. I was always in favour of the branch lines. But my reason was the same as Sir R. Bond gave, that these branches would require a very large outlay of money. You would have to borrow more money to continue these branches. I ask whether it's the Government's intention to start work on this branch line to Bonne Bay this summer. Remember that by the contract you are bound to construct 50 miles of railway every year. As to the projected car ferry service, I notice there is a change in the route. The old route touched Bonne Bay and if it was ever carried out it would have been a great advantage to the people of Bonne Bay. The cold storage service would have meant a lot of money to these people.

It is well known that our lobster catch has been falling off very much, but the increased price obtained has to some extent made up the leeway. Some time ago the Premier introduced his scheme for the propagation of lobsters and foreshadowed great results from it. Now I made some enquiries in St. Barbe District, and I found that as soon as the young fry were in the hatchery the surge of the sea used to throw them up on the beach and there they were eaten by the hawks and crows. Eyewitnesses related this, and said the game was not worth the candle. If the thing is to be done at all, vote the money and do it properly. Do not do things by halves.

In 1911 I presented petitions here asking for the abolition of the single lobster pot. These pots are set in among the ledges and they catch the female lobsters; and I am told that until you forbid the use of single lobster pots you will never save the female lobsters.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate you on the high office to which you have been elected, an office to which I am sure you will do credit. I should like also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply upon their able and interesting speeches and the new

members of the House upon the excellent showing they have made at the beginning of their parliamentary careers.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, in commencing I must follow the example of those who have spoken before me and congratulate you upon your election. I am sure that you will do what is right and fair by both sides of the House.

We have heard a good deal since we came here about what the Government have done in the past five years. It would be a poor Government that did nothing, and we do not say they have not done some good. But they have spent too much upon it. There are the branch railways which we heard were going to cost four million dollars and now they have cost six millions and they are not finshed yet.

It being now half past six the debate was adjourned until to-morrow. On motion the remaining items on the Order of the Day were deferred.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY said in reply to a question of Mr. Abbott as to amounts paid fire sufferers, the statement would be found in the public accounts, which were on the table, under the head of Forest Fires.

MR. KENT asked when the Minister of Finance and Customs would reply to his questions of the 20th, 22nd, and 23rd.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS tabled a portion of the answers and said that the rest were in preparation.

MR. GRIMES gave notice of question.

On motion the House then adjourned till to-morrow at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

TUESDAY, Jan. 27th, 1914.

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Since we adjourned yesterday two citizens prominently identified with the public life of the Colony, have passed away, Hon. J. S. Pitts and Judge Prowse. Mr. Pitts' passing was not unexpected. During the past few days his condition has been critical, and we knew it was only a matter of a few days at the most when the final call would come. In the case of Judge Prowse, though he had reached a ripe old age, his death has come suddenly and unexpectedly. Both gentlemen have been members of this Legislature. Mr. Pitts was never a member of this branch, but for years was a prominent member of the Legislative Council and on many occasions took a leading and prominent part in the work of that Chamber. In addition he was for several years a member of various administrations. He was not exactly a strong party politician, as a matter of fact I think he was a member of cabinets representing divergent views, and supported a man or policy only if that man or policy commended themselves to him. He was a member of the Legislative Council from 1884 to 1894 and again from 1898 till his death. As a private citizen he was engaged nearly all this life in commercial work and in that sphere he amassed a very large fortune. This was due largely if not altogether to his great industry and attention to detail as well as to the fine intelligence and judgment he displayed in the many matters of business that filled his career. Only a few years ago he was honoured by his Sovereign, by being created a companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George,—a mark of respect not only to himself, but to the peo-

ple of the country as well. In 1908 he represented this country at the Quebec tercentenary. As a citizen he was held in very great esteem. He held a prominent place in the commercial life of the city, and was largely interested in its industries. Any scheme which commended itself he was always ready to assist, and in that way he did a great deal in promoting and building up local concerns. It is also well known that he was a director of the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company and their agent in this Colony. While he was not the founder of the Ropewalk he was one of the promotors of that company. He had a large interest in the Newfoundland Boot and Shoe Company and he was one of the principal members of the Electric Light Company that had the first contract of lighting the city. He was also a large shareholder in the Imperial Tobacco Company and in many other local concerns; in fact, in any enterprise that commended itself to him he was always ready to invest his money and in that way he did a great deal to work up the local industries and give labour to our people. In the church and school work of the body with which he was identified he was a large and consistent supporter, and his loss will be very generally mourned. In the great sorrow at his passing this Legislature joins, and desires to express its sympathy with his widow and relatives. In Judge Prowse an interesting character has passed away. Born in 1834 he had just entered on his 80th year. He was a man of wonderful enterprise, and was identified at one time or another with every part of the country's life. He was admitted to the Bar in 1859, represented the district of Burgeo from 1861 to 1869, and in the latter year was appointed to the bench as a district judge, which position he held till 1898, when he was pensioned. But it is not as a lawyer or a politician or a judge that he will be remembered, but as the Historian of Newfoundland. In 1895 he brought out his first history, which was an interesting and convincing compilation of records and facts dealing with the story of this country from earliest times up to the present. It contained a mine of information, which will become more valuable as the years go by. The London "Times", perhaps the greatest authority in matters of this kind, stated that he had added another chapter to the History of the British Empire. Not alone did he help to make Newfoundland known by his history, but by his Guide Book, by his continual correspondence and by his magazine articles and contributions to the Press generally he did much for Newfoundland by giving the outside world her history and by placing her claims before them. This was not the Judge's only work. While on the Bench, he compiled a work which is known as Prowse's Manual, a compendium of local laws for the use of magistrates and Justices of the Peace. He was also identified with the carrying out of the Bait Act, in which he engaged with characteristic energy. His principal characteristic was a profound affection for his family, in whose sorrow now every one will share. I beg to move the following resolutions:—

RESOLVED—That this House desires to express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. J. S. Pitts, C.M.G., who for many years was a member of the Legislature of the Colony, and for some time a member of the Government of the Colony; and that, out of respect to his memory, this House do now adjourn.

RESOLVED—That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to his bereaved widow and family.

RESOLVED—That this House desires to express its deep regret at the death of D. W. Prowse, Esq., K.C., C.M.G., who for many years was a member of this branch of the Legislature, and that out of respect to his memory this House do now adjourn.

RESOLVED—That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to his bereaved widow and family.

MR. KENT desired to join with the Premier in the resolutions just proposed, and in the expressions of regret at the death of Hon. J. S. Pitts and Judge Prowse. As the Premier has said, the death of Mr. Pitts does not come with the same shock as that of Mr. Prowse, as the former was not as active during the past few months as formerly, and it was very generally known the end was not far off, whereas Judge Prowse up to to-day was as active as usual, and citizens thought he was about as usual when the news came of his death. Both men are a decided loss to the whole community. Mr. Pitts was one of those men who in everything he undertook was thorough, a man of sound judgment, ripe experience and great industry, also of great integrity and singleness of purpose. He took a prominent part in the public, commercial and industrial life of the Colony. In his public life he has been for years a member of the Upper House and was in several administrations a member of the Executive Council. I, myself, have had the privilege of sitting with him for a short while as a member of the Executive, and there had an opportunity of recognizing his sterling worth, his very clear vision, ripe judgment and sound sense. In the commercial world he was also a prominent figure. As a promoter of industry he was one of the men who had turned the money earned by labour to profit not only to himself, but to the whole community by investing in local concerns whereby the people of St. John's have benefitted. The success of many of the industrial concerns in this Island is largely due to the interest which the late Mr. Pitts took in them. He also took a prominent place in matters connected with the church with which he was identified, and its institutions received valuable support from hm. In all things that he undertook,he was very thorough and cannot but be a decided loss to the whole community.

The death of Judge Prowse removes from amongst us one who was a historic figure, not only in the sense that he has written history, but that he was one of those men who had some of the characteristics of those whose name and works will be remembered more by those who will come after them than by those of their own time. I believe that Judge Prowse will be most appreciated by generations yet unborn. His great historical work which stands perhaps unique as a monument of facts and records will be the storehouse from which future historians will gather their facts to make history interesting to their readers. The work that Judge Prowse has accomplished is that he has compiled the materials upon which others may build interesting history. Judge Prowse in his day occupied a prominent position in this House for 8 years. Long before most of the present members were born, he was here fulfilling his duty as a representative of the people. One of the most interesting things that could happen to one was of recent years to meet Judge Prowse and hear him recount some of the anecdotes and stories of the conditions that prevailed in this Legislature during the political life of his time. He was always interesting, and was liked by everyone with whom he came

in contact. In recent years, he has kept in touch with public affairs in order to perform his duties as a representative of the foreign press.

I think that we shall all miss these two gentlemen. They both in their day performed their work as men and as citizens here in this world faithfully and well. They have now passed to another world to be rewarded for the life which they have led and I feel sure that, when both of them are called upon to answer for their lives here, they will be able to render a good account of the stewardship of what was entrusted to them.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the Resolutions which have been proposed by the Rt. hon. the Prime Minister.

The Resolutions being passed unanimously, the House adjourned until to-morrow at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

WEDNESDAY, Jan. 28th, 1914.

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

PAPERS TABLED.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS laid upon the table of the House answers to questions of Messrs. Coaker, Kent, Clift, of various dates.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS laid upon the table of the House the following statements:

Of Current Account for the year ending 30th June, 1912-13.

Public Debt to 30th June, 1912-13.

On account of Agricultural Bounty for one year ended 30th June 1913.

Marine and Fisheries Departmental Trust Account, 1912-13.

Colonial Secretary's Departmental Trust Account, 1912-13.

Trust Account, Branch Railways, 1913.

Balance Sheet of Treasury Accounts for the year ended 30th June, 1912-13.

Trust Fund Department of Public Works, June 30th, 1912-13.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY laid on the table of the House the Regulations approved by the Governin-Council under "An Act respecting the Assistance of Sufferers in Marine Disasters."

Also certain information relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines; also statement of expenditures in respect to Tuberculosis up to 31st December, 1913, as asked for by Mr. Coaker.

PETITIONS.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring before the House a resolution signed by the Agricultural Society of Bay Roberts and over three hundred of its residents asking for a bonus for clearing land. The demand for local products has increased very much the past four years and owing to the lack of cleared land the people are unable to raise sufficient feed to tide their cattle over the winter. I would ask the Government to take this into consideration and renew the bonus for clearing land that was in vogue some years ago. I believe that during the time a bonus for land-clearing was paid the people of Harbor Grace district benefited greatly and if more land was cleared much more produce could be raised. I beg to move that these resolutions be referred to the proper department for I feel certain that agricultural pursuits will be considerably advanced if they receive favourable consideration.

MR. PARSONS.—I have much pleasure in supporting the resolutions presented by my hon. colleague.

MR. COAKER.—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Squid Tickle in the district of Bonavista asking that the sum of $500 be

allocated for three years to repair and build a road leading from Squid Tickle to Salvage Bay. Some money has already been spent on this road but it was desirable to extend it to Salvage Bay. This petition also asks for a new Postmaster at Squid Tickle as the present person holding that position is not capable, or fit to hold that office. In fact serious trouble arose some time ago in connection with this gentleman and the Magistrate from Greenspond was obliged to hold an enquiry into his conduct. I hope the Government will give the place a new postmaster. The petitioners also ask for the establishment of telephone connection between St. Chads and Salvage Bay a distance of only twenty miles. I trust the Government will give these matters their earnest consideration.

MR. JENNINGS.—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Indian Burying Place in the district of Twillingate, asking for a sum of money for the construction of a breakwater to protect that harbour from the effects of the sea. The people there are obliged to haul up their boats at present in order to save them from damage. I trust that the prayer of this petition will be granted and I ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. This petition also asks that this Harbour be made a port of call for one of the Coastal boats and the request is a reasonable one because the steamers now pass close to the port. I hope the Government will also see the request of the petitioners granted in this respect.

MR. CLIFT.—I beg to support the prayer of this petition. I know the locality in question and may say that the requests of the petitioners are reasonable. A coastal boat very frequently passes close to this place and its inhabitants are entitled to steam communication. The harbour is one of some importance and situate on the Straits shore and I trust that the Government when arranging for the summer service will see that the wishes of the petitioners will be complied with. I also trust that the Government will see their way clear to recommend the allocation of a sum of money sufficient to furnish the breakwater asked for.

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Drake Cove, District of Bonavista, on the subject of the mail service and with the permission of the House I will read the petition. (Hon. member here read the petition.) This petition is signed by 32 people. I may say that I am familiar with that portion of the district and I heartily endorse the request of the petitioners and I hope their prayer will be attended to by the Government.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to give the petition my support. I have had some experience with the mail at that place. It is not only a place for changing the mails, but it is often used as a place of safety when the mail is delayed owing to bad weather. The mails are transferred here from one side of the bay to the other. It is a lumbering place and there is great necessity for this post office not only for the convenience of the people but also for the safety of the mails.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition. I feel sure that there is only need to lay the matter before the Colonial Secretary in order to have a post office placed there. It is a place of some 40 or 50 male inhabitants and the connecting place for the change of mails. The mail for the place itself goes through it to a place

five or six miles down and then is brought back and the people are delayed in their mails for five or six days.

It was ordered that the petition be received and referred to the Department of Colonial Secretary.

QUESTIONS.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing what money has been expended by his Department on account of the Kelligrews Public Wharf from January 1st, 1910, to December 31st, 1913, and by whom expended.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I hope to have that information to-morrow.

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon. Minister Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing: (a) Salary and Commission paid the Tidewaiter at Topsail for 1912 and 1913; (b) What salary is paid to Frank Tilley, doing Customs work at Kelligrews.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table that information .

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House, a statement showing the amount paid as salary by the Postal Department to Frank Tilley, Kelligrews.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the information.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement, showing Local, Special, Main Line and Bridge expenditures at Topsail, Manuels, Kelligrews, Upper Gullies, Long Pond and Middle Bight during 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to table that information in a few days.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS to move the House into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs it was ordered that this motion stand deferred until later in the day.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, as to the agricultural policy of the Government, I know I shall not be able to praise it up as much as it has already been praised up by hon. members on the other side of the House. But I, as well as a large number of my constituents, fail to see where the agricultural policy has improved the District of Trinity. I know there has been seed given out there and it struck me to enquire whether it has proved to the satisfaction of the people as it has in other places, especially on the West Coast. In one section of the district a couple of ponies were sent and some of the people made the remark that when the ponies got there and saw the fine looking Newfoundland ponies one committed suicide and the other died. I do not know whether that is correct or not but the Sable Island ponies were not anything compared to the ponies that belong to the places where they were sent. I also found that a number of people did not find the seed the same as has been represented in this House. I do not mean to say that that is anything against the policy. Probably most of the seed is good enough but what I do want to say is that as far as I can understand it is a waste of money, this policy. I know it is a great improvement in some places because the hon. member, Mr. Woodford

said that a number of people in his district have found the seeds good and they seemed to understand farming well enough. But I may say the people in the north know a lot about farming. They all do quite a lot of it during a lifetime. It is my opinion that if the money expended in this policy were spent in bonuses for clearing land it would be better for agriculture. I would like to make one or two remarks as to old age pensions. Some of the members on the other side of the House have said that the Government has carried out its policy to the letter. If those are not the very words used they are what was meant. I fail to see how the policy of old age pensions has been caried out. I do not know whether it was carried out on the Southern Coast. It certainly has not on the Northern part. If I understood aright these pensions were to be given to men who were destitute and had no visible means of support when they reached the age of 75. I find that in my district there are men of 75 years of age and 85 years of age, comparatively destitute who do not receive the pension while men of 70 years with good means of support and money in the bank are receiving it. I think that is a very poor policy. I know one place in the District of Trinity where one of the sitting members went where a man of 82 years of age had not been receiving the pension up to that time. The member said to him: 'Who did you vote for?" He said he voted for the Government. The men who were with the member said that you could depend on his word. He got the pension. I do not think that is fair. In fact under these circumstances it would be better not to pay the pensions at all.

With regard to the price of fish a great deal has been said and it is my duty to refer to it. I feel it my duty to uphold the man who raised the price of fish and that man is Mr. Coaker. He did not raise it in the foreign markets but I do not believe that he ever said that he did. But he did raise the price in Newfoundland. And we have proof enough of it. The members on the other side deny this but the fishermen up north know that it was he that did it. It is only a year or two ago that we heard there was a combine among the merchants to give only a certain price for fish. Now Mr. Coaker manipulated a combine of fishermen to sell only at a fair price and I do not think that anyone can honestly deny that he did it. I think it only fair to give honour where honour is due.

In the past we have not known the price of fish in the foreign markets. The present Government promised five years ago that if they got in power they would publish the necessary knowledge about the price of fish in the foreign markets. That promise was not carried out. Someone said that they saw in the papers a few years ago that fish was 40 milreis. That is very useful to men who know what it means but it is not sufficient information for the fishermen. We want more information than that and I believe we should have a man to inform us as to the price of fish in the foreign markets and publish the information in a way that the fishermen would understand. I have nothing to say against the merchants. The F. P. U. are not against the merchants. But the fishermen should know what the price is in the foreign market and I think the time has come when existing conditions will be altered. I do not mean that it will be altered by the Government but it will be altered by Mr. Coaker.

In conclusion I would like to make a comment upon the remarks of the

Minister of Finance and Customs. I did not think that we should be subjected to personalities from any member of the Crown. He called the fishermen of the country simply because they have not had all the education that is possible, "illiterate" and "cullage men." I do not agree with him but I am surprised that such personalities should have been indulged in in this House.

MR. F. MORRIS—Mr. Speaker,I beg to offer a few observations on the motion before the chair, and in doing so I think I shall follow the example of other hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, and begin by congratulating you Sir, upon the high honor you have attained in this Assembly, the highest gift of the Legislature. That the choice has been a good one I feel sure, and that your actions and conduct since your assumption of the office of Speaker, have justified your unanimous election to that position. I, myself had the honor at one time to occupy the Speaker's chair of this Assembly, and I fully appreciate the difficulties that must have presented themselves to you on the very threshhold of your work. And looking back over my own experience in the first few weeks of office, and until its legislative duties became better known to me, I can say with all sincerity that you have been so far a decided success. I confidently believe that your term of office will be characterized by that spirit of impartiality which has been the distinguishing quality of those who have occupied the position you now hold.

We have had a variety of subjects discussed since the debate on the Address in Reply came before the House, and it has revived in my memory the time, now some twenty five years ago, when I first had the honor of a seat in this House. It was then customary for the Address in Reply to be an answer to each paragraph of the Governor's speech; and each paragraph was debated in committee of the whole, and if the Government lost on a vote on any one paragraph, it was understood to be defeated on its policy. For many years past, the rule has been, the Address in Reply is tendered to the House and generally adopted without discussion, but I am glad to see that the old order of things has been to some extent revived; it is a healthy sign.

The Government has a policy and it ought not to be ashamed to have it discussed intelligently. Of course one does not expect hon. members on the Opposition side to agree with everything, or even anything pertaining to the Government's policy but whereas it is not their sole and only duty to criticise, yet it is a most important function of the Opposition to criticise the actions of the Government. There are certain forms of criticism which are sincere and honest, and there is certain criticism that is insincere and dishonest. I do not wish to infer that hon. members who have spoken on this motion have dishonestly or unfairly criticized the policy of the Government, but there is no doubt that some of them have fallen into error. But I do not think they have done so knowingly, or willfully misrepresented facts.

A great deal has been said as regards the price of fish. It has become a question almost as com-

plicated and as hard of solution as the vexed question of the Landfall of Cabot was some years ago among our local historians, the greatest of whom (the lamented Judge Prowse) I reret to say has recently passed away from us. But Mr. Speaker, whoever raised the price of fish, is it not a most commendable action, and a good thing for the country? And whether it was raised by my hon. friend the member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, or as the member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman says: 'by the law of supply and demand'. I say again, it is certainly a good thing for all concerned and fraught with beneficial results to the country generally. The hon. member. Mr. Abbott, in his remarks stated that certain telegraph messages received by him last Summer from Mr. Coaker had considerable to do with helping up the price of fish in the Northern Bays. If this be so,it is only fair that a just meed of praise and recognition should be given Mr. Coaker and every honest minded man, will, I feel sure, accord to him any honest merit he may have acquired. But, Sir, what I would like to know is, how it was that the fishermen to the Southward and Westward, who had not the facilities apparently enjoyed by the F.P.U., also obtained such handsome prices for their fish?

Personally, I have no knowledge as to who raised the price of fish or who did not, but from the statements made by my hon. friend Mr. Abbott, I think that in the section of the country which he represents the efforts of the Fishermen's Union certainly had something to do with it. I believe that the Fishermen's Union organization has been and will be of benefit to the fishermen of this country, especially to the Northern fishermen. It was time for the fishermen of the country to combine to protect their interests and demand the very best returns for the products that they supply, and that they have to work so hard to obtain. Why should they not have a Union, Mr. Speaker as well as the tradesmen, the labourers or any other industrial portion of the community? In fact, if you look at it from a broad standpoint considering the number of fishermen in this country, their importance and the importance of the avocation which they pursue, I think it will be admitted that they have had need for a union and required co-operation much more than others who have been protected by unions for years. and whilst the Fishermen's Union proceeds along the lines of an earnest and honest endeavour to benefit themselves and to get the best possible results from their voyage and cheapen, if they can, the necessaries of life, no man in Newfoundland I think, no matter what his calling may be, but will wish God-speed to it. But the Fishermen's Protective Union has entered upon a new era, it has gone beyond its charter, so to speak. It has entered into political life, and you cannot disassociate the Fishermen's Union from the political union led by the worthy member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker: and it is only with the political faction within the Fishermen's Union that any fault can be found, and that only from a political party standpoint.I have no fault to find individually with any hon. member oppos-

ite. They went out into the political fight and we went out into the fight. They fought our candidates for all they were worth, and we fought theirs. They won in the districts where the Union very largely predominated, and we won in all other districts where policy was the issue. We are not out of sympathy or harmony with the Fishermen's Union as a union to benefit the fishermen of this country. I would gladly become a member myself if I were qualified for membership and do all in my power to assist the aims and objects of the fishermen because they are most laudable, right and proper; but the political aims and objects are other matters, and in connection with those we differ. If there has been any bitterness in the fight it has been a purely political bitterness, and I hope that now we have all won, each in his own district, that that little political bitterness will cease, and that we will make a combined effort to do the best possible for the country generally. We have on this side of the House gentlemen who represent fishermen without belonging to the Fisermen's Union, and they are as sincere in their desire to uplift and benefit the fishermen of the country as a whole, and those that they have the honour of representing particularly as it is possible to be. I have the honor of representing three of the biggest bays in Newfoundland, in which as many fishermen reside as there are in any other three bays in the country. It is my duty to assist the fishermen of these bays and of the whole country, and I will be glad to support any and all measures that may be brought into this House for their benefit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will pass on from that subject, and I would like to say a word in reference to the much abused agricultural policy. I have been a member of this House for a number of years. When I came in here in 1889 there were only one or two agricultural societies in the whole coutry—one of them was here in St. John's and the other, I think, in Harbour Grace–I am not quite sure whether there was one in Harbor Grace then or not. Sir William Whiteway, the Leader of the Government of that day, inaugurated an agricultural policy precisely on the same lines as the agricultural policy of the present government. That policy embraced the formation of societies in each district, and the distribution of seeds and stock, and the distribution of literature amongst the people; and I want to tell this House that there was no portion of the policy of progress which was initiated by Sir William Whiteway that had better results than that in relation to agriculture. In the district that I had the honour of representing in this House for twenty years–Harbor Main—we had seven agricultural societies; and the portion of that district that is today the most prosperous of all that prosperous district, namely that section extending from Topsail Road to Holyrood, was at that time the most poverty stricken part of Newfoundland. I don't mean as a whole, as there were some very prosperous people there, but I speak of the majority of them The railway to Harbor Grace was finished for some years and the line to Port aux Bas-

ques had not then been begun; there was no employment; the shore fishery had failed; nothing for these unfortunate men to do. Then they began the cultivation of the land, and today as I have said, they are one of the most prosperous farming sections in Newfoundland. Now, the hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Targett, who has just sat down could not tell what benefit these agricultural societies had accomplished. If he will permit me, I will read a few extracts from last year's report in relation to his own district. The Secretary at Hant's Harbor says that the potato seed sent down yielded 15 barrels to the barrel, and that they were of great benefit for seed. The Secretary at Port Rexton says that the potato seed sent down yielded from 12 to 15 barrels to the barrel: the cattle were considerably increased; and that the sheep and pigs were also considerably increased. The Secretary at Britannia Cove says: 'The sheep have increased 10 per cent. and the breed is very much improved; the bulls received from the Government have done good work and gave the locality in which they were placed a good supply of calves, which will doubtless improve the stock of horned cattle.' Mr. Snelgrove the Secretary at Catalina, says: 'Potatoes yielded twelve barrels to the barrel. Our sheep are of a very much better stock than formerly.' At Queen's Cove Mr. Hall, the Secretary says: 'The potatoes sent down yielded from 15 to 20 barrels to the barrel.' These are four or five extracts that I quote entirely for the benefit of my worthy friend opposite. Now, the reports from the societies in some of the other districts are even better. I find that in the Kelligrews section to which I have already referred, there were last year 800 horses—that section runs, as I have said, from Topsail Road to Holyrood. In the old days we sent up some of the very best stock available to that part of the district, and the result is that they have got a splendid breed of horses up there. I estimate that these horses are worth on an average $100 each, which means that there are $80,000 worth of horses in that section. They have 1000 cows, which at $40 each, would represent $40,000. They have 2,000 sheep valued at say $6 each or $12,000. In other words, they have up there horses, cows and sheep to the value of $132,000. They sold last year to customers here in St. John's 320,000 pounds of beef; 38,000 pounds of mutton; 2,000 pounds of pork; 2,500 heads of cattle and 1,500 sheep. In view of these facts does the hon. member mean to say that the agricultural policy of the Government has not been a success. I maintain it has been a success and a great success, but an attempt has been made by those opposed to the Government during the last four years to strangle it. But the Opposition will not succeed in that attempt.

Now, Sir, a great deal has been said about the railway policy. The great majority of the people of this country have always been in favour of railways. When the railway policy was first started in this country in 1881 and 1882, a Party called the New Party went to the country in opposition to Sir William Whiteway on this policy, with the result

that out of the thirty six members only eight men were returned as anti-railway men. That is the history of the first political contest on the railway policy in Newfoundland. Sir William Whiteway at that time was opposed by certain of the mercantile men in St. John's, and at that time they had a considerable amount of influence. They practically owned the fishermen body and soul. It was the time of open voting. There was no secret ballot by which a man could exercise his independence and freedom of opinion in the secrecy of the ballot room. Every merchant knew how his dealers voted. His employees were scattered all over the country in ever district, intimidating, the voters. And notwithstanding all this influence what was the result? The two political parties came back to the House of Assembly, 28 in favour of and 8 against the railway. Now, Sir, from that day, during the Governmental control of Sir William Whiteway the railway policy progressed and flourished in this country. When he laid down his mantle, Sir Robert Bond, upon whom it fell, did not uphold this policy and never built a mile of railway. There was not a sod turned for railway extension in this island during the nine years that he was Premier. When the present Government went to the country in 1908 and 1909 it was on a policy of branch railway building. That was stated in our Manifesto, and you know the result. We have carried out our programme; or at least it will be admitted by all honest men that as much has been accomplished as it has been possible to do. You can only build fifty or sixty miles of line during the season of operation in this country Our policy was endorsed by the reat majority of the people, and it is not, I submit as has been put forward by the Opposition, contrary to the desire of the majority of the fishermen of this country. Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker the President of a very worthy Institution, would go down to his constituents and announce that he intended to stop the railway to Bonavista, or that the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Llyod would go down to Trinity and tell them that it was his intention to stop the Trinity branch?

DR. LLOYD—I did it, at the last election.

MR. MORRIS—The hon. member was returned for the district of Trinity if he will permit me to tell him on an entirely different policy altogether. I submit that no matter what policy was laid before the electors of Bonavista and Trinity it would not have altered their opinion politically, they would have voted as they did for the Fishermen's Union. The hon. member was returned not on any policy but because he was supposed to be supporting the Fishermen's Union.

DR. LLOYD—Then why did you put the question to me?

MR. MORRIS—I was referring to what would happen if you were not a supporter of the Union but had gone to the district of Trinity on a question of policy. I submit that the main railway and the branch railways are the best assets that

Newfoundland has today and I challenge contradiction.

DR. LLOYD—I contradict.

MR. MORRIS—If it had not been Mr. Speaker that the learned Doctor had the aid of the Fishermen's Union—if he had gone down to Trinity district as a supporter of the Bond policy, and if the President of the Fishermen's Union had stood aside and allowed the merits of the issues to be fought out between Dr. Lloyd and Mr. Squires, I would like to know where he would be today.

DR. LLOYD.—I would not have gone. I would not be such a fool.

MR. MORRIS.—I say, sir, that the railway and branch railways are the best assets we have in Newfoundland; and they are not inconsistent with the policy supported by the Fishermen's Union. They ought to be a great auxiliary to the fishermen, and I feel sure that they are. Newfoundland was one great fishing flake, if I may so term it, until theg railway policy was started in 1882. There was no source of employment of any importance outside the fisheries, and a bad fishery meant bad times to the great majority of our people. The internal resources of the country were undeveloped. You could not get inland. The whole interior was as much isolated from us as we are from Norway at the present time. But the policy of Sir William Whiteway of opening up the country by means of railway development brought permanently before the world our various great natural resources, and gave the people of the country for the first time in its history a chance to live and to utilize those benefits which nature had given them. Fifty years before the same thing applied to Canada. Canada fifty or sixty years ago was one of the worst colonies of Great Britain. To-day she is one of the greatest. To-day she is an empire in herself; her name and fame are world wide. Why? Because of her railways; because of her internal development. The great C. P. Railway made Canada, discovered the Northwest with all its vast natural resources; and now Canada is a network of railways. I do not mean to say that we can vie with a great country like Canada, but if we pursue the same policy we will be a hundred per cent. better off in ten years time than we are to-day. You may not see the benefits of the railways to Bonavista, Trinity and the other large districts to-day, or tomorrow, or next year, but you will see it within the next decade. The same applies to the branch railway at Trepassey; this railway connects all the populous and flourishing settlements on the great coast line known as the Southern Shore, starting from St. John's, with its terminus at Trepassey, and ought to be one of the best paying branches in the country. I anticipate for Trepassey within the next eight or ten years, that it will be one of the most flourishing and prosperous outport towns in the country, with large ocean steamers calling there, which must necessarily create a great commercial activity, and together with its deep water railway terminus and general business advantages and its beautiful natural surroundings is destined to become in the near future a "sportsman's paradise." The Biscay Bay River is known far and wide as one of the most prolific sea-trout rivers in the country. Then we have the North West River, which has only been known to sportsmen within the past two or three years. I fished on both these rivers last year, and I have no hesitation in saying the North West River of Trepassey is one of the finest fishing steams in the country. The fish run

from 4 to 20 lbs., with an average from 8 to 10 lbs. I make this statement from an acquaintance of over 35 years with some of the best trout and salmon streams in the country.

Some four years ago the two thousand voters for that portion of the district, which I have the honour to represent, comprising St. Mary's and Salmonier, headed by their respected parish priests the Rev. Father O'Driscoll and the late Dr. Howley, petitioned this Legislature, asking to be connected with the Trepassey railway, or by a branch from St. Mary's to Whitbourne. This petition was well received by the House, and at that time, and since, the Government through the Prime Minister, have assured the petitioners that railway facilities would be given them at an early date; just as soon as the Colony's finance would warrant the building of the line, and Mr. Speaker, why should not the people of St. Mary's and Salmonier have the advantages of a branch railway? Is not their claim in this respect a just and equitable one? Have not they contributed for the last 30 years their proportionate share of the Colony's revenues? Have they not been contributing an equal amount to pay the interest on the loans that have given railways to their more favoured brothers, in the districts of Harbour Main, Harbour Grace, Brigus, Carbonear, Burgeo and St. George's, and now Bonavista, Trinity and Bay de Verde; is it not only fair that their claims for railway extension should be now seriously and favourably considered? This section of the country, Mr. Speaker, is particularly adapted by nature for agricultural pursuits. The Salmonier Valley contains some of the most fertile spots of land in the whole country; and the agricultural land at St. Mary's and around and about the neighborhood of the Holyrood Pond and St. Vincent cannot be excelled and rarely equalled in any part of the country. To-day transportation and travelling facilities are just as crude and ancient in this district as they were fifty years ago. This should not be in this 20th century, and I hope that the St. Mary's branch railway will within the next year or two be commenced, and that the good people of this heretofore neglected section of the country will soon be enjoying the great benefits and comforts which have followed in other districts, which are now enjoying railway facilities. The raising of sufficient money for the further construction of branch railways, and the development of our great natural resources is the problem which now confronts us. But we should not be afraid to increase the public debt for such a purpose. What has made Canada is the money she has borrowed from England and expended in railway building and following thereon the development of her internal resources. Canada was not and is not afraid of increasing her public debt, and her public men of both political parties do not fear because her debt is increased by a few hundred millions, because this money goes towards development and railway building. Canada will double her public debt within the next ten years, and she will be justified in doing so. England is admittedly the greatest nation in the world, and the greatest asset she has is her public debt; for it is that which has made her great. Our own public debt is a mere bagatelle, when compared to that of Canada or any other of the British Colonies, and we have got good value for the moneys we have borrowed since we have started on a policy of railway building. Our resources are being developed, it is true, but we have only been crawling along instead of putting on

a good sprightly step. For the past four years there has been a continuous howl of opposition against the building of these branch railways, but I would ask this House, Mr. Speaker, if we do not finish the branch railways now in course of construction, and build new ones, what are we going to do? What are our people, especially our young people, going to do if they do not get employment and are unable to earn a decent livelihood in their own country, they will be forced to emigrate. We cannot make fishermen of them all. The present generation as they grow up seem to be disinclined to take to the fishing boat as their fathers did. It is therefore our plain duty as representatives of the people to put forth our best efforts in support of a strong policy of development, and in this respect I would gladly vote to double our public debt, if necessary, for more railway building and the opening up and development of our great natural resources. We are living too remote from great trade centres, and our isolation affects our attitude and views when dealing with big business propositions. We want to travel more and see what other people are doing in this direction.

Some people do nothing but criticise; with them it is a policy of tear down, not build up. If anything appears in the Press of other countries, which might be to the country's disadvantage in the money markets of England, some people pounce upon it as a sweet morsel, and trot it forth either in this House or in the Press, to the injury of our credit as a Colony. We should not decry our own credit, the credit of this Colony, and its good standing abroad should be very dear to all of us but I am sorry to say it has often been grievously hurt in the past by the adverse criticism of persons who ought to be more patriotic; but who seem to be willing to sacrifice everything in order to hamper and discredit their political opponents. Some Opposition papers are widely circulated and these adverse accounts as to the state of the country's finance are often read by interested parties and often have a bad effect on our financial standing. That these statements are made for purely political purposes is no justification. Why do certain hon. members appear to gloat over our present temporary shortage of revenue, and foreshadow the impossibility of our being unable to borrow sufficient money to complete our railway contractual obligations. They must know, and they do know that the credit of the Colony never stood higher in the money market of London, than it does at the present time, and that the Colony was never in such a state of prosperity as it is now enjoying. They also know that a money stringency is felt at present in all parts of the world, and that all the British Colonies, in fact all nations are finding it extremely hard at the present time to cope with their financial requirements. I make bold to predict that when Newfoundland goes to London for a new loan she will get it on as good terms comparatively as any other Colonial borrower. We should have more patriotism and love of country, Mr. Speaker, and whether Government or Opposition, we ought now to sink all polititals differences for the benefit of our common country. Any other course must mean disaster to the Colony. If the hon. members of the Opposition were on this side of the House and formed the Government of the day, would they consider it helpful for the Opposition members to get up in this House, and quote our standing in the money markets of the world. Such statements are not made to help or

build up, but to tear down and destroy. We should not be small-minded enough to sacrifice the future of this country for the sake of making a point against a political opponent. Let other people find out for themselves our financial standing, and find it out on its merits. If there is a stringency in the money markets abroad, it is not a stringency that is applicable to Newfoundland alone. I am stating Newfoundland's side of the question, and in this we should all play the game fair. I am stating the facts as I see them, and I have a right to do so. In a matter of such grave importance, as the credit of the Colony, Mr. Speaker, we should all unite and work for the country's good, and give the Government the helping hand along, especially if it finds its financial pathway a little rough to travel as at the present time.

When I rose, Mr. Speaker, it was not with the intention to inflict a long speech on the House but the subject matters under discussion are of such importance that they must plead my excuse.

As I remarked on rising, this session we have departed from past customs. Only the chiefs on both sides took part in these discussions, but this session, however, we all seem to be interested, and desirous of placing our views on record, and I must certainly say that I think the departure is along good lines, because every member, especially those members here for their first session have had an opportunity, and have availed of that opportunity, in my mind very well, to give practical proof of their debating qualities. Everything has been conducted in a most harmonious manner, and this full discussion I believe will have a good effect.

HON. MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a few observations on some of the points which have come up for discussion. It is not my intention to go into the details of the figures in this matter, because this subject has been thoroughly thrashed out. I join, sir, with other gentlemen in taking this opportunity of congratulating you upon the high honour that has been accorded you. I feel confident, sir, that you will sustain the honour and integrity of that position, and will prove yourself a worthy successor of those who occupied that chair in the past. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a remark of Mr. Targett on the question of Old Age Pensions. That question is like all other questions where there is an opposition. Anything that comes from a Government is naturally abhorred by the Opposition. This has always been the case, and so it will always continue. Nothing good can come from the Government as far as the Opposition is concerned, that is my experience. You have only to look at the papers for the last 50 years to see how both sides have always different views. With regard to Old Age Pensions, it is very easy to find fault. The scheme is not perfect, we do not say it is perfect; but we do say that this question has been seriously taken up and gone into during the past few years. We appointed a Commission some time ago under a former administration; but that commission made no honest attempt to deal with the subject, and nothing was done until this present Government came into power. Some three or four years ago, we provided for 400 Old Age Pensions a year for 3 years, so that at the end of our term of office we would have 1200 old people receiving pensions. We placed the limit at 75 years as a beginning. Of course some will think that that is too high a limit. We know that the allotted span of years is 70; but before

we can consider the' lowering of the limit we must feel our way and go cautiously. We have it thrown out from the Opposition that a great many of those Old Age Pensioners are not in want and do not need this relief, and that favouritism was shown those who voted for Government candidates. There was none of it known in my district. My Old Age pensioners are very glad indeed to get this relief, and I have evidence to show it. It has been our intention and it 's our intention in the future to reduce that age limit and to increase the number of pensions, until all old fishermen of over 70 years who are in need are enjoying this pension. Of course there are old men of 80 or 90 years in this country who are not getting a pension, while others have it who are only 75 years old. I take it that those who have charge of the scheme consider the applications in order of receiving them; and, as vacancies occur, the most deserving cases are then considered; but so far as the Government is aware, this is done without favoriteism. When this pension scheme was brought in, I remember very distinctly that it was classed by Opposition members as being nothing more than a pauper's dole. That was repudiated by the people and by the relatives of the people who have been thus helped. Small as is the sum of $50 a year, I can tell you that to my knowledge all who get this relief and who are deserving of help are grateful for it. I speak of my own district. I keep a watch on the pensioners and I say that those who were most deserving—without considering their politics and taking them in their order, (always taking into consideration the need of their case)—were helped first as far as possible. I have good evidence of that. I only hope and trust that this Government will be able to continue and reduce the age limit and give the people more pensions, as the years go on.

A great deal has been said about the Agricultural policy and both parties must be sick and tired of hearing of that. I can only say what others have said before of that subject—that there was no agricultural policy before like it. The late Government established a model farm; but they were unwise in their choice. Even if good results had been obtained, we did not consider the plan was suited to the needs of the country at present. We consulted the most eminent scientists of Canada who gave their approval of the plan that we had outlined. They considered that it was in our present condition a sound policy to distribute good seed and good cattle throughout this Island. We formed 120 societies throughout the Island and we know of no other way to scatter that seed. We placed it in the hands of the societies and, if abuses did occur, it is very easy to blame the Government. The Opposition members who are new to the House will very soon know that they will be blamed for everything that happens in their districts whether it has anything to do with them or not. Similarly the Government is blamed for everything that goes wrong even if, like wrong distribution of seeds or stock, it is the societies or the people's fault.

We are told that our Government is not a fisherman's Government It is said we did nothing for the fishermen. I take issue with any opposition member who says that, and I say that this has been a labourer's and a fishermen's Government as none ever was before. What are we doing in the way of lighthouses and fog alarms? How could you benefit the fishermen more than by carrying on these noble

works? Take the South Coast where fog abounds. We provided more fog alarms between Port aux Basques and Placentia than in any other part. What have we done there? Go to the District of Burin and go into Fortune Bay. There you will see the most up to date fog alarms in the country. Those will be appreciated by and by. I hope to see more of them in my district. We are placing one on Penguin Island and we are putting one on Burgeo Island, and it is our intention to continue them where necessary. When we undertook this work were we not considering the interests of the fishermen? Who else gets the benefit of these things?

I do not want to go into the matter of education in detail now. I said that the large expenditures that we made have amply justified our intentions as a Government. These moneys were spent judiciously; of that there can be no question whatever. Where they never before existed, schools are now being built, and it is only right and proper that credit should be given a Government who take such an interest in providing them.

We have spent a great deal of time upon the question of who raised the price of fish—whether Mr. Coaker did it or whether it was raised by the law of supply and demand. Some gentlemen contend that Mr. Coaker raised the price of fish locally, others contend that the law of supply raised it in the foreign markets. I have not studied that question, but it seems to me that fish is mostly an article of food and that its price varies in proportion to the demand. Of course it is only nonsense to say one man is responsible for raising the price of fish. If by the formation of the F.P.U. Mr. Coaker has improved the condition of the people, if he has brought about their welfare to some extent and if he has contributed something, no matter how small, which would tend towards raising the price of fish, then I say he deserves every credit for it. The history of Trade Unions has been the bettering of the classes employed in the individual trades concerned. There is no question whatever that the F.P.U. is going to do some good in all this Colony if it is properly conducted. From the tone of the Opposition members one would imagine that most of us on this side of the House opposed the F.P.U. How could I oppose it, since I represent a fisherman's district? We are in sympathy with the movement when it tends to the advancement of the position of the people of the country. The charge against us that we used cries of "Socialism" and "godless schools" is entirely unfounded. In my district, I say as far as Fortune Bay is concerned, there were no such catch cries used. Such cries do not appeal to the better nature of the electors. It is not my intention to say anything further on this matter now; but this subject cropped up during the course of the debate, and I did not wish to take my place without saying something in reference to it.

MR. DWYER.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks with regard to the assertions of the last speaker.

He spoke of his agricultural policy and the puting down of the experimental farm instead of it. Three agricultural experts have deprived the farmers of the work. Mr. Speaker, I think I am right in making these few remarks. I have said something on the question before, and I do not need to point out again the very little that the Government has done for agriculture. But as for the commissioners, surely, their ignorance of what they were paid for and for what they were

appointed is plain enough. Mr. Speaker, under the Bond Government we had the best men on agricultural affairs in the country. They gave their services without pay; but to-day their services are of no account. They are of the past. To-day, there are thousands of dollars spent on agriculture; but the difficulty is to find where the benefits are.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks regarding the matter before the House. I take much pleasure in seconding the amendment made by Mr. Kent in connection with the vacancies in the Departments of Agriculture and Justice. I agree with him when he states that we believe the Government has done wrong by opening the House without filling these positions. So far as the F. P. U. is concerned, resolutions condemning the conduct of the Government in this respect have been sent to the Governor. The F. P. U. don't believe that such important offices as these should be held by men who have been ousted from power by the people. It has been rumored that it is intended to fill these positions by making two appointments to the Legislative Council. If this is done, I feel that it will create an agitation in the Colony that won't soon subside. We who represent the fishermen of this country believe that the Heads of the various Departments should hold seats in the House of Assembly and if appointments are made to these vacant positions of members of the Legislative Council the F. P. U. will go one step further and agitate for the abolition of that chamber. It is not fair to the country. It is certainly not fair to our constituents that these men who were so badly defeated at the polls should be placed in the Upper House and allowed to hold the same positions as Heads of Departments. As regards the price of fish, our friends on the Government side think they made a tremendous gain against the F. P. U. because they tried to show that the price of fish was raised by the law of supply and demand. I have no intention to deny that the law of supply and demand had something to do with it; but it's the F. P. U. who were the chief cause of the high prices locally paid. In the past, we often heard the merchants complain that they were losing money on exporting fish, but we never heard that they were making money by selling fish. They tell of their losses but are silent as to their profits. Now I get reports from the foreign markets and know how prices stand and I am in a position to advise the fishermen down north when to hold back their fish until they get satisfactory values. I always try to get some men here in St. John's to make offers for our fish. I have had offers of $5 for fish from men in St. John's that they had to pay $6.30 for subsequently, because we would not take less. If I consider the price offered is not sufficient, I advise the men to hold back their fish until the price goes up. If we tell them to hold back for $6. they will stand by us. The year before last I went to some merchants on Water Street and asked for an offer. "I will give you $5.50 for Green Bay fish," one said. "We won't sell it less than $6" was my reply. I then sent a message to the fishermen telling them to keep their fish. A few days after, this same merchant offered $6.30. "Why didn't you offer that price before," I asked? "That was all it was worth then, but your appeal to the fishermen to hold for six dollars which appeared in the Advocate, was telegraphed to the markets and they at once responded to higher prices and consequently we are able to pay the higher prices just as easily as we

could the $5.50 when it was offered. The appeal to hold back the fish for six dollars was the cause of the advance abroad as it was claimed the catch was short and the Union controlled 150,000 qtls. and would not sell at less than the price you named. This keeping back of their fish necessarily caused the price in the foreign markets to go up. The Hon. the Premier said that he went down to Bonavista and had a chat with a Bonavista man. This man had bought a certain quantity of coal from the Union and had lost $15 worth of fish through unloading the coal himself Mr. Abbott has stated that whenever they handled coal or fish in the busy season at Bonavista, they always hired men who were not fishermen to do the work and paid them to land the coal. There is no man fool enough to do as the Premier stated that man did. They buy loads of coal every year and if it did not pay the Union men at Bonavista to do so, it would soon end. They were offered $5.50 for their fish at Bonavista in 1912. I went to men who buy fish at Bonavista and offered the fish for $6 a quintal. They offered nothing more than $5.50. I told the men not to sell for anything less than $6. I sold 1,000 quintals at $6 for them and they were wild because I had not sold the 3,000 quintals that they had offered; but before the 1,000 qtl. lot was shipped the price had advanced to $6.40 and then they learnt why I had not sold the 3,000 qtl. lot at $6. The men of Bonavista are loyal to their Union. When the members of the Government went to Bonavista and held their meetings, they denounced the Union and Union stores and denied that Coaker had raised the price of fish, hence the opposition they aroused against themselves. The men knew that I obtained $6.40 for their fish for them and you will never convince them otherwise. They have had the proof of it. Another hon. member stated that up in Burin they were getting $6.50 for fish. Why we were getting $6.60 at Twillingate when it was selling for $6.25 in St. John's. You should ask the people of Green Bay who fixed the price of fish for the last few years. The price has been fixed north and not at St. John's. It is only when the fishery is a poor one, when the catch is small that we can fix a price as the demand has a great deal to do with the price of fish.

I am qualified to say something about the agricultural policy of the Government as I have been a bit of a farmer. I spent 20 years farming and I tell you that your policy is a wrong one. I want to see agriculture promoted in Newfoundland. It is alright to give out stock to certain people. Suppose you give a bull of a first-class breed to the ordinary fisherman. He takes charge of it for three years and allows it to run at large until the winter. He gives it no meal or feed like it was raised on, but feeds it with a little dry hay. If they had plenty of hay to give it, the animal may thrive but in many cases not half enough food is fed to such animals. I remember buying a number of pure breed sheep some time ago; but I lost them, because they were not used to our climate. They simply wasted away. You have to feed them all they can eat and hay is not sufficient. I repeat that the agricultural policy of the Government is a wrong policy. Give $40,000 for clearing land then some good will result. Spending $8,000 on exhibitions such as those seen last fall won't encourage agriculture. The Hon. the Premier stated that we had done our work behind closed doors in the recent election campaign. Now, I held 45 public meetings during September and October and everyone of them was open to

the public. We did not work inside of closed doors. The trouble in Bonavista Bay was that the Premier did not dismiss his colleague, when the F. P. U. asked for his dismissal in 1912. Had he done so the Government would not have been so unpopular and the north would not have turned down his men so badly. Now, if ever the men of the north find out I have failed in my duty to them and have not done what is right there will be no chance for me in my own or any other district.

The question of sectarianism has been referred to. Now there is no such thing as sectarianism connected by us. We want to unite the people and we have done it. In our Councils we have Catholic and Protestant members sitting side by side, no such thing as religious difference is ever witnessed. Go down to the District of Fogo and you will see an illustration of this. Before the formation of the Union the Catholics and Protestants kept to themselves and did not unite one with the other, but when they joined the Union both attended the Council meetings, and after a few meetings the Catholic members could get on their feet and discuss matters just as well as the Protestants who had been attending Lodge meetings for years.

Then take the vote of the Catholic community of Tilton Harbor at the last election. Out of 130 votes cast the Union candidate got 80. I want to see sectarianism banished altogether. No one hates it more than I do, and our whole aim has been to unite all denominations in our Councils and nothing has ever done more to banish sectarianism from the Colony and to bring all our people together than the organization of which I am the head. Now I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will not have any more insinuations about sectarianism thrown across the House. I don't want to have anything to do with it. But if they want to fight in that way I am prepared to fight them, but let them take the responsibility. I am asked to give my reasons for what I said about the Trepassey line. Why was I in favor of the Grate's Cove Line the Bonavista Line, the Fortune Bay line, and the Bonne Bay line and against the Trepassey Line. Now the town of Bonavista has a larger population than the whole District of Ferryland; and the railway runs through a section of the country where it is absolutely necessary to have a railway and if you did not build to Bonavista it would be only a matter of a few years before thousands of our young men would leave the country. They would find that the conditions of life would be too hard and that they could make an easier livelihood in Canada or the United States. They would say to themselves that that kind of a life had killed their fathers and that they themselves would go away. On that section of the coast the harbors and landing places are bad and it is absolutely necessary that they have a railway. Now who asked for the Heart's Content railway? The operators of Heart's Content. They thought it would be a good way for them to get to Carbonear to have a good time now and again. They thought the railway was going to go straight across to Carbonear, but now they find it goes up Trinity Bay to Broad Cove and they say that it is of little use to them. Now the people were opposed to this railway because their gardens and lands and houses were taken from them and in many cases they were paid very little while others who had pull got big grabs. Now there are splendid harbors along the Trepassey District shore and they did not want the railway but they did want the railway in

Bay de Verde because they have no harbours.

Now we were prepared to support the Grate's Cove railway because we knew that it was necessary. But it need not have gone further than Island Cove, when it would have cost but one-half the. money because the people of the lower end of the district did not need it so badly. They will not ship their fish by railway when they can ship it by water.

Now as regards the Trepassey Branch it runs parallel to the coast and the harbors are good. Do you think they are going to ship their fish over the railroad when they can so easily come to St. John's and return in their own boats? There will be very little traffic from that railway which will cost nearly two millions. You could have spent $20,000 or $25,-000 on a first class motor car road through that District to connect it with St. John's. A motor car service for passengers and mail could be run twice a day which would be just as good as the railway. If you had a line of steamers calling at Trepassey I would certainly be in favour of this railway, but I don't believe you will ever have this line of steamers, and further it would be time enough to build that railway when you had such proposals before you.

Now look at this $2,000,000 in another way. Suppose you spent this money in motor engines for the fishermen of Newfoundland you could have supplied 15,000 engines at $120 each. Now supposing these fishermen thus supplied with these engines had each brought in twenty additional quintals of fish through having motor boats, that would be 300,000 quintals of fish and if valued at $6.00 a quintal would be worth $1,800,000. Now that would be in addition to the present earnings of our people. Now out of that $1,800,000 probably $8,000,-000 would be spent in purchasing articles not dutiable and a million would go to purchase goods that would pay a duty of probably 35%, that would give you $300,000 additional revenue, and the $380,000 that you took off last year would not have to be put on again this year. Now the interest and mail subsidy for the Trepassey Line will be $75,000 a year and if you had not built that railroad you could not only have that additional $300,000 a year as I have pointed out but would save the $75,000 also. You have spent this money and you do not know where this expenditure is going to end. I don't want you to think I am against that railway because the people of Feryland are Catholics, as has been insinuated by members on the Government side who have drawn a distinction between South and North.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—No. No such insinuation was meant.

MR. COAKER.—I am going up to Ferryland to give them the F. P. U. as soon as I can as I have had four or five applications from that District. I would not like to put my friend Mr. Cashin out but I would like to have him in the same boat with us. I always admired the Minister of Finance and I hope some day to have him with us and I don't want anything that happened on the floor of this House to make us bad friends. As regards the railway policy I always was a supporter of railways but I do not believe in expending $8,000,000 in the way it has been spent. When the Premier announced that he was going to build these railways for four million dollars, although I was a supporter of Sir Robert Bond's I left him and decided to support the Prime Minister in his railway policy. But he did not build these railways for four million dollars. Six million have been spent long ago, and the railways are not

yet complete. I am sorry that he went into this thing without giving it more careful consideration and without finding out what it was going to cost. He should have built Bonavista branch first and seen how it would turn out and then he could go on with another, but he should not have made a contract for the whole five at once. Then of course these railways should have been paid for in bonds instead of in gold because by paying in gold we will lose five hundred thousand dollars in realizing the bonds. We have to go to the London market to raise a loan for the completion of these railways and we will not be able to raise the money at three and a half per cent. In the present condition of the market we may have to pay four and a half per cent. I am glad that the Prime Minister and his Government are on the other side of the House. I would not want to have to go to London to raise two million dollars and pay four and a half per cent. for it and get about 90 for our bonds. The Government have got themselves into this hole and it is for them to get out of it. You said it would cost six and now you say it is going to cost eight. If you had said in the first place it was going to cost eight million dollars you would not have been supported by the country. But the present position shows that you made a serious mistake in this whole thing. The Hon. the Colonial Secretary stated the other day that the Government represented the majority of the people of the Colony. Now I take issue with him there and I have gone to the trouble to find out exactly how the votes went and I find that the Liberal-Union Party polled 3,421 votes more than the Government.

The votes in the Districts were as follows:—

District	Govt.	Opp.
Port de Grave	687	871
Carbonear	608	534
Ferryland	1006	361
Bay de Verde	1114	1154
St. John's East	2452	2676
St. John's West	2645	1680
Hr. Main	1147	840
Hr. Grace	1377	1185
Burin	1187	763
St. George's	1187	770
Trinity	1550	2628
Fogo	594	1313
Placentia	1909	1366
Bonavista	1538	3360
Twillingate	773	3435
Burgeo	760	728
Fortune	1000	895
St. Barbe	871	1253
	22405	25822

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—My reference was made to the Districts according to population.

MR. COAKER.—What I claim is that the Opposition represents more people than the Government does.

Now the other day the member for Burin made reference to the amount of green fish exported to the United States and said that this was one of the reasons for the rise in the price of fish. In 1912-13 the export of fish to the United States was 49,000 quintals while in the year 1911-12 it was 97,000, or nearly double the export of 1912-13. Now Mr. Hickman in his remarks the other day dealt very fully with the question of the export of fish and the prices and he said that the export of green fish had no more to do with the price for our dry fish in foreign markets than the Emperor of Japan. Now I believe that a great deal can be done as regards exporting our fish to the American markets and that a great deal will be done within the next five years. I believe that the best days of our fishing industry

are to come and that the present prices will never go lower unless we should get a tremendously large catch before we get well established in the American market and I believe that next year our fishermen will get seven dollars a quintal for their fish. There is a great possibility for our people in developing these American markets and the Fishermen's Union is prepared to work hand in hand with the Government in developing these markets. What we want is for you to take off your coats and get at it.

Now I have a word to say with regard to the fishermen of the North. The Hon. Minister of Finance spoke of them as "ignorant illiterates." Now I am sorry that he made such a remark because as I said before I have always admired him and looked upon him as a friend of the fishermen. The reason he made this remark of course was that the people of the North supported the Union against the Morris Government. Now the Northern people are very much opposed to the Morris Government, not because it is a Morris Government but because they believe that you are not doing your best for the fishermen and not listening to their demands and especially because you have not paid attention to the representations made by the Fishermen's Protective Union. We have laid various memorials and representations before the Government, but they have been neglected. I had several consultations with the Premier and with Mr. Morison but nothing ever came of them. I was told there was no hope of anything being done because the Executive was opposed to the Fishermen's Union and that out of the nine members of the Executive only two were favourable to us.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Where did you get that information?

MR. COAKER.—I got that information from you in your own office in an interview I had with you concerning the F. P. U. Resolutions when you told me that out of the nine members of the Executive seven were opposed to us.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I never made any such statement whatever. If the hon. member says I made such a statement the hon. member can prove it by means of the other party who was present at the interview. The only interviews I had with the hon. member, Mr. Coaxer, were in the presence of Mr. Morison. He was never in my office except when Mr. Morison was present.

MR. COAKER.—I say I was there several times with Mr. Morison and I was there when nobody eise was present.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is not the case; and my word is as good as yours.

MR. COAKER.—For about two years we were endeavouring to get the Government to accede to the Resolutions which we laid before them. A deputation consisting of myself and one or two men from Change Islands, laid before them the following Resolution on November 17th, 1909:

To His Excellency the Governor in Council.

The leader of the Government intimated last March at the Sealers' meeting, that it was the intention of the Government to introduce a law providing for a standard cull of codfish. The Fishermen's Protective Union have given this matter much consideration and we beg to submit the following suggestions for the consideration of the Government anent this matter.

Qualities, there should be four and damp:—No. 1, large and small; No. 2, large and small; No. 3, No. 4 and damp.

No. 1, Large should be dry, sound, smooth, well salted fish, over 17 inches in length, measured from nape to 3rd last bone joint in the tail.

No. 1, Small, same qualifications as in No.1, large, from under 17 inches down to 8 inches, same scale of measurement as for large.

No. 2 large should be dry, sound, rough looking, oversalted fish of same length as No. 1 large.

No. 2 Small of same qualifications as No. 2 large, from 8 inches to 17 inches, same scale in measuring as No. 1 large.

No. 3 should be all small under 8 inches and all broken or sun-cracked fish of all lengths.

No. 4 to consist of slimy fish.

No. 2 large to be 50c. per qtl. less than No. 1 large. No. 1 small to be one dollar per qtl. less than No. 1, large. No. 2 small to be 50c. per qtl. less than No. 1 Small. No. 3 to be One dollar and fifty cents per qtl less than No. 1 Small. No. 4 to be fifty cents per qtl. less than No. 3.

The Quintal to be fixed at 100 lbs. instead of 112 lbs.

There we have a resolution with regard to the standardization of fish and I contend that it would be impossible to adopt any better means whereby that end could be attained than by accepting what is contained in that resolution. If fish could be sold for $6.50 for No. 1 small, the price of large No. 1 would be $7.50, $7.00 for No. 2 large, $6.00 for No. 2 small and $5.00 for No. 3. These figures would work out satisfactorily to the fishermen and I do not know if there is a fish buyer to-day who would refuse to pay $7.50 for No. 1 large fish. There you have the figures that we asked for but, of course, they were not accepted because they came from the poor fishermen of the north. "Who is this man, Coaker?" they asked. "What do they know about the price of fish?" "What is the Union?" These were the questions that were asked and they refused our request and treated us with scorn. Nothing could have proved of greater benefit to the country than to accept what we had asked for respecting the cull of fish. It is a well known fact that the quality of our fish is getting worse every year. The merchants do not know what to do with the bad fish that they get and the Government is making it worse for everybody by not insisting upon a proper standard to be made for our fish and refusing to allow it to be sold under the system of talqual. Why does not the Government do something in this matter? Why don't they put a stop to the present system? What encouragement is there now for a man to make up his fish in the best way that he can? There is none, because if he spends days and days in labour to make his fish as well cured as is possible he will receive no more for it in the end than the man who takes no trouble at all. It is the duty of the Government to do everything they can to keep up the price of fish and they have been very negligent in their duty. There are markets to-day for good fish but there are no markets for bad and in spite of this the Government scorned our resolutions which were drawn up for the sole object of increasing the price of fish so that the fishermen of the Colony might benefit by it. Thirty years ago nearly all our fish was merchantable but to-day owing to the talqual system three-quarters of it is No. 2. How can you expect it to be otherwise under the present conditions? You have to face the fact that unless some step is taken such as we have suggested the result of the present system will mean a great loss to our people. It is the Government's duty to give the matter their attention and it is about time they thought

of doing it.

In speaking of the cull of fish, we come to the question of the alteration of a quintal to one hundred pounds. I do not know if the trade would have much objection to this and we must be up to date. It would be much easier to handle fish if it is made up in one hundred pound lots and it would be as convenient for the merchant as for the fisherman.

Cullers for St. John's.—All Cullers to be paid and sworn by the Government, and responsible to an Inspector of Cullers, who will examine and license every culler under him. No other person to interfere with a culler under certain fines or punishment. All disputes to be decided by the Inspector. The Inspector to remove all cullers for breach of duty when proven by him upon three occasions and to cancel the culler's license for five years. The Inspector shall provide sub-inspectors for certifying qualities of fish in packages put up in the store, and also of cargoes. The Inspector shall brand all packages that are so certified by his agent and certify all cargoes in bulk when sent abroad. The Government to recover payment from each firm of the amount paid out by it to cullers employed at their respective premises. The Inspectors of cullers to be appointed by and responsible to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. He should be liable to dismissal for a single breach of duty. He should examine and grant certificates to Outport Inspectors of Cullers.

Cullers for Outports.—All cullers should be sworn and pass an examination under the Outport Inspector, and hold a license from the Inspector before culling fish. They should be paid by the person or firm employing them to cull, but when culling fish should be entirely subject to the Inspector and responsible to him alone. The Inspector shall have power to dismiss any culler for breach of duty and cancel his license for five years. All disputes between buyer and seller to be decided by the Inspector. No party to interfere with a culler but the Inspector. The Inspector to be recommended by the Fishermen's Union and appointed by the Department of Fisheries, and subject to dismissal for breach of duty, after enquiry conducted by the Fishery Department, before a Magistrate or Commissioner. The Inspector should be paid by the Government, and the amount so paid collected from each fish buyer at each port in proportion to the fish handled for the season. For small places where little fish is sold by the fishermen, those culling shall be examined and approved by the nearest Inspector to such a place, and all complaints between buyer and seller, or culler and fishermen shall be decided by such Inspector nearest to such a place. The Outport Inspectors shall also take steps to prevent mixing of fish in stores, after being culled on the wharf, and of certifying all cargoes exported in bulk, and branding all packages. The Outport Inspectors shall be examined by, and granted certificates by the Inspector of St. John's and unless holding such certificate shall not be appointed by the Department.

Outport Inspectors shall also be the Inspectors of Weight and Measures for the ports they serve.

I have only to read these resolutions to show you to what great trouble we went in this matter and is it any surprise that our fishermen were disappointed when the Government took no notice of them. Talk about the Union being no good! Can any better system be suggested by this Legislature or any other body than set forth in these resolutions?

Certainly not. What has the Government done? Nothing except to congratulate the fishermen on the high price of fish, which is not due to anything that the Government has done but to the fact we had a small catch and a good demand. If it had been a big catch, matters would have been very much different and the price might have dropped as low as $4.00.

Another section deals with the protection of our timber reserves as folows:—

"These reserves are being rapidly depleted of timber and a serious condition of affairs will soon face the fishermen unless steps are taken to secure what timber still remain upon these reserves. Small mills should not be permitted to cut green timber outside of three miles along the shore. Hand-logging should be immediately prohibited as this evil is rapidly growing. If timber for the construction of schooners, boats, etc., cannot be had, and material for the upkeep of fishing rooms cannot be obtained from our local forests, a condition of affairs now hard to realize will face the Colony."

Unless there is some step taken by the Government to protect these timber areas there will soon be no timber left to preserve. There are small mills running everywhere, and within a short time they will cut all the timber and the fishermen will be the losers. I have seen some splendid spars that were 60 feet long, cut down and sold for lumber at $4.00 per thousand feet. I told the men that these spars would be worth $150 in the course of some years but they would naturally reply that others were cutting them and they needed them as much as anybody else. We have asked the Government to protect these timber areas but they have not stirred a finger. They talk about the future of Newfoundland but all they do to protect the people is to get all they can grab for themselves. There is no thought for the poor toilers up north who will soon be unable to get timber for the upkeep of fishing rooms or schooner building, but they take good care to provide for themselves.

Yet we are told that the fishermen have always been in control of the country. It looks like it. If the fishermen were in control at the time there would never have been a Harmsworth deal such as was passed nor would there have been that Reid deal which has cost the Colony so many millions of dollars. The fishermen have been neglected in the past but they have come now to recognize their power and their duties and unless the Government is prepared to start now and protect the people they will learn very soon that the fishermen will put others in the places which they now occupy. There are nine representatives of the toilers in the House now, for my hon. friend, Mr. Hickman, is one with us, and, when we next appeal to the people of the country, there will be three times that number. The hon. Minister of Finance asks what would happen if I died. Somebody would be chosen to take my place and to carry on my work and he, himself, ought to be over here with us. This is the place for him, where he can do some good for the fishermen, and not where he is now, where he has to do what he is told.

I know the Government does not take very kindly to all the suggestions that come from this side of the House but I can assure them that we are very much in earnest in this matter and I hope the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister will take some steps to protect what is left of the timber up north. There will be a desperate state of affairs in ten years time if he does

not do so, for it will be an impossibility to get the material with which to build schooners. This year there were a hundred less schooners built than there were two years ago. Schooners wear out and soon it will be an impossibility to replace them, for the size of schooner that is used on the Labrador coast is very hard to obtain and if there is no timber left the men will not be able to build them. We will not be able to go to Harmsworth or Reid and get the sticks. Where shall we get them? Nowhere, and yet these areas are the inheritance of the fishermen and absolutely necessary to them. Is it any wonder that they are anxious as to what the Government will do? Can you blame them for taking their position for which you call them ignorant and illiterate? For twenty-five years the people of Bonavista gave the Tory party their continual support and they were praised and lauded as intelligent men. Now they have seen that the party did them no good and they have supported the Union. The very men who once praised them now insult them and the Hon. Minister of Finance refers to them as cullage. I cannot imagine that he means that but I do know that if the member sitting next to him had said it I would have skinned him down.

I pass on now to the next resolution presented by the F.P.U.

We respectfully recommend the despatching a half-dozen Trade Agents to seek new markets and to stimulate the sales in the old markets. The country must find new markets for at least half a million quintals of fish or confidence in the fisheries will be sadly lacking, and the young men leaving the Colony to find homes abroad. While conditions are such as to permit at any time a repetition of the black Fall of 1908, the young men will not have sufficient confidence in the fishery, to continue at it, after enough has been made to carry them to Canada or the United States. Make a return to 1908 conditions impossible by finding markets for ⅓ of our present catch. If this is accomplished, there need be no apprehension of seeing another 1908. We therefore beg the Government to lose no further time in arranging for the despatch of at least six trade agents.

We would suggest sending business men who have spent their years in connection with the fish trade.

Is there anything disgraceful about this resolution? Is there anything wrong in suggesting that half a dozen qualified men go to the different markets and make an effort to stimulate the demand for our fish? The Board of Trade has one or two trade agents in foreign parts now but it is no good for me or anybody else to seek information from them. They are not paid by us and, therefore, they will not trouble to inform us but they should be paid by the Government and all the fishermen should be able to obtain information from them. These men are doing their work but we have nothing to thank the Government for and if these men can do good work surely it is possible to get others equally as good who will be in the service of the Government. Why not have men in Portugal, the United States, Canada, Brazil and other places where they can obtain fresh business and induce the people to buy more of our fish? Why can't we have agents to encourage the sale of our green fish? Why not send a man to the Argentine Republic where the Norwegians sell plenty of fish? The Board of Trade sent a man there and he reported that there was a market there for our fish provided that the fish was well made and as hard as wood. The Norwegians

have been successful in opening a market there and there can be no reason why we should not be able to compete with them. The Panama Canal is completed now and we should be able to introduce our fish to Peru and other Latin races on the west of South America. They are a fish eating people and they will be ready no doubt to buy ours. Then, again, we should have a man in New York, where there are 700,000 Italians and Spaniards.

The Government should give the fisheries its first consideration and not give its whole attention to branch railways, which do not help the fishermen to catch fish. Not one quintal of fish has been added to the catch through the branch railway policy and not one cent has been added to the price which the fishermen obtained through the expenditure of $6,000,000 for railways. I ask the Government to look after the fishermen and do what they can to keep up the price of fish, for good prices mean money coming into the Colony and everybody is the better off for it. Our fisheries are our greatest asset and we seem to allow them to go along without any regard for the future. We are like the man that killed the goose that laid the golden egg and if we do not take heed to our responsibilities those who come after us will suffer through our neglect to protect and develop the fisheries.

What we ask is that half a dozen men be sent to different places to create a demand for our fish. Send good, capable men, not political heelers, but men who will be worth their salary. If you do this and pay them $2,000 the country will benefit by it for they will create a trade worth hundreds of thousands of dollars. The kind of man that I refer to is a man like Mr. J. D. Lockyer of Herring Neck, a first class commercial man who thoroughly understands the business. If you send a half dozen such men the good results that will follow will astonish you. The great trouble is that the Government does not take any steps at all either to improve the cure of fish or to find new markets. They should take a lesson from the Norwegians. Look how they put up their fish in the very best way and they sell it because people want good fish. They are not satisfied with inferior fish any more than our people are satisfied with inferior flour. When I first dealt in flour out of one hundred barrels that I sold fifty were No. 2 grade but they have found out that it is cheaper to buy the best flour and the result is now that out of fifteen thousand barrels of flour that the Union Stores have sold since September, practically every barrel was No. 1 flour.

It is necessary for us to be up and doing if we hope to compete successfully with the Norwegians, for the Portuguese, Spaniards and the Brazilians and other people want their fish in first class condition.

I make these statements in the hope that the Government will heed them and that they will recognize the fact that the Union people are in earnest in the matter. The Union is a strong body and their requests deserve the careful consideration of the Government. I know that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has not always thought that our position is as strong as it is for I remember that last spring he went down to Fogo and spent ten days in the district. We were told that as a result of his visit the whole Union was demolished. What did he say here the other day? He said there was no criticism of the policy of the Government but merely a senseless agitation against the merchants. Yet in spite of the splendid picture that the Premier painted the result of the

election proved how firmly they stood to the Union. I did not mind the Prime Minister's visit for I knew the people there. When they told me Sir Edward would visit them I told them to go and listen to him and treat him like Britons should.

Only a few months later my friend, Mr. Halfyard, defeated the Government candidate by seven hundred votes in spite of the fact that the Liberals joined the Tories in trying to defeat the Union candidate.

The same thing happened in St. Barbe, which the Prime Minister visited. I do not blame him for visiting these place for he did what no other Premier ever did and worked his best for the Government. He went through that district, which is a very hard district to travel through. In fact, he went everywhere and preached his policy but it was all to no avail for I upset all his plans. It was too bad that all the Premier's work was no good but it must show him how strong the Union is.

I was sorry, too, for Mr. Fitzgerald, who gave up his position to fight for the Government at Fogo. I told him not to do it but to hold on to his job but he did not listen to good advice and he is now looking for a job. He did his best for his party and I hope he will get his job back for he is not a bad sort of a man and I was really sorry that he possessed the idea that he could win against the F. P. U.

It being now half-past six,the committee adjourned until eight of the clock.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Government in their policy of securing a dredge; but I do not consider that the dredge which they have secured is suitable for the work. The boat may suit St. John's alright. It is able to take up soft mud; but the most of the northern harbours have bottoms of hard sand. The boat has been tried in these places and I have reason to say that the result has been very unsatisfactory.

I sent an experienced man who had spent several years in connection with this work, on board of that dredge. He reported that it was the kind of boat that was used for taking clams. I should like to see the Government secure a better boat. The need for the dredge is apparent, and there are hundreds of harbours all over the Island that require the use of a good dredge. It would be a great benefit to the fishermen to deepen the entrances to the harbours. Obtain a dredge that can do blasting work. Some of the dredges used in the United States cost about $200,000. This is a large amount; but it would be money well spent, if you bought a dredge that would do the kind of work needed in this Colony. This boat of yours could be used very well as a tug-boat here in the harbour. It could be used as a distress-boat to go to the assistance of schooners driven off the coast. There are plenty of uses for that boat. I am afraid that we will not get good results considering what the dredge now costs for maintenance. It would be better for the Government to spend the money to maintain a boat that would do good work. I see here a payment of $650 for a coiler; but I thought the boat was fully equipped when purchased. Mr. Pearcey has received quite a sum, likewise Mr. Duffett. The Newfoundland Produce Company received $800 in June and Mr. Foote got $228 on June 30th.

Other amounts are:—S. Pearcey, $452; P. J. Lake, $189; W.H. Burt, $100; M. Duffett, $375 in Sept.; P. J. Fitzgerald, $60; Mr. Cashin, $256; P. J. Fitzgerald, $61.69; P. J. Fitzgerald, $690 in Oct.; J. & W. Winsor, $296; Nfld. Produce Co., $52.00.

I find that the Nfld. Produce Co. received in June, 1912 to Nov. 1913, $14,172 as payments for insurance. I have not the slightest doubt that the gentlemen who received those splendid payments are delighted. Now, we had to-day tabled the expenses for about 12 months in connection with Prevention of Consumption. Mr. R. White received $3.000 for a site for a sanatorium. I have no objection to some expenditure for the prevention of Consumption, but a great deal of money has been voted for that purpose during the last 5 years and I fear little has been accomplished I wish to make special reference to the conditions prevailing in the lumber camps. We find men going to these camps from remote outports. They are often compelled to eat and sleep in a small room about 30 feet by 20 feet. In such a room some 20 or 30 men have to eat and sleep. These men go to their quarters, from their daily work, with wet clothes, and with no means of drying them. They put them on next morning in about the same condition as when taken off the evening before. In some cases they sleep on beds of boughs, and this year there are a number who have no mattresses. It would be worth while for the Association for the Prevention of Consumption to send someone to report upon the conditions of the logging camps. Some men are there a couple of weeks and the first thing their friends know is that they are seriously ill of pneumonia. I have known many cases in Green Bay where young men after a month's logging returned home to die. Three thousand men are working under these conditions. If we want to look out for their health, we must certainly take some means to ensure better conditions. We must see that they get suitable accommodation and means of drying their sweaty clothes. I am not over-drawing this picture. I hope that something will soon be done to relieve such conditions. It may not have been brought to the notice of this House before; but now that it has been I hope such miserable conditions will be remedied.

With regard to the exhibitions, I note from the returns that the exhibitions which were held during October cost $7,500. There are not all the expenses. We have not all the accounts in from Harbour Main. Would it not have benefitted agriculture much more if this $7,500 had been expended in clearing land? I notice that the R. N. Co. has taken $2,500 for freight. That is a large item out of the $40,000. Mr. M. A. Devine gets $174 and Mr. Devereaux $200 for expenses; Mr. Downey $160 for expenses, in addition to $125 per month received as salary by each.

Now as to the Lobster Fishery here is our Resolution:—

There shall be a Lobster Inspector for St. John's to have control of the testing and grading of canned Lobsters. He shall provide sufficient subordinates to supply firms purchasing lobsters. These subordinates shall pass an examination of qualification and be licensed by the Inspector, they shall test all cans purchased by the firm or firms allotted to each, and grade the quality of the lobster. They shall see that no lobster graded lower than No. 1 is mixed with No. 1, or that lobster bought at less than No. 1 price is mixed or shipped abroad with No. 1.

The Inspector shall brand all cases exported when his agent can vouch for their contents. Severe punishment should be provided for any firm mixing lobster after passing the test of the culler. The Inspector and his

agents to be dismissed for first breach of duty, and the license cancelled for the future. The Government shall pay the salaries of Inspector and his agents, and receive the said payments by placing an export tax of 10c. per case. The cullers shall only be engaged by the Inspector for the season requiring the testing and grading of lobsters from about June to October.

Now this is a very important matter and we had packers at the convention who seemed to think that a great deal of wrong is being done in the assorting of lobsters in St. John's. For instance 10 or 20 cases of lobsters are sent on here and out of that a case and 24 cans say, are condemned and in many cases the packer does not know why. It is often found that the cans condemned are not to be found. Often that they have been unfairly condemned. There should be inspectors to look after the packer's interest here. These packers are in the hands of the buyers at St. John's. The merchants themselves may not be responsible. Some assistant on the wharf is probably the one to blame. A large number of cans are used for sampling. I am told that it frequently happens that someone takes away those samples and makes a meal of them. Of course it is necessary to sample lobsters. But there is a tremendous loss in connection with this sampling and testing. I should think that as much as $4,000 worth is lost to the packers in this way every year.

Nothing has been done to meet our requests and I do not suppose anything will be done until the power comes to us. Meanwhile the fishery is dwindling away. It decreased last year 10,000 cases. The year before last it amounted to 26,000 cases, last year it was only 16,000. That is a serious thing for the country to consider. That is one of the shortages upon which the Minister of Finance did not reckon last year. That is where his estimate may be out—10,000 cases at $22 is quite a sum of money and the Minister of Finance lost his one-third of the $220,000 short in the value of lobsters. I have had something to do with the lobsters, especially during the last 25 years. I believe the only cure for this fishery is to close down one part of the coast one year and close down on another section the following year. At present a tremendous lot of small lobsters are being canned. I know that as many as 25 are put in a can. A legal lobster measures eight inches. Of these there ought to be no more than five in a can. The average when I began to pack was three and when we got down to putting in five we thought they were small lobsters. This is a most serious business. We now sell them at $24.00 a case. Next year they will be $25.00. We need not talk about the Nova Scotia fishery. It is no longer important to us. Most of the Nova Scotia catch is sent fresh into the States and I dare say when the Fog Free Zone railway is established we will do the same. But the Government ought to take up the matter seriously. A commission of lobster experts should be appointed to gather all the information possible so that laws may be passed that will be stringent and that will be strictly adhered to. Never mind appointing fishery wardens. They do not carry out the law. They are only a waste of money. I was a fishery warden many years ago. I visited my section three or four times and I was paid $100 and when I made my report to the Government I said that if they wanted to waste money they should go on paying it out to fishery wardens and that there was no way they could waste it better. I say the same now and I know what I am talking about after twenty

years experience. Fishery wardens are no use to carry out the law. If you want to protect this fishery you must do something more than has ever been done. I see that it is not fair to ask the Government to do everything but I suggest that they pass a law to close down this fishery on the North East coast for two years and then on the West Coast for two years. I would not like to see the whole fishery closed down for two reasons. In the first place we would lose our connection with the markets. We have control of the markets now and if we closed down for any length of time we would not only lose control but probably we would lose all connection with them. And secondly, if we closed down the whole fishery for a couple of years you would probably have a number of people rushing into the business at the end of that time hoping to make a lot of money out of the high price and you would soon again have the industry ruined and the last state would be worse than the first. So that the only remedy is to close down each part alternately for a couple of years. This policy of taking lobsters and breeding them in pounds is only good to the men you employ to run round in motor boats collecting them. The incubators used years ago hatched the fish all right but to be a success the little fish when taken from the incubators should be protected.

I now come to outport hospitals.

We strongly urge the Government to make a start in connection with their promises in this respect, and are of the opinion that Twillingate, Fogo and Bonavista should be considered the coming session, as great suffering and even loss of lives are caused owing to the want of those most beneficial institutions.

I am a believer in cottage hospitals as proposed by the F. P. U. resolutions. I do not see why a dying man or an injured man should be brought on here from Bonavista or Trinity or Green Bay. There are in Bonavista three or four good doctors who are able to look after such an institution as a cottage hospital with ten or a dozen beds. At present a man is very often taken and put aboard a steamer, brought, say to Lewisporte, taken from the steamer, put on board the train and then a journey of a couple of hundred miles in our easy going trains. No wonder they are nearly dead when they arrive. I know that the Government has a great deal to do and it is unfair to ask them to expend more money than they have, but I think that in places like Bonavista and Twillingate, where there are two or three good doctors and in similar places on the West Coast we ought to have cottage hospitals. I believe that if the Government went the right way to work they would get the fishermen to subscribe to the upkeep of such institutions. I am sure I could get the F. P. U. to give $1.00 a man to support a cottage hospital in their own town. I do not see why the Government should have to pay for everything and I think that if the Government showed interest in the right and proper way they would find the fisherman a very reasonable person where such matters are concerned. You are not going to bull dose and force him but there is no man more reasonable than a fisherman, if taken in the right way and I believe they would pay $1.00 a head for the support of cottage hospitals. Dr. Grenfell had a hospital at Pilley's Island which failed, but Dr. Grenfell is not the Government and not the F. P. U. The fishermen don't take to Americans easily. The Americans do not know out people. They are a little

distant and stand-offish. The fisherman likes to feel comfortable and happy and intimate with those with whom he comes in contact. Dr. Grenfell's hospital has not been a success at Pilley's Island for that reason. While on this subject there is a matter I should like to mention. We ought to have a dispensary in connection with the hospital here. I do not know why we have not got one. We ought to haveone, it ought to be every man's right to go there and be examined and find out what is wrong with him. At present a poor man has to go to a doctor or get one to come to him. It costs him $1.00 or $2.00 and so he puts off having one as long as possible,so that a matter which if dealt with at the initial stages would succumb to treatment, a week later very often takes six weeks to cure, because the sufferer failed at the right time to receive proper medical treatment. So that we ought to have a dispensary and everyone ought to have a right to go there and be examined and prescribed forandif the doctor in charge thinks it necessary to send him to the hospital let him send him there. I feel sure my hon. friend Mr. Higgins would support such a proposal.

The next matter I wish to speak about is night schools. The Government were going to have a commission appointed to consider this matter and this commission was going to report at this session of the Legislature. I presume the commission never met. We ought to have night schools. We have one or two here in St. John's and we find they are doing a lot of good among those who had not a chance to learn when they were young. I believe in night schools. When I was at Herring Neck I opened a night school in the fall months and I found it did a lot of good. I found the young men appreciated it. It did not cost them anything. They were only too glad to come and the only difficulty I found was that too many came. One finds that boys of 9 and 10 years of age are taken away from school. They are a little use in the boat or schooner and their father takes them fishing, intending to send them back to school in the winter. Then when the winter comes the father wants to build or repair a boat and Tommy has to stay home to help. The next summer he is even more useful, in fact too useful to go to school. He is now twelve or thirteen and he has to work. He has no time in the day to learn anything and he has no facilities for learning anything at night. Nothing has been done to meet the requirements of these boys. They are allowed to spend their evenings smoking their pipes and playing cards in someone's kitchen, when they would be only too glad to go into some school for a couple of hours every night. They would find that at the end of the season they would have improved considerably. There is a great need for this. The only way to get at the matter is by giving bonuses to teachers who will teach in a night school. I thought something would be done in this direction when $20,000 was voted for teachers some few years ago, but nothing was done. The three or four teachers in a harbor could come together and hold regular classes for work and a great deal could be done in this way. There are numbers of boys who never get a chance to learn anything. I myself was taken away from school when I was eleven years old and I have never had a chance to go to school regularly since, and what I have learnt I have learnt by my own exertions. I hope the Government will take this matter up and see that some such scheme as I have outlined is established.

The next matter to which I wish to refer is Old Age Pensions. I opposed the Government's policy of giving out 400 pensions to men of 75 years of age. When the Government decided to do this I as President of the F. P. U., protested against it. I did so on these grounds: If you cannot afford to give it to all those who have reached the age limit of 75 then do not give it to any. Do not make cheese of one and chalk of another. If any man is entitled to this then all at 75 are entitled to it. There must be no difference. The Government said they could not find enough money. But last year they took off $380,000 in duties. Every year since they have been in power they have had a surplus. They should have provided for every man in the country at 75 years of age. All that is necessary is to put 20 cents a barrel on flour. I told the Government before that if they put on 20 cents a barrel on flour to go for pensions for aged toilers they would derive enough from this source. They ought not to pay the few a pension and let the others go without it. Take an instance. Two men, both 75 years old. Both have gone to the fishery for 60 years. They raised their families. They have paid their accounts. They have been exemplary citizens and now when they are passed work when they are worn out they expect the Government to provide some small pension for them. The Government provided for 400 out of the 1400, because that is about the number that there are in the Island at the age of 75. They provided four hundred and the other thousand are thrown aside. All had an equal claim. I wanted the Government to make the age limit 70 years and the pension $100, but I am prepared to waive that for the present so long as they treat all alike and give what the finances of the Colony will permit. When I was canvassing Bonavista Bay I learnt that my opponents had had a lot to say about Old Age Pensions. They criticised my platform. I wanted 70 years as the limit and every man to get it. They asked down there, "Do you want the pensions given to James Ryan and Phillip Templeman?" I say sir, that if the Old Age Pension scheme is right it should be every man's right to claim it as a right when he reaches the age limit and if Ryan and Templeman with all their thousands want to take the pension then they should have a perfect right to do so. Take two typical instances. You have two men just starting out in life. One man gets a good wife, a woman who looks after what he earns. If he earns $100 she sees that every cent of it is properly spent. She goes into the stage and on the flake and does her share of the work. She works the garden in the summer when the man is away. The other man gets a wife whose main desire in life is fancy dress and fancy hats and who wants a servant girl. She spends every cent of his earnings and the man sees that the proceeds of his hard work are done away with. The other man finds that because of his hard-working wife he can afford to put a little away. When he gets on towards fifty he has $2,000 put away because both have worked early and late. The other man begins to get lazy and sulky. He doesn't care when he gets up to work and he might just as well earn $50 as $100. One makes a few thousands and has a little property, well kept because he worked hard and his wife made good use of her time, and was careful over what he earned. Are you going to penalize him for his industry and say: There is nothing for you. If you do that the result will be that no one will trouble about the future, because they will feel that

when they reach the age of 70, if they are in need, they will get a pension of $100 and that in the meantime they can take it easy. If you want to make the country prosperous, give every man the right to his pension; and if one man has more means than another and does not need the pension, why he can leave it,and it can be put to some other use. Another thing. We hear a lot about giving pensions to men but there is no talk about giving them to women. Who works the harder in Newfoundland, I should like to ask, men or women? The men have to work hard during the fishing season, but the women have to work hard during the fishing season and all the other seasons from early morning till late at night. They are at work while man is resting, smoking his pipe or reading his paper, and she is sewing and darning when he has been hours and hours in bed. If she doesn't do it she cannot make the two ends meet. During her early life a woman helps her husband in every way. Then when she is old and worn out, and her children have gone away or got married and cannot afford to give her very much, she has not a cent in her pocket and no means of getting anything. She is too old to work for her living, and all that is left for her to do is to pray God to take her out of her misery. I have been in homes and seen women on their knees praying God to take them. Now that is a condition of affairs that should not be permitted to exist. It is difficult to say who is to blame for this, but at any rate nothing has been done, and these poor women have had to depend on the widow's dole—$4.00 a quarter to some, $5 to others, and in extreme cases $6.00. They have been worn out in the service of their country, and when they become too old to work any more they are regarded as outcasts. Contrast this with the way in which Government officials are treated, men who have served their country for ten or fifteen years at a salary of a thousand dollars a year—and as soon as they get too old for service they get pensioned as a matter of right. They are not paupers. I might cite the case of the wife of the ex-Magistrate of Bonavista, who was a telegraph operator in the public service. When she became a widow she got a pension of $160 a year because at one time before marrying she was an operator in the public service. But the poor fisherman's wife, who has worn herself out doing her duty, has to put up with $20.00 a year. Be up and doing. Look after these poor old souls, who have done their duty and made the country what it is, and in their old age give them sufficient to enable them to live fairly decently. I earnestly hope that something will be done in this matter, and done quickly. Give them pensions as a right. Don't call them paupers and outcasts. In London and New York and the other great cities of the world there are people who deserve this name—people who have never done an honest day's work in their lives; but the wives of our fishermen have done nothing to deserve the name. I hope the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister will communicate with every Poor Commissioner in the Island to-morrow, and tell them to no longer call the worn-out widows of Newfoundland paupers.

Now, in relation to Cold Storage. I hope the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister wont think what I say is too hard, because while I do not feel that he is going to appreciate what I am saying, yet I have no desire to do any thing to interfere with the Government in doing what they can to help the toiling masses, and if they have any plans to put in practice with that end in view no one will give them more aid than we will. We are here,

as has been already said, to do what we can for those who sent us. We are independent, and our sole desire is to uplift the country and make it a happy and prosperous place to live in. Now, about this Cold Storage business, you have been so busy on the other side of the House considering the railway policy and such like, that you have quite forgotten Cold Storage, but don't you see that it is one of the things which is needed to make this country great. If you were to put a depot in a place like Greenspond or Catalina, with a motor boat in connection with it and get fifty squids or 100 squids, and spend every suitable day on the fishing ground, you would find that *you* would add a tremendous amount of fish to the catch. These men have now got to spend days and days, often three and four days out of a week, looking for bait, and in that way they lose a tremendous amount of time. In Catalina alone, if there were a bait depot there, probably a thousand quintals would be added to the catch, that is, $6,000; and the cost of a depot would not be more than a thousand dollars. And do you realize this: That if these men at Catalina made that extra $6,000 they would spend it in buying goods, so that a considerable portion of it would go into the revenue of the country. And the same thing would apply to the rest of the country. You would find that you would be getting a tremendous revenue, and the cost, as I have said, would not be great. We have offered to build those depots and maintain and operate them free. All we want is for the Government to give us the materials. I don't believe that the Government should be asked to do everything. I think the people should help, and I don't believe in helping any man who will not help himself. In the Union we don't do it. If a man is poor we will help him on. If he wants twenty or thirty or forty dollars to help him get a fit out for the fishery instead of going to the merchant and getting himself over his head in debt, we will loan him the money. We won't be down on him becaushe he is poor, but we will say to him: Here is your chance, go and do the best you can, but mind you must pay that money back. If he doesn't get the fish, and cannot earn the money, we forgive the debt, but otherwise we insist on getting paid; and if the person can pay it and won't, he will never get another cent from our Union, and he is put out of our ranks and is known as a black sheep. But, as I have said, as a rule the man who gets that money works and toils as he never did before in order to earn that money and pay back the Union the loan, because he knows that the Union helped him to keep his head above water, and he doesn't want every man in the Harbor to be down on him and calling him a black sheep. If a man is dishonest you must make him honest, and the way to make him honest is to trust him. There are men who from the start have never had fair play. There is some good in every man and the way to bring out that good is to make him feel that you trust him and that he is getting his chance. You will not do him any good by trampling on him all the time, while if he sees that you have faith in him you will find that he will respond. That is what we are doing in the Union. It is too bad of me to be taking up so much of the time of the House, but I have a wonderful lot to say. I hope the Rt. Hon. Premier won't be too mad with me.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have not the slightest objection to you taking all the time you want. I will be delighted to hear all you have to say.

MR. COAKER.—That is something like Dr. Lloyd, in Trinity Bay, who often said that he much preferred sitting on his seat and listening to Coaker because he always made such splendid speeches. But I know the Premier is not going to find fault with me, and if he will listen he may learn something that will be of use to him .Now, the Premier has been credited with the statement that oil and water will never mix. If he did not say it, the Herald has said something to the effect that the Union Party and the Liberal Party would never get along together because oil and water will not mix. Well, it is quite true that oil and water will not mix, the oil floats on the top of the water. Now, the oil in this case is the Union or Coaker, and it is on top, and we are going to pour some of this oil on the Liberal water and see what effect it will have. Have you ever heard of the effect of oil poured on water? I have read a lot about the Panama Canal, and down there they have discovered a wonderful remedy for one of the terrible diseases that used to be so prevalent there. They found that the germs which were the cause of the disease used to breed in stagnant water, and also they discovered that they could destroy the germs by pouring oil on the water, and that was what they did,and now that disease has been entirely stamped out down there. Now, we are going to try that experiment here and pour a little Union oil on the Liberal waters and kill out all the mosquitoes and germs and blood-suckers that exist in them.

Now, my friend the hon. member for Harbor Main, in the course of his speech (and I am not going to raise any objections to most of the things he said; I intend to let them pass; I dare say if he had his time over again he would not have acted as he did) made one or two remarks which I intend to deal with. One was that they had won up in Harbor Main on principle. I must say that I differ from him on that point, and what has made me think that queer things were done up there and that the vote was not on principle is the like of this.

"Men of Harbor Main District, read this: Coaker has made the statement in Green Bay, Fogo, Bonavista and Trinity that work at Bell Island mines will be equally divided with the fishermen of the northern bays, and that Conception Bay men will no longer have the monopoly of the work if he is elected. Signed, Mark Osmond."

Now I don't say that the hon. member wrote this, but whoever is guilty of printing it and circulating it is guilty of dastardly work, and if the hon. member calls such tactics as that fighting an election on principle, I cannot say that I agree with him. But a little more.

"Just seriously consider what this policy, if carried out, will mean to Harbor Main. There are over 2,000 men employed at Bell Island mostly all of whom reside in Conception Bay and if the work is divided with the men of the northern districts it will mean that at least a thousand of you will have to be discharged, and as a result many of you will have to leave the country. What is your plain duty then? Go to the polling booths and record your votes against Coaker's nominees."

Here is another.

"Coaker has stated in Bonavista Bay that the cause of the shortage of bait is owing to the tremendous amount of caplin that is used at Holyrood and Harbor Main to manure the ground, and that if he is returned he is going to pass legislation preventing

any caplin being used for manure."

Now, if after hearing this anybody contends that the election in Harbor Main was fought on principle, I cannot agree with him. I believe in putting up a good fight but I also believe in giving fair play. In the last campaign I never said anything in Bonavista or Trinity or anywhere else that I would be ashamed to repeat here in this House. In my campaign through the last three or four years I never attacked anyone individually. I talked Unionism and the good that the Union could do, and that is why I won in Bonavista Bay. It is alright to say that we were not fighting on Tory and Liberal lines, but our fight was fair. I did not blame the Government altogether for what they had done, but they might have done more. They did not treat us right. They refused our aid and support and would not work with us. What were we to do? Go down on your knees to these men, or were we justified in making up with the party whom we thought had some sympathy for us and our work? If we did not do it we would not have been men.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. —I wish to say that I never used your name on any platform in the district of Harbor Main; neither did I see that circular.

MR. COAKER.—Did you read the report of your meeting at Holyrood which came to the papers in St. John's.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. —I don't think I did.

MR. COAKER.—Well, if you did you would have found a great deal in that message about who Coaker was and what he was doing. I want to tell you that if I went up to Harbor Main to oppose you I would give you a clean fight, and if you wanted to do anything else then I would deal with you. I want to say that I do not intend to be a party to this kind of work, but if you start it then I will fight you with your own weapons. I will not be the first to strike a blow, but if you strike I will most certainly strike back.

Then my friend said that there was somebody behind me. I want to tell him that I and the men who are with me are free. There is no one behind us. Who was behind the Premier? No one. Who was behind Mr. Kent? No one. I presume they will say there was not. I am here as the representative of the Fishermen's Union. I have a responsible position to fill in that Union and I have got to give an account of my stewardship every time the Convention meets. I must produce my accounts and answer any questions that I may be asked concerning them. All my official correspondence and whatever I do in my official capacity as President of the F. P. U. must be laid before the Convention. This year we had 160 men from 160 different settlements at the Convention, and all my actions were laid before them. I am here representing these men. There is no one behind me. I want the House to understand that clearly. The insinuation was, of course, that Mr. Morine was behind me. Now, I want the House to understand that Mr. Morine has no political connection whatever with me. He is the solicitor for the Union, and he advises me on legal matters concerning which I ask his advice but he has no other connection with me in any way. The Fishermen's Union have never considered any connection with Mr. Morine except in his capacity as a solicitor. Now, I hope I have made things clear so far as that point is concerned.

With regard to Confederation, I said the other day that I believed that the present policy of the Government would mean Confederation. I believe

that if you go on building railways and borrowing money as you are doing now, you will soon find that you will have six or seven branch railways built and ready to run, and no money. The man that built the railways will say: I have a contract with you; I have certain obligations to perform towards Newfoundland, for the carrying out of which you have got security worth $250,000 that I handed over some years ago. Now, I want to be released from my obligations, and I want you yourselves to take charge of your railway operations. Whenever the Reid Newfoundland Co. chooses to write a letter to the Colonial Secretary and lay down that position, you have got to take over the railway lines and operate them. Now, mind, you have paid that man for operating the railway for forty years, and have inserted no provision in any of your contracts that if he does not carry out his obligations he is to forfeit the land given him in payment for forty years operation of the system. He owns them and you cannot take them from him, and when he sucks the orange dry and when all the branches are built that can be built and he can earn no more money, you will find that he will say: Operate your system; I have lost money in the operation of your railroads, and now you have got to operate it yourself. And then what will you do? You will have to go to the Canadian Government and ask them to take us into confederation. That is why I am so opposed to the policy of going on building railway after railway without counting the cost. It is alright to say that this is not true, and that no such things can happen, and all that sort of thing; but before the railway deal of 1898 was brought into this House we would have thought that it would be impossible for such a law to be carried through the Legislature. And when it was done did we not rise up in our thousands and say: No, such a thing shall be; we are supreme and we will not permit it. And did we not send petitions to the foot of the Throne asking that it be forbidden; and we were told that we were helpless. That is what I meant the other day when I said that this policy will result in confederation, but it will be a confederation with us on our knees and they will give us what they like.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words relative to the resignation of Sir Robert Bond. This in my opinion was perhaps the best thing that ever happened to this Colony. We now look to Mr. Kent to lead us, and as the cry of Sectarianism has been raised, this will have the happy result that we shall hear no more about it. Sir Robert Bond was indeed a great man. Honesty and integrity were his chief characteristics and no one could point the finger of scorn at him. He has delivered splendid speeches in this House and spoken words that will long be remembered by those who heard him on various platforms throughout the country. As a worker he ranks lower than the Hon. Premier, and if he was as approachable as the Premier he would be sitting this evening leader of the Government. But he never could assimilate with the common man. His resignation affects me but little for we are strong and can well do without Sir Robert Bond, if he can do without us—which I doubt. I regret he resigned when he did, but we the Opposition are here to-day under the leadership of Mr. Kent. Mr. Kent may not agree with me in some of my opinions and views but I state with confidence that he will before this session ends. Dr. Lloyd is a hard man to beat in debate and I am glad to be able to state his views coincide

with those of the Union. Objections are to be heard saying that he is a man from Wales and a stranger. He is a man from England. He left school at the early age of twelve and has the honour of being perhaps the most highly educated man in this House to-day. He is a man to whom the country looks up, and will no doubt have a great and prominent part to play in the future history of this country. It is indeed no reflection that he is not a native of this country. I wanted Mr. Kent to accept the position of leader of this party last year. Had he done so we should now be occupying the seats on the other side of the House. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, to have occupied the attention of this House so long, I can only say in conclusion that had all those now listening to me heard me deliver some of the speeches I made in Bonavista Bay which lasted two and three hours, they would all be strong Coaker men and fighting for the cause of the Fishermen's Protective Union.

HON. MR. CROSBIE.—Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of addressing this House in connection with the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, until the Leader of the F. P. U., W. F. Coaker said across the floors of this House that he would skin me down. What these words mean I cannot say, but as I look across the House at the Leader of the F. P. U. and after his Speech of this afternoon I am sure this House will pardon me if I repeat a very familiar quotation which I am sure this House will agree is most appropriate for the Leader of the F. P. U. "Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad."

Mr. Speaker, I thought I would treat this with silent contempt as I have done the past four years but fearing my countrymen and constituents may misunderstand me, I feel it is my duty to reply as briefly as possible. He apparently has an idea that he is a little god, and that he is everything that is good, but perhaps it would be well to remind him of what the famous writer has said, "It will come to pass every braggart shall be found an ass." How appropriate these words are to the Leader of the F. P. U. will be readily acknowledged by all who have read the back issues of the Advocate, and who have heard him speak this afternoon.

As to the price of fish; I have listened to the hon. members discussing this question until it makes one weary. One of the best speeches in connection with the fishery question and the price was made by my hon. friend the member for the District of Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman. He told us supply and demand govern the price, if he had told us anything else we would have believed that he knew he told us what was untrue; but I differ from him when he says that Green fish going into American markets has no effect whatever on the price of fish in this Colony. I will quote figures for my hon. friend and he will then see he has been in error.

The calendar year of 1910 we exported green fish to the United States, 443 qtls.; in 1911, 69,841 qtls.; in 1912, 51,788 qtls.; in 1913, 104,197 qtls. If you will notice the Oporto stocks for the year 1910, we exported 443 quintals only of Green fish and the stock in Oporto in the spring was 23,000 quintals. In 1911, when we exported 69,840, the stocks in Oporto in the spring of 1912, were eight thousand and some odd hundred quintals, and when we exported in 1912 , 51,788 quintals you will find the stocks in Oporto in the Spring of 1913 down to practically 7,600 quintals; for the Calendar year of 1913 we exported 104,197 quintals of green fish, and I make this statement without fear of contradic-

tion that you will find the stocks in June 1914 lower than we have ever seen them on acount of the large export of green fish to the United States in 1913, therefore the argument of my hon. friend has fallen to pieces when he says that the export of green fish from the West Coast in the fall of the year has no effect on our foreign markets; I say without fear of contradiction that it has practically all to do with the price of early fish, as Oporto more or less rules the price for the new fish on the West Coast and practically the whole Island.

Again referring to the price of fish I will quote what was paid for it:— In 1905, $7.00 Talqual, 1906, $6.50 Talqual, 1907, $6.00 Talqual, 1910 $6.75 Talqual, and yet the Leader of the F. P. U. has the audacity to say he rose the price of fish when these prices were paid when he was down stuffing the sheep with straw at Coakerville, as he told us in his speech.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the discussions of culling, the cure and standardising etc. of Codfish and I am told by the Leader of the F.P.U. that it is essential that it should be standardised and culled; in this I agree with him, but it is very poor example for the Leader of the F. P. U., the hon. member for the District of Bonavista, to educate the people to cure their fish, when during the election campaign of 1913 we could see them taking it in at Grate's Cove by the lamp light, and the fish almost alive; it would really make one sick to hear them talking about the quality or standardising of fish.

As to the railway, Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said since I have been in this House that the railway on the North Shore should never have gone beyond Lower Island Cove. What folly! Why the leader of the F.P.U. knows but very little about it. The people of the North Shore deserved a railroad long ago, and it is one of the pleasures of my life, and of my late colleague Mr. Jesse Whiteway that we were able to complete a promise to the people of the North Shore for which they have paid taxes for years and years. If I remember rightly there were petitions sent into this House a year or two ago asking to stop the building of this railroad, these petitions were engineered by the Leader of the F. P. U., therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand a man coming here and saying he is in favour of this or that to-day and against it to-morrow, he is not to be taken seriously. Mr. Grimes during his remarks yesterday mentioned the supplies that were given to the men by the Reid Nfld. Co. on the South Shore, and although they got $1.50 per day they were so taxed and overcharged that when the month was up they had nothing for it. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say here that the Reid Nfld. Co. has not supplied the people of the North Shore; when they found out that they could get the supplies on the Shore, they did not supply them, for as they said to me there was nothing in it, and yet to-day they are accused in this House of taking practically all the men earned.

With regard to the agricultural policy, I say, Mr. Speaker, if the agricultural policy had been carried on in the lines that it was intended by the Prime Minister undoubtedly this country would have benefitted very much more by it, but the Prime Minister was a very broad minded man and said he wanted to make this Society a non-political one, and in my mind this helped to defeat the main object of the Society. I can quote instances where men opposed to the Government have been given charge of cattle, and have gone so far as to let

these poor unfortunate beasts starve, and it was nothing more or less than their vindictive spirit and hatred towards the Government. I think, Mr. Speaker, the proper place for some of these would be behind the bars. Some people objected to the Government taking a gift from Canada in the shape of fifty Sable Island ponies which did not cost the Government a cent, and we gave them around to different people, and yet they come in here to criticise the money they cost.

Now as to Old Age Pensions; I am quite in harmony with what the Government has done, and there are today, Mr. Speaker, fifty-seven Old Age Pensions in our district,and I for one am proud to say I had the privilege of voting for the Old Age Pension which gives $50.00 a year to men over 75 years old. If I get no other thanks than what I got in travelling through the district last fall, when one old chap shook my hand and said, "God bless you, your colleague and Government, for the Old Age pension which has made me so happy in my old age," I am fully repaid for what I have done in connection with this Old Age pension.

Mr. Speaker, another matter which has been discussed in this House is the price of coals, and I now quote the cost of coals for the benefit of this House, and I might say I am prepared and would ask the Prime Minister to pass a bill and look into what the coal is actually costing the merchant, and if the coal merchant is stealing from the people then I feel it is the duty of the Goverument to import coals here for the people so that their money will not be taken from them in this way. I am told by the Leader of the F. P. U. that he sold his coals at $6.80 and made no profit. Mr. Speaker, we are not working for no profit, we must make a profit or we cannot live, and I may say if we break down a wharf, if we run into a steamer, or any damage we may do we have no body of men to whom we can pass the hat around and say that you must give 25c. a man for repairs to steamer, wharf, etc., and one can readily understand if you have a body of men at your back who are prepared to give in this way, it is very easy to sell coals at $6.80.

Mr. Speaker, I have been accused by the leader of the F.P.U.of doing everything in the past four years that is bad; he tells us that I sold to the Government of this Colony two spars for $2,200.00, I now insist and demand that the Prime Minister will lay on the table of this House a statement of what I had actually sold to the Government. I may say, Mr. Speaker that we sold to the Government 4 Oregon Pine sticks 75 feet long, two topmasts 35 feet long, and top gallant mast yardsand rigging complete,and yet,sir,I am accused by the hon.member for Bonavista of having sold to the Government 2 spars for the sum of $2,200.00. Mr. Speaker, a man who is capable of such lies is contemptible enough for anything, and yet he tells us that his Election campaign was a clean one. He has also referred to our coastal contracts. Why should we not have coastal contracts as well as anybody else? The Coastal Contracts of the Newfoundland Produce Co., which I have the honour to be the Managing Director of was advertised for in the papers of this Colony for thirty days and no one would send a coastal boat on the Fogo service, and I also may say Mr. Speaker, no one would run a boat on the Fortune Bay Service, and now we are running these boats and making a success of them. If these contracts were

given to Messrs. Bowring or Messrs. Reid it would be quite in order. For what the Government pay us we give them full value, and carry out our contracts to the letter. As the Hon-member for Bonavista, apparently seems to know all the money we are making out of these contracts I would say to him: Come up to my office with the F.P.U. money and give me the cost of the steamers of the Nfld. Produce Co., Ltd., and I will transfer them to you with pleasure, but he knows, Mr. Speaker, that he cannot run such a contract and that in a very short while, like all other things he has undertaken they will become a failure.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say a word to the followers of the Leader of the F. P. U., in fact I feel nothing but pity for them, and all I can say is that it is a case of the blind leading the blind, and they all will fall into the ditch together. I might also say, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Leader of the F. P. U. that I began to earn my living when I was sixteen years of age and I am now thirty-seven, and those who have had to depend on me from that date have never had to be fed by sweet charity. As I said in the beginning of my speech I did not intend to address this House until later in the session, but the remarks of the Leader of the F. P. U. have left me nothing else to do but to reply, as I have thought silence was no longer golden, and I would quote one of Shakespeare's famous quotations for my friend, the leader of the F.P.U. "Who dressed in little brief authority most ignorant of what he's most assured like an angry ape plays such fantastic tricks before high Heaven as make the angels weep."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I may say that there is no crime that the Leader of the F. P. U. has not accused me; he has branded me, I understand, as the worst scoundrel who ever sat in the House of Assembly. That honour might have been mine in the past four years, but as this is the first year the Leader of the F. P. U. has sat in the House of Assembly I transfer the bouquet to his good self as he is better qualified to wear it than I am. At some further date I may avail of the opportunity of saying a few words.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, there are just a few words I should like to address to the House in relation to the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The amendment is in relation to the filling of the offices which were occupied by Messrs. Morison and Blandford and is as follows:

"We, however, regret that measures were not adopted previous to the meeting of the Legislature, so that the Departments of Justice and Agriculture and Mines might be represented in the Legislative Assembly by their proper ministers, responsible for the administration of these departments respectively, and we trust that the usual costitutional procedure will be adopted at once whereby they will be so represented during the remainder of the present session of the Legislature."

In pointing out the non-necessity of this amendment I should like, with the permission of the House, to say one or two words in reply to the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, who this afternoon and to-night delivered a very exhaustive and in many respects novel and interesting speech. Although he has spoken before on the Address in Reply, we may regard this as in effect his maiden speech on important matters. There are two or three important points which he

touched upon, and I should like to refer to them very briefly. In the first place he referred to the Reid Newfoundland Company and the danger that he foresees that they are not going to carry out their contract. Well, that is a most serious matter for anyone in this House to take up or to make such a statement in relation to the Reid Newfoundland Company unless he is prepared to submit facts convincing to this House and convincing to the country. I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, that there is any less security to-day than in the Contract made in 1898 with the Company and which was extended in 1901 by the late administration and this Legislature fifty years from 1901. The Contracts that we have made with the Company have been only for the same period, that is fifty years from 1901. Nearly fifteen years of this period has now passed away, and we are getting nearer and nearer to its termination. it may be that there are many in this Chamber to-night who will not be here when the question will have to be taken up as to whether we are to operate the railway and other works ourselves, but when they take that question up they will find it very difficult to make a better contract than was made in 1898. I do not propose to weary the House by arguing the details of that proposition. I have done it over and over again, and I merely wish to say here and now that I would not hesitate in submitting that Contract to any competent tribunal with absolute certainty of receiving as a verdict that there never was a better Contract for Newfoundland or any other country. But, Sir, I say that now in no spirit of blaming those who have been on the other side. I say it in no hope or expectation of winning the support of anyone on the other side or in the country, because no doubt people now have taken sides and made up their minds; but when the hon. member in his representative capacity here to-night referred to the thousands of petitions that went to the foot of the Throne against that Contract, then I think, as one of those who supported that contract, one of the few representatives in this Chamber to-nigint that voted in support of that Contract, and in defence of those who have passed out of this House—some of whom can never again defend their action either here or elsewhere, I think I may be pardoned if I say, as I have said, a word or two in reference to it. There never was a better contract. What was the position? We had built a railway to Port aux Basques—six hundred miles of road. The contractor who had built the road was about to leave the country, and we had the road on our hands and we had to operate it. The operation might mean a loss of two hundred thousand dollars a year, judging by what the Intercolonial and similar roads were losing. The Government of the day—the Winter-Morine Government—and the thirty men in this Legislature who voted for that contract saw that in that offer of Mr. Reid at that time lay the only hope and the only certainty for Newfoundland to get clear of the operating expenses for fifty years and the possibility of developing the country. What are the facts? Now after having the road for over fifteen years they have not been able to sell or settle an acre of the land we gave them. Why to hear the way it is talked about, you would think the land we gave them was Hyde Park or the very finest land around the cities of London or New York. We gave them land, it is true, that in time will probably become valuable by settlement, but it is a difficult proposition to settle those lands and to induce immigrants to

come and settle on them while the attractions of the United States and Canada are at our door. Sir Robert Reid took this road and operated it free except for this land we gave him and which can never be of value to him unless he makes it valuable by settlement and development and we have built a road that cost nearly $9,000,000. We were faced with a loss on operation—a loss, if you like, that might be justified because it was going to be a great developing influence and agency in the country but we were only too glad to get clear of the annual loss on the operation and get a man to take that road and operate it for fifty years by reason of our giving him land. And now as I said, after fifteen years we read in the position of affairs to-night our justification because he has operated it for fifteen years at a loss—and a very serious loss—he has not been able to utilise one acre of the land we gave him, and anyone that wants to, can to-day get land from him free; they have been advertising them practically free, both the timber and agricultural lands. It was the same with the other branches of the contract, we have got steamers on every bay for one half what we can get them to-day. We are paying the Reid Nfld. Co. to-day for nine steamers that they operate for the Government about one-half what we would have to pay at public tender and what we are paying Bowring's for their splendid service, and other contractors. We are paying Bowring Bros. to-day for their coastal service something like seventy-five thousand dollars. That is very nearly the same amount we paid Reid under the 1898 contract for the steamers he was then operating and it was the very lowest we could get them for. Sir Robert Bond in 1905 advertised for these steamers for the coastal contract and he could not get them for one cent less and he could not get anyone else to tender for them and I would say to my hon. friend the member for Bonavista if he has an open mind upon the matter and if he is desirous of finding out the facts relating to the 1898 contract I hope some day I may have an opportunity of talking the matter over with him, and putting our side of the case to him and I am convinced he will be satisfied that there never was a better contract for Newfoundland and that in a few years time when that road comes back to us we will find it very difficult indeed to get a better contract.

Then as regards the security he has referred to, we have practically the same security that we had in 1901. Why every day the Company are adding to the value of their property Within the last five years they have invested nearly a million dollars in steamers. They have got two boats running to Port aux Basques that cost half a million dollars. They have another one running to Labrador that cost a quarter of a million and they have steamers in other directions, all aggregating about a million dollars, so that as far as the Colony is concerned if there was any trouble we have ample security. Why a Company that is doing its utmost like the Reid Nfld. Co. should be made a football of in this House and in the Press is a question I can never understand. No other Company could stand it and no other business in Newfoundland would permit it. We have no more right to get up here and talk about the insolvency and the inability of the Company to meet its obligations than about any other firm on Water Street. I say it is wrong and cruel and unfair and unjust. I notice it Mr. Speaker, merely in connection with the statement made by the hon. member that our security for the carrying out of

our contract for the operation of a branch line is not good. Now I tell you that the security is quite as good as under the 1898 contract and the 1901 contract or any other contract.

Then he talked about Old Age Pensions. Old Age Pensions were talked about for years and years until the present Government came into power and then we dealt with it, and not four hundred as he says, but twelve hundred old people in this country to-night are receiving these pensions. It is perfect nonsense to talk about giving every one a pension because it would be merely taking it out of one pocket and putting it into another. Who are we going to get to pay these pensions? We have to remember that whilst we want to be generous we have first to be just; you cannot muzzle the ox that treads the corn; and you cannot add too much to the burden of taxation of the people of the Colony and when we have asked them to give fifty dollars a year to every old man in the country who is in want I think we have done about all that we can hope to do for the present.

However, when the condition of the country warrant it, we may be able to increase that amount and may be able to reduce the age limit; but when you give twelve hundred pensions as we have done of fifty dollars a year it embraces nearly every old man in the country that is in want. The hon. gentleman asked the question, "Why have you not done it to the old ladies?" and then he made a very fine appeal for which I give him credit; but which does more credit to his heart than to his head. Does he not know that in nearly every house that that pension went there was an old lady and when you gave it to the old man you gave it to the old woman. But even there I am prepared to admit that when the Colony's funds warrant it, and when the country is in a position to pay out more money, that even that may be taken up and we may not alone increase the pension for the old men but may be able to extend it to the old women. Rome was not built in a day, and we cannot be expected to do everything in the short space of four or five years. Look upon what we have done. Even our opponents admit that we have accomplished marvels in the four years that we were in power. There would have been no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we would have swept the country from one end to the other had it not been for the new policy and the new gospel propounded by my friend in connection with his Union. He has told us to-day that not a man on that side of the House with the exception of Mr. Kent, the Leader of the Opposition, and Mr. Dwyer, but owed their seats to the votes of his Union. We carried every seat in Conception Bay with the exception of one man and every seat from St. John's to Bonne Bay where there was no Union and we would have carried the North and got every district in the North if it had been merely a question of policy. In other words we would have carried the North if we had been tried by the people of the North by our record and by what we had done but our candidates went down there and were up against an entirely different proposition and the issues there had no bearing upon the public affairs of the Colony and had no more to do with the affairs of the country than the issues in the election that took place in England a few days ago. I do not say that in any offensive sense. I do not say that that is not perfectly right; but what I do say is this, that there was no trial of the Government. The result of the elections down there is no measure of the way in which we did our work.

Then my hon. friend went on to talk about Night Schools and cottage hospitals and he referred to the fact that a year ago we had promised to hold a commission in relation to Night Schools. That is not quite correct. What we did say was that we would inquire into the matter, and we are inquiring into the matter to-day and have been inquiring into it for some time and we hope Mr. Speaker to establish after a while continuation schools all over Newfoundland.

MR. COAKER.—This session?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Not this session, because it will require a lot of money. We have voted over one million dollars in four years, more than the previous Government voted in eight. We added one hundred thousand in four years to the Education vote. When we came in the Revenue of the Colony was about three million dollars and when our term was up it was about four. It may be said you are receiving a million dollars a year more than your predecessors and what are you doing with it. Well in the first place we are paying one hundred thousand dollars more on Education grants. We are paying sixty thousand a year in Old Age Pensions. The various public institutions like the Hospital, the Lunatic Asylum and the Department of Public Charities take another very large sum. Then we have got the Lighthouses and Fog Alarms all over the country that we have established and are maintaining. Then we have put in over fifty telegraph offices in five years and put up some thousand of miles of wires all over the country. We are paying $210,000 interest on the money that went to build the branch railroads. That $210,000 is money found, and is not costing the rate payers of this Colony one dollar. It does not represent increased taxation because it is money found. When we came in there was no tax on the Bell Island Companies. They had a good property and were paying good dividends and they are now paying the Colony $100,000 a year or about one-half the amount which we pay in interest on the whole Railway Loan; and there are other resources that I might mention that have been discovered, that have been found, and that cannot be regarded as taxation upon the people of the country and you have only got to look up the public accounts and the Estimates to see where that million dollars is going to-day. And then the hon. member wants to know why we do not do this and why we do not do that. why we have not got more dredges than one, why we have not more old age pensions, why we have not night schools, why we have not this, that and the other thing. You have only to go and see what we have done in our five years. We did more than any other Government ever did in ten or fifteen years and that is why we were sustained in the country and why we were able to carry every district in the country except the districts that were inoculated by my friend with his new gospel. With a great many things that he referred to I am in entire accord and in entire sympathy. As to tuberculosis the position of all Governments is the same today and the matter requires looking into. The establishment of outport hospitals and the care of the health of our people we regard as one of the highest and most important duties of the people of this country. We are doing it as quickly as we can. We have a number of outport hospitals to-day in Newfoundland that we helped to establish and we propose to go on and not alone establish these outport hospitals and sanatoriums all over the country but to deal with the question of dispensaries and other

matters referred to, and not to get into what my learned friend the member for Trinity, called it the other day "a financial bog." We had the learned member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd speaking the other day for over an hour on the raliway contract we made with the Reid Nfld. Co. in relation to the branches and also as regards the loans that would have to be raised. As usual the facts were not stated and the position was not fairly put. I claim here to-night that there was never a better contract made in this country or in any other country than the contract with relation to these branch railways and there is not a man within sound of my voice to-night or in the whole country if he could hear me, or in the whole world, but would say after examining the facts that the Government made the very best contract that man could make.

In 1889 we called for tenders to build a railway first to Bay of Islands, then to Port aux Basques. There were eight tenders. The Government of that day considered that the tender of R. G. Reid was the best. He proposed to build it for $17,400 per mile. This tender he afterwards reduced and it was considered best. In 1890, a contract was entered into by which a road was to be built to Port aux Basques at a rate of $15,600 a mile. Now we have to go to the same company 19 years afterwards and ask for another tender. What had happened in the meantime? Everything had doubled in cost. The Reid Nfld. Company must now give $1.50 to a man—an increase of 50% in the labour bill. The cost of rails, rolling stock, flat cars and passenger cars have gone up about 60% The sleepers that cost 8 cents, now cost 18 cents. Thus it is evident that the cost of building a railway in Canada or in Newfoundland has increased at the very least 50 per cent. since 1890. If these facts are not correct—and I challenge the Opposition members to take a note of my figures and ascertain if they are correct—then I am greatly mistaken. I repeat that the same Company that built the railroad in 1890 must now give the labourers 50 per cent. more, must pay 60 per cent. more for rails and rolling stock. Take the cost of building a house. Can you get a house built as cheaply now as in 1890? Why, a house that cost $1200 then would cost $3,000 or $3,500 in 1909. What did we do when we wanted them to build these branch lines? We would not give them any more than in 1890. We gave them facts and reasons and arguments; we pointed out that they had sole possession of the road and that there was no fear of competition. We put forward many reasons and, in consideration of our paying them in gold, the Reid Newfoundland Company agreed to build the railway for the same price as in 1890. Dr. Lloyd spoke in favour of the contract. It is the first time that I heard anyone in Opposition say a word in its favour. I think that, if the Doctor will look up the files of his paper, he will find there is nothing in favour of it there. The very day that I introduced the resolution, Sir Robert Bond read a paper from London and pointed out that I would not get 90 for the loan, whereas I got 97½. When I went to London, I found the papers of this country in many offices. They were brought to me and I was told to read the opinion of my own country and the opinion of the leaders in my country. "You are looking for 97," they said; "but the leaders of the Opposition in your country think that you should only expect 90." Now, when another is being raised we have the Opposition members for the last 10 or 15 days, debating the

matter, and we have heard them say that the bottom was falling out of everything. Blue ruin is predicted for the country and that goes abroad to the money markets, and yet the country was never in a better position in every way. I did not intend now to go into any details in relation to the question of a railway, or the cost of the contract or the question of a loan. I shall have an opportunity of doing so at a later date, when I shall ask the committee to examine the contracts that we have made, the amount that we are paying and the loans that we are raising to pay this amount. I am quite satisfied that all the members should know about these matters. In particular, I wish my friend from Bonavista who may not have had an opportunity of enquiring into the detalis of this matter to know the position of these contracts and of the country. Then we had considerable time expended in relation to the Dredge. My friend, the member for Bonavista, thinks that $25,000 a year for that dredge is throwing money away. Well, that is not the case. It is not costing that amount of money or anything like it. The dredge was the very best that could be bought on the other side. I think I heard him say that the dredge was only fit for dredging clams. This dredge was built for one of the largest railways companies in England; and was engaged in dredging work at the terminus of their railroad. It was recommended by them as one of the best in England and cost about $50,000. It was only a year old when we got it and it is doing excellent work all over the coast, as the account here shows. An expenditure of $25,000 for the year is I believe an unusual expenditure, and not what may be regarded as an annual expenditure. In the first place, the dredge went to Wesleyville or Botwood and it was discovered that one of the buckets was not fit for the work at that place. I think we had to order two new buckets. That was something that could not be discovered until we were on the ground. But if, when the dredge was got, the buckets had been got new, that expense would have been added to the cost of the dredge, instead of being paid now. The crew have to live on board, they are going all over the coast and we have got to feed them. Then there are the continual repairs needed in such a ship and the item of insurance—a very considerable item because of the great risk. The dredge is engaged on a very wild and dangerous coast and this fact makes the insurance companies demand a high premium for insurance. Then my friend went on and referred, at very great length, to the resolutions from the Fishermen's Protective Union, which were sent to the Government in relation to various matters, one in relation to the cull of fish, another referring to the standardizing of fish and another to the cutting of timber by the saw mills all over the country. Besides these mentioned a great many other matters were brought to the notice of the Government. We can unhesitatingly say, however, that there are considerable difficulties in dealing with these matters. He seems to think that he has only to express a wish, to pass a resolution and it will be done that afternoon. We are not the first Government that has been in power in this country. Sir Robert Bond was here for nine years and never dealt with any of the matters referred to. He was here not only for 9 years as Prime Minister, but for 19 years as Colonial Secretary, and never dealt with them. We may conclude, therefore, that there must have been very great difficulties, or he would have dealt with these subjects. There are

men on the other side of the House this evening who will agree that, if these matters required dealing with, they would have been dealt with by Sir Robert Bond. The question of the cull of fish was never touched or dealt with while he was Colonial Secretary or Prime Minister. I have heard a great deal about the damage that the whale fishery is doing in the country. Dr. Lloyd, the member for Trinity, said that the prosecution of the whale fishery was dying out. I think that is correct; but in 1904 Sir Robert Bond went to the country promising to do something that he never did. I think you will see in the Speech from the Throne of that year the same promise, and nothing was done. I state this in no sense as a charge; but the inference is that there was no necessity to do anything, and the matter did not reach the point when it was necessary to take the subject up and deal with it until this Government took office. The policy seems to be to throw all the blame on this administration to blame us and give us no credit. Nothing has ever been done with regard to the prevention of Tuberculosis. Within a few days of our taking office we appointed a commission to make enquiries and voted the sum of $15,000 for this object. You have only to read Mr. Harvey's reports to find out what has been done. Then the Reid Newfoundland Company offered to put up 20 hospitals to cope with this White plague. We hope to see the principal hospital erected in St. John's on Waterford Bridge Road at an early date, and then other hospitals started all over the Island. This question of consumption will be dealt with and thousands of sufferers will be benefitted and cured. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty with us is that we have had to do so much. We have tried to do all these things. All this criticism of us has been unfair and bitter. Since the day our Government came into office, some of my friends on the other side of the House have never ceased their censures for a day. We have never had a fair chance; it has been nothing but severe and bitter criticism. The only object of all this criticism is to make it difficult and impossible for the Government to carry out their policy.

I am surprised that a lawyer and a constitutional lawyer, for I have a very high regard for my learned friend as a professional man, should desire it to go on record that he accuses the Government of doing wrong because we have not filled the offices of Minister of Justice and Minister of Agriculture and Mines during the present session. The whole object of the amendment is to make it apparent that the Government is guilty of wrong doing in not filling these offices. Ever since we came back to power and it was known that the two ministers had been defeated in Bonavista, although seventeen hundred voters there had refused to go under the yoke, they have been attacked in the Press and out of it and there was a regular hue and cry as to when they were going to resign and who would take their place.

Such tactics are not carried on in any other country under the British flag. The mere fact of our not filling these offices is not a matter for serious comment. That is the Government position. I have been told that I was wrong but I think some of my friends are aware that in matters of constitutional law I am not usually wrong.

Up to the time that Governor MacGregor turned out the Liberal Party when we stood eighteen each there never had been a better Governor in their opinion but an hour after he had turned them out there was noth-

ing too strong to be said or written against him. Take up the newspapers of the Liberal press of that day and you will find that he was most bitterly attacked for having done what was called an unconstitutional act. In spite of these attacks the Colonial Office and the highest legal authorities in England upheld all that the Governor had done. What else could be expected? You cannot imagine Governor MacGregor or any other high officer of state, who represents the King, doing a favour to one side or the other. It is not likely that he acted without the advice of the law officers of the Crown in England. These matters are not such as a layman cares to take up without advice. Under his instructions the Governor may take advice from the Judges but he might not consider that the questions involved in this case came under that head. The despatch of Lord Crewe showed that the Home Office was in touch with the Governor all through and that they upheld everything which the Governor did.

Shortly afterwards there was another point of constitutional law raised in this House when Sir Robert Bond on the day of the opening of the House spoke on the question of the gift to the Government of twenty sanitaria from the Reid Newfoundland Company. The hon. gentleman said that it was unconstitutional to accept such a gift and referred to some musty precedents to support his argument and to make it appear that we were acting unconstitutionally. It was idle to point out that there was no analogy or similarity between the case in question and the precedents that he quoted. I brought the matter, therefore, to the notice of Sir Courtenay Ilbert, the Clerk of the House of Commons, one of the very highest authorities in England, and he sustained the position which we had taken. He held that Sir Robert Bond did not have a leg to stand on, as hon. gentlemen will find if they look up the journals of the House. Yet this was the very gentleman that Sir Robert had termed an expert on constitutional law and it was Sir Courtenay Ilbert that the right hon. gentleman had approached when the parties stood eighteen each. It was because of the fact that he was such an expert that I appealed to him and the result was that he held that we were right.

The next constitutional question that came up was in connection with the holding of the election. The whole country was flooded with petitions and people were led to believe that we were to have the elections last spring, when hundreds would have been disfranchised by weather conditions and other reasons. A number of other matters were referred to in this petition, copies of which were sent to a certain section of the country. They came from the Fishermen's Protective Union and I have no fault to find with them because they were misled on the constitutional law of the matter. Months before the date of the elections was fixed I drew the Governor's attention to the question for I knew it would be raised and I thought it only fair to him and to myself that I should do so before he should bring the question before my notice. I wrote to His Excellency and pointed out our position and in that also I was sustained by the law officers in England, who held that we were right in holding the elections when we did.

Now another question of constitutional law has arisen and an amendment has been moved by the hon. member, which has been read. I contend that the amendment is unnecessary for even if we were inclined to act unconstitutionally we have not the

power to do so. Men have held such positions under the British Constitution under similar circumstances. One case has been cited here referring to the year 1845 when Mr. Gladstone was a member of the Cabinet and held a departmental office without having a seat in either branch of the Legislature. There were numerous cases up to that time and since then to the present day where ministers have held departmental offices for months after they had been defeated

My hon. friend, the member for Bonavista, has taken a very strong position on that point for he has memorialised the Governor and the Secretary of State, as may be seen by those who read the opposition papers. In fact, Sir Robert Bond gives this as one of the reasons why he resigned the leadership of the Opposition party.

DR. LLOYD.—That is not correct.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It is correct for he gave it as one of his reasons. I quote this from his letter to Mr. Clift:

> "I have special reference to the Editorial utterances of the Fishermen's Advocate in respect to the Newfoundland Savings Bank and to the non-resignation of two mem bers of the Government."

DR. LLOYD.—Read further on.

MR. KENT.—I should like to point out that when a portion of a paper is read in the House and any hon. gentleman requests that the whole of it be read and not merely a quotation, it is absurd to have it done.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have no objection whatever and I ask the Clerk, therefore, to read the letter in full.

The Clerk of the House then read the said letter accordingly.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That letter abundantly proves the correctness of what I have stated. The principal reason given is Mr. Coaker's attitude as to the Savings Bank but he also refers to his attitude to the two defeated ministers. I was content with the first quotation which I made from the letter but further on Sir Robert Bond makes his position stronger in relation to this very matter because he says:

> "Again, while I am prepared to associate myself with the F. P. U. in a respectful protest against the violation of a constitutional right or practice, I cannot permit myself to be connected, however remotely, with accompanying threats of violence."

Nothing can be plainer and clearer and if the hon. gentlemen opposite do not take this view let somebody write Sir Robert Bond on the matter.

Now, sir, I have merely brought up this matter in connection with the amendment before the House, which I do not consider is a fair one, for there can be no doubt whatever that the Government is acting in a constitutional manner. Sir Robert Bond saw no doubt what would happen if he associated himself in the House with the hon. member for Bonavista and he refused to be a party to hounding these two men down.

The Legislature may feel absolutely safe that nothing unconstitutional will be done by the Government for, as I have said, we could not do so if we desired. I mentioned the other cases to show that we have been right in the past and I feel sure that if the present case were submitted to an independent tribunal we would be sustained in the position we have taken. What value is it to appeal to the other side? What can we expect from the hon. member for Trinity. Dr. Lloyd? He lives only to make a point. He spoke in the debate a day or two ago and he could hardly control himself. I have never listened

to a more venomous speech in this chamber and I thought some of his references, particularly to my hon. friends, Messrs. Downey and Devereaux, most insulting. He referred to the excellent speeches of these gentlemen as speeches "justifying their jobs." He was careful, however, to say nothing of the fees which he received for arbitrations in the late Government or to the fact that he was in the pay of a subsidized newspaper office. This was not all that he received during the eight years that his party was in power. I do not object to what he received. What I do strongly object to is the hon. member's charge that the two gentlemen to whom I have referred were merely "justifying their jobs." There is an idea about that it is an unpardonable crime to give any Government patronage to a layman. You can give all you like to a lawyer; you can give well-to-do plumbers contracts without a tender but it is a sin to give a man who is neither a lawyer or a plumber any work at all.

My hon. friend referred to the fact that the Legislature had been outraged by the appointment of the agricultural commissioners. There is absolutely no justification for that statement, for the Act which created the offices contained the provision that members of this House could hold the office of commissioner and draw their salaries. Everything is bad that comes from this side of the House is the opinion of my learned friend. No arguments and no amount of evidence will convince him of the contrary or change his opinion.

No legislative measures are foreshadowed in my hon. friend's opinion, in the Speech from the Throne. Let him go back to the Speech from the Throne in 1908 and see how much legislation was foreshadowed that year. Then he can go through all the speeches of Sir Robert Bond's administration and see how much was foreshadowed and how much was carried out. Why, we were only nineteen or twenty days sitting in 1908 at the last session. I think we met for only nineteen or twenty days in January and closed the first of February. It was stated in the Speech from the Throne that the Legislature was called together early to deal with the Labrador Boundary and another question. I know it was not the reason. The real reason was to enable my friend, Mr. Kent, to come into the House, because in February he could not appear; for he was acting Minister of Justice for six months and that time was up in February. That is why the House met so early and not to deal with the Labrador Boundary question or any other question. Nothing was ever done with regard to the Labrador Boundary question by the late administration. The argument was put forward by some parties that there was nothing to justify calling the Legislature together this year in January. In answer to this, I would refer my friend back to 1908.

He dwelt on the Fog Free Zone question. When this proposal first came before the House, although I said I did not greatly believe in it, I defended and fought for it, because I was one of Sir Robert Bond's followers. He believed in it, and Mr. Thomson believed in it. Sir Robert Bond believes in it to-day. Even now, I say that some day it may be realized. It is not for us to say anything against it, if Mr. Thomson can build these great steamers and bring us within 2½ days of Liverpool, for $75,000 a year. It is not for us to oppose it if these steamers take the place of the Furness and Allan and other lines, and if there is a train service across the country and a connection on the Canadian side for our

fish and our products. It is not for us to say anything against him. If he can do it we will get the benefit. If not, there is no harm done. That was one of the legislative measures foreshadowed. The two or three items in relation to Cold Storage I supported, because I believed in Cold Storage. I had something to do with bringing one of the men down. Nothing came of that though, except the building in Bay of Islands. Then there was the smelting on Bell Island. And so I might continue. However, I might be misunderstood, because it may be said that they are reflections on Sir Robert Bond. I shall not say anything against him. It is only an answer to charges that were made by some of the members on the other side of the House—from men who were never heard to say a word when they were on this side. My learned friend painted a picture of blue ruin with regard to the position of the country. I shall take another opportunity to show to this House that no better financial arrangements could have been made than those which the Government has made.

It is very easy to talk glibly about these matters, but as far as I am concerned I have heard enough, more than enough. Every mile from Whitbourne to Port aux Basques was going to be ruin. Every hole dug a grave. As a matter of fact no one knows more about this railway than I do. I am part of it. I almost built every mile from here to Port aux Basques and men who do not know the difference between a culvert and a bridge, come in here and talk glibly about the cost of it and talk unfairly too and for no other reason than for party purposes and then writing it up in to-morrow's papers and continue the policy of misleading the people outside. It is a most difficult thing for us as a Government to meet the whole country when day after day they are reading these papers which are sent broadcast over the Island with this sort of incorrect statements. We find it the same in every department of public life. When I am going round canvassing every four years I find the Evening Telegram with great headlines, "Morris the Traitor." That is their description of a man who leaves his party on a question of principle, who leaves his office and every possible chance of promotion. That is the Editor of the Telegram's idea of a traitor. It takes a good deal of courage to leave a party with which one has been associated with for over a quarter of a century. I was member of an administration that from 1901 to 1908 did nothing but collect the revenues and pay public officials their salaries. The country was dying from dry rot. If I was back again I would leave in 24 hours. When I left Sir Robert Bond in 1898 I left behind me the work of a lifetime. My claim was on that party. I left it on a question of policy, a question of principle. I left it because I supported the 1898 contract. I left again in 1907 for the same reason. And I say it is not fair it is most unjust for the hon. member for Trinity to stand up here and use such language as he has done.

There were a number of other matters to which I wished to refer but owing to the lateness of the hour I shall have to postpone them.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order and I ask the permission of the House to make a personal explanation and I would ask the House to judge whether I substantiate the position which I take in reference to a few remarks made in debate a few days ago. The first reference that I desire to question is that made by the hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Lloyd. In his speech of a few days

ago he made a remark to the effect that I had been an applicant for the position of Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I desire to characterise that statement as an absolute and deliberate misrepresentation. No member of the Government nor any individual will claim or admit nor can be forced to admit that I ever made reference to the filling of this position. Many persons have mentioned it to me and my invariable reply has been that the thing was out of the question and that for certain reasons it could not be entertained and I would not under any conditions make such an application to the Government. The hon. member further stated that neither my colleague Mr. Devereaux nor myself were qualified for the positions which we hold and that we would be unable to earn a living without them. I shall leave the House to judge as to the value of this statement when I have finished. In the first place I was not personally desirous of going into politics. In fact the Prime Minister will bear me out when I say that I surrendered more in going into politics than I have ever made out of any position that I have filled since. I am not prepared to state, sir, that the hon. member for Trinity left his country for his country's good, neither am I prepared to say that we have derived any material benefit from his residence here. And I want now to submit my record in comparison with that of the hon. member and leave this House to judge which of us bears the comparison better. I must preface my remarks by saying that I am either cursed or blessed with something in my disposition that makes it impossible for me to live outside of this country. In the year 1885 those with whom I was associated were pleased to state that they recognized that I had certain qualifications which made it advantageous to them to make me an offer to leave the country, an offer which I accepted. I regretted it very sorely afterwards, owing to the disposition to which I have referred, and I returned to the country after refusing offers greater in amount and very much more advantageous to me as an individual than were ever made to any individual in this country.

On my return to this country I was not content to remain a drone on the economic hive, and I went immediately to work. I was successful in getting back the sum of $21,000 to the Government after they had been advised that it was utterly and irretrievably lost, advised by their professional advisers. Then as I had become familiar with the fish business in the United States I took up the subject in a series of press letters, and endeavoured to create a new outlet that I knew existed for a certain quantity of our fish. When I found this of no avail I decided to experiment to see if it was profitable, and for the purpose I located on the West Coast. The result was that I was the first to create this outlet for our fish, and helped thereby to increase its value. Fish was then being bought for eighty cents a quintal from the knife. By the methods adopted by me I advanced the price to one cent a pound for small fish and 1¼ cents for large, so that instead of the fishermen getting $4.00 a quintal, I was giving $6.25 for small and $6.75 for large, spot cash. This industry failed for the want of facilities, which it should have been the duty of the Government to provide, but the Government of the day made no effort to provide them. Had such an effort been made that business would have been in operation to-day and the difficult problem of marketing the West Coast catch would have been solved. I have heard people claiming credit for the advantages conferred

upon the people by the F.P.U. No person in Newfoundland welcomes that Union more than I do, because I claim to myself the credit of being the first to sow the germ of unionism among the fishermen. I submitted a scheme to a certain section of the country, but in those days unionism had not caught hold of the people as it now has, and the people were not inclined so much to see the advantages of it. So that with the indifference of the people to these advantages and the indifference of the government to the conservation of the new industry, the whole scheme collapsed. Or perhaps I am speaking too strongly. I found myself so handicapped as not to be able to make the success of it that I desired, and as it was too small to induce me to continue in it, I allowed it to relapse into the hands of those who are prosecuting it to-day. I think I have already stated that when I came first the people were getting the equivalent of one cent a pound for fish, or about $5.00 a quintal. I raised it to 1½ cents a pound, or $8.25 a quintal, because it takes 550 lbs. of green fish to make a quintal of dry, to which you have to add the cost of making and of salt. I claim no credit myself for giving this price. because even at this price the business paid me very fairly indeed.

But I will not detain the House any longer. My object in rising was to establish the fact that I had not made application for the portfolio of Agriculture and Mines, and that I am not dependent upon what I receive from the Government in recompense for my services. I am justified in saying that I can earn a dollar in a hundred different ways any day where the hon. member for Trinity would be utterly helpless. I do not wish to reflect upon the hon. member, but once in one's life it may be necessary to do oneself a measure of justice, and the imputation here in the present case justifies the position I take, and shows that the services I have rendered are as great, if not greater, than those rendered by the hon. member for Trinity.

DIVISION ON ADDRESS IN REPLY.

On the amendment proposed by Mr. Kent and seconded by Mr. Lloyd, the House divided. There stood for the amendment: Messrs. Kent, Lloyd, Clapp, Dwyer, Hickman, Grimes, Coaker, Halfyard, Jennings, Stone, Targett, Abbott'12. Against the amendment: Rt. Hon. Sir E. P. Morris, Hons. M. P. Cashin, J. R. Bennett, J. C. Crosbie, C. H. Emerson; Messrs Woodford, Piccott, Moulton, Higgins, Currie, Devereaux, Kennedy, Downey, Kennedy, Moore, Young, Parsons, Le-Feuvre Morris, Walsh, 20.

On motion of Mr. Currie, and seconded by Mr. Higgins, the Address in Reply was passed. On the House dividing the same division showed; the address being received and adopted..

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, all other orders stand deferred.

Mr. Coaker gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Sealing Laws.

Mr. Coaker gave notice of question.

Mr. Clapp gave notice of question.

Mr. Stone gave notice of question

Mr. Jennings gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Targett gave notice of question.

On motion it was ordered that when this House rise it do adjourn until this afternoon at 4.30 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, January 29. 1914.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

PETITIONS.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Cat Harbor, asking for the sum of $600 to bridge a brook

between Cat Harbor and Newtown. Attimes this brook is so swollen that it is impossible for the people to cross it. I think the request of the petitioners a laudable one and one which should appeal to this House. We hear a lot of talk about giving facilities to the travelling public and in some districts they are not satisfied unless they get a railway to their back doors. I may say that in travelling through the district of Fogo I was surprised to see the disadvantages which the people have to work under to gain a livelihood. I would ask that this petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

I would also ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Cat Harbor asking for the sum of $200 to finish a public wharf which was begun there recently. The people are finding this wharf a great advantage and they hope to get this small amount to finish the work. Now, this is also something which should appeal, to this House and I hope the Government will see its way clear to accede to the wishes of the petitioners. This petition is signed by Stephen Wright and 79 others. In fact, both those petitions have been signed by every elector in that neighborhood.

I also ask leave to present a petition from Cat Harbor on the subject of a way office. I understand that the people suffer a great deal of inconvenience and loss of time in this connection, and I trust that the Postal Department will remedy it by putting a way office on Cat Harbor Point. This petition is also signed by all the electors in the neighborhood. I would ask that it be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

I also ask leave to present a petition from Joe Batt's Arm, asking for the sum of $100 to build a cradle or landing place at Little Fogo Island. The petition sets out that it is a very rough place and very often during stormy weather small boats there get dashed to pieces against the rocks. This landing place is consequently very greatly needed, and I hope that the Department of Marine and Fisheries will see its way clear to accede to the wishes of the petitioners. The petition is signed by 95 residents of that neighborhood. I would ask that it be received and referred to the Department to which it belongs.

I also ask leave to present a petition from Barr'd Islands and Joe Batts Arm, signed by 190 electors. The petition sets forth that about seven-eighths of the codtraps are set in Shoal Bay, and to get to Shoal Bay from Joe Batt's Arm and Barr'd Islands they have to go out a considerable distance around a head of land. There is a very narrow isthmus or neck of land separating Shoal Bay from Joe Batt's Arm, and the petitioners state that a canal could be cut through there very easily. This would facilitate the work of the men down there very much, and it would insure a greater security for their poperty, because in the event of a storm arising they could easily get to their traps, while to get around the head of land might be impossible. I would ask that the merits of this petition be enquired into, and, if possible, the prayer of the petition granted.

I also ask leave to present a petition from Seldom Come By. This petition is signed by seventy residents of that settlement, and it asks for the sum of $1,000 for the construction of a public wharf at that place. This is a public work which is badly needed at that place. Seldom is a thriving settlement, and the people there are very independent, and they as well as the rest of Fogo district

contribute largely to the revenue of the country. I take great pleasure in presenting the petition, and I trust that it will receive the consideration which it merits.

These several petitions merit the great attention from this House, because they come from men who know their needs, and not from one individual asking for a sum to dig a well or make a road to his backyard. They are for public necessities, which will be of the greatest convenience to the whole community.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Clarenville, asking for an elective Road Board. The people are asking for this all over the country, and I think the Government should take steps to meet their wishes. I ask that this petition, which is numerously signed, be referred to the Department to which it relates.

I also ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of New Perlican, asking for a small grant to build a road. This petition is also numerously signed, and I know that this road would be of great benefit to the people there, and I ask that this petition be passed over to the Department to which it relates also.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petitions just presented by my colleague, Mr. Stone. I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of New Chelsea asking for a sum of money to build a slip in that settlement. This is very badly needed, and I hope that the Government will see its way clear to accede to the prayer of the petition. I ask that it be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Cupids on the subject of a public wharf. They ask that some repairs be made to the wharf there and also that an extension be built. I have been on the spot and know exactly the requirements in this connection. The wharf appears to be in a very dilapidated condition because of the fact that little or no attention has been given to it by the authorities. The land under the wharf is falling away, and if at any time there is a heavy sea on, there seems to be no doubt but that the whole wharf will be washed away, and that will be a very serious matter for the people there. They want the extension built for the purpose of enabling the steamer to haul into the wharf. At the present time the steamer cannot haul in, and it is very difficult for the people to land their goods. I hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Premier will give this matter some attention. The Premier knows this spot well, as he visited it at the time of the Guy celebration, and he knows the great merits of the inhabitants and the necessity for this work. The petitioners also ask that a Postal Telegraph office be placed there. There is a telegraph office there at the present time, but for business reasons they want a postal office. At the present time some people go all the way to Brigus in order to send a message to the city or any other part of the country. This, of course, means considerable inconvenience. They also ask that the telephone system be extended from Brigus to Cupids. I understand that the Government is giving particular attention to the extension of the telephone system throughout the country, and I trust that they will give this matter the atetntion which it deserves. The petition also asks that the dredge be sent to Cupids to dredge out part of the harbor there. At the present time, in a very heavy sea, most of the vessels have to run

over to Carbonear, whereas it is thought that this harbor could be made one of the best in Conception Bay. I trust that the Government will accede to the prayer of this petition, and ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition just presented by the hon. member for Port de Grave. I think that the matters referred to would be of great benefit to the people.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the accounts for 1912-13.

QUESTIONS

MR. COAKER asked the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House, an itemized statement of the cost of the recent elections in Bonavista District.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the accounts.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement of the services rendered by Ab. Stratton, of Valleyfield, for the amount of $50.00 paid by his department Dec. 23, 1912.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I hope to have the statement to-morrow.

MR. CLAPP asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing (1) the total amount credited out of special grants to the District of St. Barbe; (2) statement of each allocation made therefrom, giving date and amount of each, also to whom allocated, and for what purposes.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Speaker, I may say that these questions should read "From the 30th June to the present time."

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member I may say these statements are in course of preparation.

MR. CLAPP asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing (1) the total amount credited out of the special grants to the District of St. Barbe; (2) statement of each allocation made therefrom, giving date and amount of each, also to whom allocated, and for what purpose.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, these statements are being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House copies of the returns for all special, local and main line grants expended at British Harbor, in the District of Trinity, for the year 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I hope to have this information early next week.

MR. KENT asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a statement showing what has been done, and the present position of the negotiations between the Government and the Companies operating steamships on the North Atlantic, with a view to securing an improved ocean steam service, and to lay on the table a copy of all correspondence, documents and other papers, relating thereto.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr Speaker, I am having that prepared.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of expenditure of $50.00 allocated to Edward Woolfreys, of Black Island, for sinking a well at that place.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, that statement is in course of preparation.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement in detail showing expenditure of the sum of $300.00, allocated to Walter Fudge, of Whale's Gulch, for the purpose of making a rail and steps from Whale's Gulch to the main line road.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, that is also in course of preparation.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of expenditure of the following grants allocated to Mark Rideout, of Western Head, viz.: 1st, $50 for public road leading from main line; 2nd, and two grants of $50 each for digging well.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I hope to have that statement ready early next week.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of this House a statement showing the total amount of spirituous liquors imported into this country during the last fiscal year, the countries from which imports were received and amount of duties collected from the same.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, that statement is in course of preparation.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement of the cost of repairing the cable to Exploits during the years 1912 and 1913.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member I might say that he will find that statement in the public accounts to be tabled by the Minister of Finance.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of $50 expended on the Magistrate's Office at Twillingate during 1911 or 1912.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I hope to have that statement ready early next week.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House copies of the returns of expenditure on the breakwater at Back Harbor, Twillingate, for 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I hope to have this statement next week also.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House an itemized statement of the cost of the recent elections in Twillingate District.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY Mr. Speaker I will table that statement tomorrow.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement of Dog Taxes collected at Twillingate 1912 and 1913.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table that statement.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay on the table of this House, a statement, in detail, giving the number of Agricultural Societies established in the district of Twillingate up to the end of 1913; also, amount of live stock and seeds of different kinds distributed, and cash grants allocated for the last fiscal year, with account of distribution and expenditure.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER Mr. Speaker, that statement is being prepared.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of cost of the Marconi Station at Cape Harrison up to the present time.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, Imay say that there is no special account kept for Cape Harrison. The construction and detailed expenses in connection with these matters are all charged into one account. As soon as possible I will have the account with respect to Cape Harrison prepared and tabled.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of the following items of expenditure tabled account of Game and Inland Fisheries for 1913, Supervisors' Salaries $2,482; Supervisors' Expenses $1,695; Wardens' Salaries $11,790; Wardens' Expenses $431; Fox Farming $1,160; Prosecution and Investigations $679.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, it will take a little while to complete that statement, but it is in course of preparation.

MR. HALFYARD—asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of the items making up the following amounts expended on dredge for 1913; J. and W. Winsor $296, Pay Sheet July $582, M. A. Duffy $872, M.A. Duffy $375, S. Blandford $420, Thos. Wornell $80; also, P.J. Fitzgerald, all amounts paid him; S. Piercey, all amounts paid him; W. H. Bartlett, all amounts paid him.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, that statement is being prepared.

SUPPLY.

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 the Committee.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask when the Auditor General's report will be tabled.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—It will be tabled tomorrow.

MR. KENT—Then you don't intend going on with supply today?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—No.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, on your desks are complete copies of the Estimates for the coming year and I merely propose to-day to go over these Estimates, pointing out where changes are made and expiaining the causes thereof. I hope then, to have the text of my remarks printed in to-morrow's papers in order that hon. gentlemen on the other side may be in a position to deal with the individual votes very fully when we come to consier them, and I propose to raise the committee at the close of my review of the Votes until such a date as will be convenient for them to enter upon the discussion of them in detail.

If hon. gentlemen will turn to the summary on the first printed page of the volume in their hands, they will find that the total estimate for 1914–15 is about $3,842,091.85 against $3,736,034.41 last year, an

increase of roundly $106,000. I might add that we have yet to introduce resolutions to provide for a sum to meet the interest on an additional loan to complete the branch railways. We are waiting for the Government Engineer to furnish an estimate of the exact amount that will be required and at a later date will submit our proposals in the usual form.

The increase in the Public Debt interest for the coming year as compared with the past—$762.40—is explained by the increase in the issue of bonds in lieu of old debentures under the Conversion Act of 5th Edward VII. Cap. 1. Such bonds to the amount of $13,873 have been issued and street widening at Carbonear has entailed an outlay of $5,187, making a total of $19,060, the interest on which at four per cent would be $762.40.

On page 5 will be found the votes for civil government. I direct attention first to those under headline 'B' which give the expenditures authorized by Statute. It will be seen that we propose to increase the salary of His Excellency the Governor from $10,000 to $12,500. His Excellency has made strong representations as to the inadequacy of his salary, in view of the increased cost of living at present, representations so strong, indeed, that the Government consider them unaswerable. They are embodied in this letter, which I shall read to the House.

"The Honorable, the Colonial Secretary.

Salary of the Governor of Newfoundland.

I have the honour to submit, for the consideration of Ministers, a statement of my receipts and expenditure for the six months ending June 30 1913, being a balance sheet compiled from my personal accounts in the capacity of Governor of Newfoundland.

These accounts have been carefully kept and are supported by vouchers and account books which are open to audit examination.

This statement excludes any reference to my personal income or to the expenditure payable therefrom. It aiso excludes all such ordinary personal items (as dress allowance, pocket money, wages for maid or nurses etc.,) which are usual among persons of my position and are expenses which cannot be affected by the fact whether I were to hold my present appointment or not.

Ministers will note that I am out of pocket during six months, by virtue of my office in the sum of $5,000 or £1,000

2. An examination of the accounts will show a considerable expenditure on what I may call capital account. For instance, the purchase from my predecessor at a cost of £183, of his stable equipment, might be reasonably spread over three years. Outfit expenditure (£337) may also be fairly spread over two years. Consumable stores (£170) are calculated in some cases over a period of twelve months. The insurance policy (£120) also covers a whole year. Most of the travelling expenditure (£360) will not recur under normal conditions for some years. So the statement of expenditure—in so far as it represents six months only—may reasonably be reduced, in a calculation of the normal expendture of a Governor, that is, for the purpose of computing what it would cost a Governor of Newfoundland to live. These deductions would be, for stables 5/6 of £180

(£150); for outfit ¾ of £337 (£240); for stores ¼ of £170 (£43); for insurance policy ½ of £120 (£60); and for travelling expenditure 5/6 of £360 ((£300). These deductions amount to £800 and reduce the actual excess of expenditure over income to £200 on a normal period of six months.

3. It may be assumed from an analysis of these accounts that the normal reasonable current expenditure of the Governor of Newfoundland can, with prudence, be reduced to £2,400 a year or $12,000. But it must be borne in mind that a capital outlay has to be incurred at the commencement of office of say £800 or $4,000 in addition to the normal expenses of the office.

4. This statement of account is not inconsistent with the estimates of Sir Henry Blake who put the Governor's necessary expenditure at £3,000 and Sir John Glover whose computation appears to be rather less. Nor is it inconsistent with Sir Cavendish Boyle's statement to me that the post would cost me £1,000 a year above my salary. Sir Ralph Williams also wrote to me to the same effect.

My conclusion, however, is that, with thrifty management and the avoidance of waste and yet with the maintenance of the hospitality which is nowadays resonably expected of the Governor of Newfoundland, the normal expenditure of the office can be covered by an annual expenditure of £2,750.

5. To meet this expenditure the salary of the Governor is now $10,000 or £2,000, plus a vote for travelling expenses of $1,000 (£200). The salary of the Governor before 1896, when it was reduced owing to the straitened affairs of the Colony, was $12,500 (£2,500).

6. The opinion which I now offer for the consideration of Ministers is that the salary of the Governor should now be raised, as from the beginning of the present financial year (July 1st, 1913), to $12,500; and that provision should be made under the head of "entertainment and travelling allowance" for $2,500, to include all travelling expenses and to be drawn by the officer administering the Government during the absence of the Governor from the Colony.

I offer this opinion with some diffidence because I should myself be pecuniarily a gainer. But I put it as resonable that a Governor of Newfoundland should not be expected to be a loser by virtue of his office but that he should reasonably expect, like every other wage-earner to have the opportunity to put by 10 per cent. of his salary if he chooses to do so and if his circumstances require it.

7. I annex a schedule, which is compiled from the statements appearing in the Colonial Office List, 1913, of certain Colonies with the salary of the Governor and the revenue of the Colony (generally for 1911). It will be useful to Ministers in considering this question. Several contingencies arise in the computing of Governor's salaries, but it is manifest that the present salary of the Governor of Newfoundland is by far the smallest both as regards the importance of the Colony and the revenue raised therein.

W. E. DAVIDSON,
Governor.

10th August, 1913.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE AS GOVERNOR OF NEWFOUNDLAND.

Receipts.

By salary (from Newfoundland):

For Feb.	$668.23
March	833.00

April	833.00
May	833.00
June	833.00
	$4,000.23
By outfit allowance from Imperial Govt., half of grant on leaving Seychelles	£200
Whole of grant for going to Nfld.	300
	£500 2,500.00
By travelling expenses for Nfld. in June	192.23
Excess on expenditure side..	5,000.58
	$11,693.04

Expenditure.

In England (Jan. to June) £1,591. 1. 2., say .. .. .. (as per statement A.)	$7,900
In Newfoundland (Feb. to June) .. .. (as per statement B.)	3,793.04
N. B.—Plus outstanding accounts not settled on June 30, vide annexure Y not included in statement	£100.14.2.

W. E. D.
8.8.13.

STATEMENT B.

Actual Expenses in Newfoundland Wholly Connected with my Functions as Governor of Newfoundland.

	From 13 Feb. & Mar.	April.	May.	June.	TOTAL.
Tradesmen	614.29	327.65	285.82	492.56	1720.32
Wages	127.16	81.06	100.17	125.40	433.79
Extra Wages	11.30	48.00	22.50	18.00	99.80
Donations	50.00	38.50	30.00	18.50	137.00
Travelling	38.59	116.20	70.35	238.29	463.43
Stamp Account	4.06	19.66	6.85	10.18	40.75
Freight	18.84	4.05	73	18.53	42.15
Miscellaneous	80.28	6.70	24.00	36.55	147.53
Garden	56.00	28.00	60.83	13.00	157.83
Stables	164.56	170.08	102.83	112.97	550.44
Totals..	$1,165.08	$839.90	$704.08	$1,083.98	$3,793.04

Outstanding Accounts not settled on June 30th £100.14.2

ANNEXURE II.

Name of Colony	Salary of Governor	Revenue of Colony	Inclusive of Entertainmen Allowance
1. Ceylon	£7,000	£3,750,000	£1,500 *
2. Straits Settlements	6,500	11,400,000	1,500
3. Hong Kong	6,000	750,000	1,200**
4. Nigeria	6,000	615,000	1,500
5. British Guiana	6,000	594,000	1,000
6. Jamaica	5,000	1,356,000	
7. Trinidad	5,000	951,000	
8. Gold Coast	4,000	1,112,000	1,000
9. SierraLeone	3,500	458,000	1,000

10.	Malta	3,500	448,000	
11.	Mauritius	3,333	696,000	*
12.	East Africa Protectorate	3,000	729,000	1,000
13.	Cyprus	1,000	320,000	
14.	Bermuda	2,946	79,000	
15.	Fiji	2,760	240,000	
16.	Leeward Islands	2,600	175,000	**
17.	Barbadoes	2,500	222,000	
18.	Windward Islands	2,500	72,000	
19.	Newfoundland	2,000	767,000	@

NOTES:—*Rupee at 1/4. **Dollar at 2/—. *Rupee at ¼. **100 from Imperial Funds. @ Dollar at 4/2. W. E. D.

I might say, further, that twenty years ago, before the crash, the Governor's salary was $12,500 and his is the only salary, of all those of the high officers of State, that has not been raised again to its old figure. The Judges have been put back and other officials have had their salaries restored, if not increased, but the Governor gets less to-day than his predecessor got twenty years ago. After the crash the salary, under retrenchment, was reduced to $7,000 and to secure an incumbent for the office at that period, the Imperial authorities had to induce Sir Herbert Murray, who was then enjoying a pension from the Treasury Department in England, to accept the Governorship. When Governor McCallum came representations were made by the Imperial authorities on his behalf and the salary was made $10,000. Subsequently provision was made for $1,000 for travelling expenses and that has been the situation since. We now propose to restore the Governor's salary to $12,5000, or, roundly, £2,500 sterling, and also to increase his travelling expenses by $1,500, making them $2,500 or £500 a year. The social obligations pressing upon the Governor of this Colony nowadays are much greater than in the past and, as we all know, the cost of living has largely advanced. During the coming summer the Colony will be visited by the members of the Dominions Royal Commission, a body of twelve gentlemen representing the Mother Country and the self-governing possessions, who are touring the Empire studying the problems of trade development; and their presence here will entail hospitalities and social courtesies from the Governor. Then there is the prospect of the Duke and Duchess of Connaught visiting the Colony, who would, of course, be guests of His Excellency. These and similar circumstances justify to us the increased provision we are making, and we feel confident that this will meet the approval of the whole House.

In the Department of the Colonial Secretary it will be noted that where in the past there were two stenographers, one at $500 and the other $300, they are now to be paid $400 apiece. In the Department of Justice the Deputy Minister, Mr. Hutchings, is increased from $1800 to $2000, as he had an agreement with our predecessors to that effect; and the typist, Miss Kelly, is increased $40, from $360 to $400. In the Department of Fisheries, on page 7, is an addition of $200 to the salary of the first clerk,—Mr. Hutchings—for keeping the accounts of the Lighthouse Department as well as of the Fisheries branch itself.

In the Department of Public Works, the first clerk, Mr. Pearce, is advanced from $1000 to $1100; the Supt. of Public Works, Mr. Wm. Churchill, is increased from $1,000 to $1200 and the clerk to the Superintendent from $600 to $750; the inspector for districts outside St. John's, from $1000 to $1200; the two road inspectors, Messrs. Murphy and Parsons, from $700 to $800 each; and the assistant typist, Miss Power, from $200 to $300; and in the Dept. of the Auditor-General the messenger is increased from $240 to $350, and the clerk and typist—Mr. Brien—is increased from $500 to $700; because of extra work and because he was resigning as he had similar offers outside.

On page 8, in the Department of Justice the vote for sundries is increased by $350, but this sum is really taken from the District Court Contingencies, which vote is reduced equal sums; and in the Dept. of Public works the increases in the vote for printing, stationery, sundries, assistance etc., are made because the experience of some years has shown that the amount of $5,000 is the actual annual expenditure.

On page 9, under the heading of "Fuel and Light" there are increases in every case, due to the greater cost of both fuel and light, and of new buildings, the figures now given being based on actual expenditure for some years. The insurance on public buildings, because of additional construction, is increased from $5,100 to $6,000.

Provision is made for a salary of $500 for the keeper of the oil store at St. John's, this amount having been previously paid out of the contingencies. In repairs to public buildings there is an increase from $10,000 to $15,000, due, first, to the vote in past years having been lower than the expenditures; and in the second place, to additional public buildings constructed in recent years. There are two votes dropped, painting and repairing the Museum, $1500, and restoring the boundary fences of the Constabulary barracks, $500.

On page 10 is a list of the additional pensions given in detail. With the sums dropped by deaths the increase is only a few hundred dollars.

On page 12, the messenger at the Supreme Court, Wm. Cochrane, is raised from $312 to $374.40; and the vote for cleaning the Court is increased $160; and on page 13 the contingencies for the district courts are being reduced by $350, transferred to Department of Justice, as previously explained.

On page 14 are some changes in the salaries of the police, made necessary by recent promotions and by providing for a third District Inspector at $800, in place of Sub-Inspector Bailey, who has recently been pensioned and whose salary was $900. The present district inspectors are Bartlett and Collins and the third is not yet appointed.

As you are aware, the salaries of the constables vary with their years of service, but the net increase in the vote is only about $50. Under "supplies" an increase of $200 for fuel and light to the barracks is made, due to the higher cost of these articles. The vote for annuities or pensions is increased by $675 to Insp. Bailey and $342 to Const. O'Farrell, while the pension payable to ex Const. Beckham has lapsed owing to his death.

In the Fire Department, though, Fire Const. Neary is raised to acting sergeant, the salaries are revised because of years of service, the increase is only $20, but the fuel and light vote is increased $200, while the pension payable to Sergt. Horwood, $375, has lapsed owing to his death.

On page 17 under the head of St.

John's Penitentiary provision is made for an extra orderly at $325, K. McLeod. The appointment was necessary as parties of prisoners are sent out to Government House, the Hospital, etc., and another man was required to take charge of them. The vote for material for brooms is raised from $7,000 to $7,500 owing to the higher cost of it and an extra $100 for clothing, another for sundries and a third for fuel and light are provided.

On page 21, under the heading of "Education" are shown $2,500 for sparsely settled localities, and $10,000 for augmentation, and $1500 for additional inspection, these amounts, however, having been voted last year in Supplemental.

The Inspectors and assistants are now allowed $200 each towards their travelling expenses. There is an additional $1,000 provided for industrial education. The amount previously paid as interest on a loan for school buildings, $4,000, is taken out, this amount being now incorporated in the general public debt, and the interest voted with the total interest to be paid by the Colony each year. The vote for "Additional Inspection" is really for a variety of purposes connected with the administration of the education service.

The vote for Public Charities begins on page 25, and very few changes will be found in the votes for outport relieving offices, and where they have been made it is because of the increase of work. On page 27 the District Surgeon for Bay Roberts and Port de Grave at $240 is dropped, it being found more convenient to employ doctors in the vicinity when required. The provision for casual attendance in the outports is increased from $8,000 to $9,000, the expenditure for some years reaching that amount. The vote for emergency cases has been increased from $1500 to $3000 for the same reason.

The vote for orphanages is increased by $2,660. The expenditure is based on the number of orphans in the various places at $40 per head, and as the number is estimated at $350 in all, it totalled $14,000. The provision for poor lunatics is increased by $500 to meet the increased outlay under this head. Conveyance of sick poor is increased by $2400, the vote in the past having been inadequate, and the amount now asked being the lowest for which the service can be performed. For the conveyance of sick fishermen from Labrador, previously $1500 an extra $500 is asked, the reason being the same; and $1500 more is asked for extraordinary expenditure, such as grants to fire sufferers and to people procuring artificial limbs; and $5,000, I am informed by the head of the Department, is certainly required. An addition of $2,260 is provided for medical attendance to paupers. The same remarks apply to this vote.

In the Lunatic Asylum an increase of $200 is provided for one of the commisioners, Mr. Hutchings who also acts as Secretary of the Board. There is a rearrangement of the attendants, both male and female, involving a slight change in the votes, an additional man being appointed and the salaries readjusted. The total increase is $330. Under the heading of supplies an increase of $2,000 is asked, for clothing $500, and incidentals $500, $3,000 in all, these figures being based on the actual expenditure for the past few years. I might say in passing that a female attendant, a Miss Hewitt, at a salary of $250, was appointed last year, she having been procured from England and being trained in the treatment of mental diseases. She has charge of the female side of the institution, under the matron, Miss Field.

General Hospital—An additional cook is provided at $120.

On page 30 there is an addition of $72 for the maids in the nurses' home. They were formerly paid $6 a month, but it had to be increased to seven, as none could be procured for less. In the heat and light station there is an increase of $600. As the furnaces have to be kept going all night they require three eight-hour shifts, and men cannot be got for less than $480 a year, but formerly there were two firemen at $420 each, so that the actual increase is but $60. The fuel and light vote is now based on cost of coal and actual quantity consumed. The hospital furnishes its own lighting, heating, hot water and power to drive a large steam laundry. An allowance of $500 for the upkeep of a horse and carriage and man is made to Dr. Keegan. As Hon. members are fully aware, Dr. Keegan lost one of his legs as a result of blood poisoning contracted while in the discharge of his duty in the hospital, and it has become necessary for him to have a conveyance at his disposal. The provision for supplies is increased by $2,000, this figure being based on the actual expenditure for some years.

In the Poor Asylum the salary of the matron—Mrs. Downs—is raised from $150 to $240 and there has been an increase in the salaries of female attendants totalling $146, as it is not easy to obtain women for this class of work without paying them at least $7.00 a month and grading upwards as they gain experience. An additional $2,000 will be seen under the heading of maintenance, this amount being figured on the actual expenditure; and there is an extra $100 for fuel and light, because of the higher cost of coal.

On page 31, under the heading of Public Health, the salary of the clerk and typist is increased from $300 to $480, and the salary of the clerk—Mr. Whiteway—from $720 to $840. The contingencies are increased $620, this addition being necessary on the basis of past year's expenditures. Owing to the requirements for conveyance, that vote is increased by $500. The vote for the tuberculosis campaign is the same as last year, $24,000. The vote for general quarantine on the same page is the same as last year.

The vote for the doctor and nurse on Labrador is increased from $1200 to $1500, as with the additional steamers, greater provision is to be made in this respect. For the lazaretto the vote for supplies has been increased from $2500 to $500; for medicines, etc., from $850 to $1700; and for sundries and clothing, from $650 to $1700, making an addition of $4,400, together with $300 additional for fuel and light. These figures are based on actual expenditure due to increased cost of commodities and also to enlargement of our Hospital to accomodate tuberculosis patients. The capacity of the place has been doubled and consumption patients are more expensive to maintain than ordinary fever patients.

In the Fever Hospital the maintenance and supplies are increased by $1,100, and the item of fuel and light by $900, this latter amount having been largely underestimated in the past and an addition having been made to the building.

On page 34 will be found the details of the expenditure for lighthouses. The salary of the keeper at Red Bay is increased from $60 to $240, as the original light there was a lantern hoisted to a pole, for looking after which $60 per annum was paid. but the present station comprises a tower and occulting light, necessitating continuous nightly attendance. At St. Anthony the position is exactly

the same. Griquet has a new light and the salary is $150. At Englee no reliable man could be secured to attend to the light for $50, and the amount had to be made $100. The same is true of Westport. At Conche there is a new light and the salary is $150. Jackson's Arm and Seal Cove are cases where no man could be secured for less than $100. At Gull Island the courier is dropped. Gull Island alarm calls for $700, this being the salary provided for the keepers at these places, being off the mainland. At Puffin Island, with light and alarm, the salary is raised from $360 to $700; at Shoe Cove from $250 to $360, and at Ragged Island, from $300 to $360 to conform with salaries paid to keepers of similar lights and alarms. On page 36 is found provision for the new fog alarm at Fermeuse, $700, this being the salary paid in all similar cases. At Placentia the keeper of the leading lights is increased from $50 to $150, as in other instances, where the original hoisted lights have been altered to stationary lights. The keeper at Lamaline is increased from $150 to $250, and the keeper of the leading lights from $50 to $150, for the same reason as in previous cases, that the character of the lights have been changed. A new light has been placed at Long Harbour Point, Fortune Bay, and a salary of $300 is voted. A fog alarm has been placed at Pass Island, Fortune Bay, to which a salary of $700 attaches. The same is true of Penguin Island light and fog alarm. On Bad Neighbour Rock, in Burgeo District, a buoy has been placed and $50 provided for the men to care for the same. At Isle au Mort the light has been improved and the salary increased from $180 to $200. At Channel the keeper of the range light and buoys, owing to greater provisions made there for safety, entailing extra work, gets an additional $40. A new leading light is put at Burnt Island and the salary is $200. At Cape St. George a light and alarm has been placed, and the salary is $700. At Little Port, near Port au Port, where the Dominion Steel Co. has its quarries and where shipping will largely resort, a light has been placed and the salary will be $300. At Eagle Island, on the West Coast, another new light has been put, and the same salary is paid. At Port aux Choix a small light has been located, the caretaker of which will receive $80. At Domino, on Labrador, a new light has been installed, the keeper of which will get $360. At Windsor Harbour, Manuels Island, Cape Harrigan, Ford's Harbour, lights are also installed and the caretakers will receive similar amounts.

What I have already explained with regard to salaries for the lighthouses, applies to a certain extent to the votes for maintenance which follow on page 38. These amounts are in most cases for new lights, and in a few instances, where changes have been made in the lights, permanent ones being substituted for lights that were hoisted on polls, provision has had to be made for the increased cost of maintaining such improved equipments. In some instances, owing to the isolation of the lights and the difficulties of getting supplies to them, the cost has been increased ,but in every case it is based on the actual expenditures of past years. If hon. gentlemen wish any further information with regard to any particular lights, I have no doubt the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is familiar with the details in every instance, will be very glad to supply it.

On page 41 will be found the vote for Agriculture and Mines. All the items are the same, except that for the encouragement of Agriculture, which we have reduced from $40,000

to $20,000, this year, as we feel that the improved stock, seeds, etc., brought in during the past few years, are sufficient for the immediate requirements and it is proposed now to give this additional material an opportunity to manifest itself in improving the agricultural position.

On page 42 we come to the vote for Marine and Fisheries. The items under these heads are unchanged. On page 43 are the items of the votes for roads and bridges. Here, again, there is no difference in the vote, except with regard to ferries. The increase is $704. The details of the ferries will be found to begin on page 47. In cases where no votes appear in the first column, the ferry is a new one. In some other cases the salaries have been increased slightly, because it has been found impossible to get the work done for a smaller sum. I am sure the Minister of Public Works will be glad to furnish any details required.

We now come to the Postal and Telegraph Departments on page 51. Under this head several increases have been made. Mr. William Campbell, Secretary to the Postmaster General, and who acts also as inspector of outport post offices, has been granted an additional allowance of $200 for this work owing to the increase in number of post offices, and especially in those with money order and registration branches attached. The inspection has become imperative, more particularly because of a series of defalcations in connection with the Department, and Mr. Campbell, who is a thoroughly experienced officer, will, it is believed, give good value for this money. Mr. R. Clarke, clerk to the P.M.G., is granted an additional $100. Mr. Allan, a fourth clerk in the Money Order Branch, is advanced from $240 to $300, and a fifth clerk is provided there at the same figure, Mr. Kelly. The work of this Department has been growing to such an extent that an additional man has become necessary, in the Registration and Parcel Post Department, Mr. Young, the book-keeper, who was previously getting only $450, has been advanced to $600; and Mr. Coady, the chief parcel clerk, gets an advance of $100, making his salary the same, and because of increasing work a junior, Mr. Ferguson, has been put in there at $200.

In the G.P.O., the clerk in charge, Mr. Clarke, gets $900 against $800 before. Mr. Atwill, despatching clerk, gets $50 advance; Mr. Philip Moore, window clerk, gets $100; and Mr. Geo. Collins, the assorter, is advanced from $600 to $750. In the Sydney, C.B., post office, three men formerly drew $2,350. Four men, Shano, Gushue, Evely and Dutot are now drawing $2,750, an apparent increase of $1,550, but they now pay their own rent and expenses, formerly paid from contingencies. There being now a daily cross-country service and a steady increase in the mails, additional clerks for the trains have been required, and Messrs. Collins, Norburg and Murphy are acting, who get $400 each with allowances of $100; and for the second steamer on Notre Dame Bay a mailman at $300 is required.

On page 53 will be found the schedule of outport postmasters. The Postmaster-General reports that thirty-two new outport offices have been opened during the past year, entailing new salaries; and increases of salaries have been given in over fifty other offices. The principal items are Harbour Grace postmaster and assistant, $200; Burin, $100; Burin North, $40; Miss Pike, at Carbonear, $50; $50 at Grand Falls; $50 at St. Joseph's; an assistant at Twillingate at $40; and $40 at New Perlican, the total being $1,539. If hon. members desire any

detailed information respecting these postmasters, who are listed on the next ten or twelve pages, I am sure the Hon. Colonial Secretary will arrange to have the information supplied.

On page 65 will be found the list of salaries for the postmasters on Labrador. Because of providing a second steamer last year for the Labrador weekly service in the person of the Invermore, a mail clerk at $300 was necessary on her, and is provided for. In the other Labrador offices there are slight increases, making an addition of $140 more.

On page 67 the list of couriers begins. The Postmaster-General informs me that thirty new roads have been added, and increases given in about the same number of old roads, making a total altogether of $2,208.75. The details of all these couriers, roads and amounts paid for the same will be found in the ensuing pages.

In several cases the new courier routes are the result of the building of the branch railways and providing communication for the settlements in reasonable reach of the same, while in other instances the increases in the amounts paid are due to the fact that ferry services are performed by contract, and it has been impossible to secure the due performance of the work except at the higher rates.

On page 75 will be found the details of the steam subsidy votes. There is an apparent increase of $18,000, but there is no actual increase, because we are only maintaining the same services as last season, when the extra sums were voted in Supplemental.

We turn on to the Telegraph branch on page 76. I am advised by the Department that the additional wires constructed into St. John's render the employment of additional operators, clerks and office tenders necessary; and, including increases to various officials of $750, the total increase is $3,700. Hon. members may be aware that in order to provide a more efficient service three or four extra wires were strung out of St. John's to different northern bays and to Cape Race to enable the Department to efficiently deal with the steadily increasing business. The detail on the lower part of the page shows the re-arrangement made as a result of this extra installation. Beginning on page 77 will be found a list of the operators outside St. John's. I am instructed that 18 new offices have been opened and salaries provided for the operators, which, together with increases in salaries for 21 old offices, give a total of $3,740, while the office allowances added for the new offices will be $270. The details are supplied in the ensuing pages. There is no change in the salaries voted to repairers on page 80, except that an additional one is provided at Salvage at $180. The items on page 81, contingencies, are the same, but there is an additional thousand dollars for Marconi royalties because of new offices.

We now come to the Customs Department on page 82. The details will be found on the next and subsequent pages. By reference to page 83 it will be seen that there is a third statistical clerk provided at $750. This is Mr. Renouf, transferred from the Finance Department. Two messengers, formerly paid $390 each, are increased to $600. For the past eight or ten years these people have been drawing $600 a year, $390 being voted, and the balance is paid out of contingencies, but as the Auditor-General has been protesting against the continuance of this practice, we are now providing the full amount. The third messenger, who appears as a new vote, was previously paid out of contingencies for a similar number of years. These

three messengers serve the Finance Department, the Long Room, Statistical Office, the Collectors and the Cashier's offices, and there is ample employment for them all. I might say further that these men were on the staff as tidewiters for many years and received a similar amount. Now they are getting beyond the age when they can, in fairness, be expected to do the work of tidewaiters and face all sorts of weather, but they are sufficiently active to be used for messenger work and so kept off the pension list.

Under the heading of gaugers, tidewaiters and boatmen, an item will be noted of eleven sufferance warehouse keepers at $600 each. They were formerly paid $500, and an extra $100 out of contingencies. We are now voting the full amount. The same is true of 18 tidewaiters,who were paid $390 and had their pay raised by our predecessors to $600, the increase being paid out of contingencies, and two boat coxwains at $480 raised to $600, an increase paid out of contingencies. I might say that in every case this practice was inaugurated by our predecessors.

The vote for printing and stationary, etc., is increased from $2,900 to $5,000, because of the needs of the Department, owing to the greatly increased business done and the thousands of additional entries passed each year. For several years past the increase has been met by Supplemental Supply. The same may be said of the excise work, which has doubled within five years; and for which we are providing an extra $500. The votes for fuel and light, clothing, and miscellaneous have been increased, not having been sufficient in any previous instance, and the extra amount being paid out of Supplemental Supply. On page 84 there is an increase of $3,000 for miscellaneous, the explanation the same with regard to this.

On the same page will be found the vote for sub-collectors of Customs. The principal items are as follows:

At Cartwright, Labrador, we have located a sub-collector at $600. Owing to the transfer by the Hudson Bay Co. of their headquarters from Rigolet to Cartwright and the opening of a mill at Brist River, it became necessary to locate a sub-collector here, while the officer at Rigolet had to be continued at that place as the Revillion Brothers and others carry on a trade in the northwest of Hamilton Inlet. At Codroy the salary of the sub-collector was increased from $240 to $360 on his giving up his occupations. Greenspond was increased from $300 to $500, and LaPoile from $300 to $360; Moreton's Harbour was made a port of entry at the request of several of our business men, and a collector appointed at $360. At St. Jacques the collector was increased from $416 to $500. In Belle Isle Strait an officer has been stationed at St. Modiste, who travels from Lance au Loup to Cape Charles and was hitherto paid out of contingencies, now getting $450. At Western Bay the salary of $20 was increased to $100, the work largely increased.

On page 86 will be found the vote for gaugers, tidewaiters, and boat men.

The principal items requiring explanation are as follows:—

Belleoram, one man, $390, previously paid out of contingencies; Botwood, two men, $790, paid in the same way; Carbonear, three men, $260 each, now increased to $1,170 or $390 each; the increase formerly paid out of Contingencies; Change Islands, one man acting as preventive officer, raised from $150 to $360, the increase formerly paid out of contingencies; Grand Falls, one man, $390, previously paid out of contingencies; Harbour Breton, one man, $480, previously paid out of contingencies; at Harbour Breton, as the

sub-collector is also Justice of Peace for the western side of Fortune Bay and has to be away frequently, the tidewaiter has to act as sub-collector, hence the extra pay; at Port aux Basques, increase of two men, at $390 each, $780; owing to the daily service and the running of two steamers between Port aux Basques and North Sydney. At Rose Blanche one man raised from $100 to $390, increase justified by work done and hitherto paid out of Contingencies. For outport supernumeraries the sum is dropped to $2,000. On the same page the percentage on duties is increased from $14,000 to $17,000, the increase required to meet the amount of commissions earned and hitherto paid out of contingencies. The printing and stationery for the outport offices is increased to $1,400, the previous facts explaining this addition.

Fuel and light is increased in the same way from $800 to $1,800, and miscellaneous from $700 to $2,700. The votes formerly were not sufficient for the service and the increases were made out of supplementary vote, of which fact the Auditor-General more than once complained. An item of $600 now appears as a percentage on light dues. This is authorized by the Act 62 and 63 Victoria Cap. 19, but the payment has not been provided for heretofore in the estimates, the amounts being paid out of the Departmental contingencies.

On page 88 it will be seen that the refund of Customs is increased from $16,000 to $20,000. This has become necessary because of rebates being granted on gasolene used for fishery purposes and because of re-exportations.

The amount provided under the heading of "Coal and Water Refunds" on account of coal duties paid in St. John's, increased from $60,000 to $68,000, because of the increase in the imports of coal into this port. We also provide a thousand dollars for Bell Island out of the coal duties paid there and authorized to be handed over o the Bell Island Council by the Act 3 George 5 Chapter 34.

On page 89 is the usual vote of $10,000 for general contingencies.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again. The report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on Monday February 2nd.

SEALING BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Mr. Coaker, the Bill, An Act to amend the Sealing Laws, was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. GRIMES gave Notice of Question.

MR. STONE gave Notice of Question.

MR. ABBOTT gave Notice of Question.

MR. WINSOR gave Notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow Friday, January 30th, at 4 of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, January 30th, 1914.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS tabled the Auditor General's Report, also reply to a question asked for by Mr. Jennings.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS tabled reply to question asked for by Mr. Jennings.

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled reply to question asked by Mr. Jennings regarding election expenses.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the account asked for by Mr. Halfyard on Jan. 29, concerning the dredge. I would like to say that these are original accounts and I am responsible for them. I would ask that they remain on the table and the hon. member may take copies. I tabled some original accounts last year and I did not receive them back until somewhere in August and so the Auditor General was not very pleased.

PETITIONS.

HON. MR. EMERSON.—I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Bay L'Argent asking for the sum of $500 to build a wharf at that place. It is very dangerous landing there at present and a wharf is a great necessity. When the steamer calls great inconvenience is caused in getting to and from the steamer. I would ask that the petition receive the consideration it deserves and that the prayer will be acceded to.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to present a petition from Isle Aux Morts asking for the election of a fog alarm at that place. It is one of the largest fishing centres on the West Coast in the winter, not because of the number of people living there but because of the number of people from Burin, Fortune and Grand Bank that make that place the centre of their fishing operations during the winter months. In coming in there in a storm it is very dangerous and I hope the Government will see their way clear to do something in this direction next year.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of English Harbor asking for a sum of money to make a road down there to the railway. This is very necessary as without that the people will be unable to reach the railway.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in giving my heartiest support to the prayer of the petition.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Comfort Cove asking for an allocation to make and repair roads in that locality. I know this place very well and the roads proposed are very necessary. Petition is signed by forty-one inhabitants I ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

QUESTIONS.

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of grants expended by the Agricultural Society at Bay Roberts, 1912 and 1913.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I will table that information next sitting.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the amount of coals supplied by W. H. Hynes and P. Templeman, and the amount paid per ton, delivered at Green Island Lighthouse, in the district of Trinity, for the years 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, this information is being prepared.

MR. WINSOR asked the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the report and expenses of the Chief Fire Ranger for the year 1913.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker that information is being prepared.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House (a) a detailed statement of expenditure of $1,943.85 allocated to John Rowsell and L. Templeman of Bonavista, on August 3rd, 1909; also, detailed statement of expenditure of allocation of $329.15 made to Robert Guy, of Bonavista, on August 3rd, 1909; also a detailed statement of allocation of $123.93 to James Ryan, of Bonavista, on August 3rd, 1909; also, a detailed statement of expenditure of allocation of $81.76 to James Hunt, of Bonavista, on August 3rd, 1909; (b) a detailed statement of expenditure of allocation of $293.31 to Philip Templeman. of Bonavista on September 27th, 1909; (c) a detailed statement of expenditure of allocation of $100 to A. J. Mifflin of Bonavista, September 24th, 1913.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I hope to have that information in a few days

PATENT BILL.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes respecting Patents.'

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this bill. It deals more with a question of practice than anything else. It amends Section 11 of the Patent Act allowing the filing of a certified copy instead of the original. It has been found very inconvenient to bring out the original where a patent is applied for, to have it deposited here. Under the old practice it was necessary to file the original document and it is now proposed to amend this.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I think that the proposed amendment is very desirable. The practice that has prevailed of having to file the original in our office here has caused a great deal of incovenience and those who have had anything to do with the filing of patents have felt it. In many cases applicants for patents have declined to proceed because of the necessity of filing original documents so that many useful patents have not been brought into operation.

I should like to have seen, however, a thorough revision of the patent law. Our patent law as it stands at present is very incomplete and it is almost impossible to decide the meaning of many sections. For example one section requires the owner of a patent to bring it into operation in Newfoundland within two years of the filing of the application. It is desirable that some provision should be made whereby the owner should be compelled to do something specific in relation to the bringing into operation. As it stands at present one cannot tell whether a patentee loses this patent because of the apathy of the public or by reason of his not manufacturing. The present practice is to publish a notice in the papers calling upon the public to lease or buy the patent in Newfoundland. That is only a rough way of carrying out the provisions of the Act. There is another section of the Act which it is very desirable should be made clear. Take the case of two applicants for a patent. I think the first person applying for a patent should have the right to obtain it, reserving the right of the Crown in certain cases. When this Bill will be discussed in Committee it might be possible to enact some provisions to make the law more complete and workable. Our laws have not been consolidated for twenty-two years, and it might be desirable to remodel the patent law when we go into Committee and consolidate it in such a manner as to make it more efficient than it is at present.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Generally I concur with the remarks

of the hon. member in relation to the desirability of amending the Patent Law, in the direction of the various points to which he has referred. Every member of this House who has had anything to do with a Patent case will readily agree that many improvements in our present law were necessary. I think the time has arrived when our statute laws should be consolidated or at least those portions of the laws which have been amended since the last consolidation in 1892. There are a great many Acts in our Consolidated Statutes which do not require consolidation, but on the other hand there are many acts such as the Licensing Act, the Sealing and other Acts, which have been amended frequently since that time and which require to be consolidated. At present the public generally are not able to follow the amendments made from year to year, hence the necessity of consolidation. I can promise the hon. member that at a very early date this matter of consolidation will be taken up.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

ADVERTISEMENTS BILL.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act respecting the Exhibition of Advertisements."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—This is a bill of a local character issued for the purpose of regulating public advertisements. Its chief object is to prevent the disfiguring of this city and the suburbs, where the custom is gradually growing of placing large advertisements which have an objectionable appearance and tend to disfigure the scenery. This will not be found to do any harm to advertising generally but will merely restrict people from exceeding a reasonable limit. It is thought only fair to announce this so that any firm about to spend any large amount in this direction may be warned in time.

MR. KENT.—I am of the opinion that this bill is of a very desirable character but I must confess I think that as far as the city advertising is concerned the proper persons to deal with it are the members of the City Council, and in case these amendments are to be made I think it is to them that the power of such restrictions should be given.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—There is no objection to give the Council the power to which you refer. This Bill I may say was suggested by Mr. Bowring the donor of the Park and it is now purposed to deal with all advertisements. A number of objectionable advertisements were put up close to the Bowring Park.

The Bill was then read the second time and ordered to be committed to a Committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to amend 6 Edward VII., Chapter 3, entitled "The Aliens Act, 1906."

ALIENS BILL.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—This is an amendment of sub-section 2 of section 8, Act 6, Edward VII., Cap. 3, in connection with the Aliens Act, 1906, respecting the laws regarding aliens in this Colony, which is hereby repealed.

Sub-section 2 is the interpretation clause of the expression "immigrant ship" which in this Act means a ship which brings into this Colony more than twenty aliens in the steerage. But we now find it more convenient for the boats coming to Newfoundland to have the term "immigrant ship" applied to any boat coming to this Island and bringing one or more alien passengers in the steerage, who is or are to be landed in this Colony.

The Bill was read the second time and ordered to be committed to a

Committee of the whole Hounse on to-morrow.

INSPECTION OF FOODS BILL.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act relating to the Inspection of Foods in St. John's."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to move the second reading of the Bill which is the outcome of very careful study of the Health Officer, Dr. Brehm. It is not considered wise to extend the provisions of this Bill beyond St. John's at the present time, as the proper machinery for carrying it out is not available at all places throughout the Colony. This Bill may require to be amended when we are considering it in detail in Committee and at that time I shall be very glad to receive any suggestions and to consider anything tending to perfect this Bill. The sections 1 2 and 3 are the present law as found in the Consolidated Statutes. Subsection three is the Manitoba Public Health Act and is regarded as one of the most up-to-date acts extant regarding this matter, and is not regarded as a hardship in that country.

Section No. 2 of the Bill is the law at the present time. All the sections from section three onward are adapted from the Manitoba and Ontario Acts. It will be found on a careful perusal and reading of this law that it is for the purpose of preserving the public health of the City and of the persons who have to purchase foods of various kinds. It is not desirable to have the law in that respect too stringent or severe because very often the conditions here are not exactly the same as in other countries where laws of the character have been in operation for many years and where people are accustomed to the carrying out of such laws; Dr. Brehm tells me he has kept the same idea in view in considering this measure, which has been under his attention for the past year. This Act has been framed with the view of having a measure as perfect as possible and at the same time not too severe. The Health authorities have tried during the last few years to give special attention to the manner in which food is prepared and sold in this town. A great deal has been accomplished particularly as regards dairies and slaughterhouses not only in this town but throughout the country Milk and other foods supplied of that nature are the disseminators of many of the epidemics and diseases which prevail throughout the country—milk in particular. Inspector O'Brien has during the last seven or eight years devoted his attention in his capacity as Health Officer to this matter. He enforced rules concerning the manner in which cattle should be stalled, milked and cared for, how the milk should be sold and handled. The same is true as to slaughterhouses. A great deal of care still remains to be exercised by those who operate these places, but much has been accomplished. In some places private individuals are not permitted by law to slaughter cattle; a public abattoir is provided wherein all cattle are killed for sale and consumption. The animals must be killed under certain rules and regulations and the abattoirs are subject to daily inspection. All the provisions of the present Act are in the interest of the public health not alone of the town but of the whole country. For these reasons I believe the House will be glad to see a measure such as this passed into law and under the administration of such a capable and efficient health officer as Dr. Brehm I feel certain that nothing but good will be the outcome of such an enactment. I shall be glad to receive any suggestions which may be offered when we go into committee. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I think that the principle of this Bill is one which must commend itself not alone to the members of this House but to everyone. The question for the public health can not be too carefully considered by this House, and when we go into Committee we will do everything in our power to make the Bill as perfect as possible. I think Dr. Brehm and Inspector O'Brien deserve every credit for the manner in which they are carrying out the laws relating to the Public Health.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed to a Committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

DENTAL BILL.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act further to amend the Newfoundland Dental Act."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—This Bill is asked for by the Medical Society in London through the Secretary of State. It reads as follows:

(1) Section 1 of the Act 3 George V., Chapter 3, entitled "An Act to amend the Newfoundland Dental Act" is hereby amended by substituting in lieu of the words "(d) possesses a diploma entitling him to examination with a view to admission to practise as a Dentist by the General Medical Council of Great Britain" the words "(d) possesses a diploma entitling him to registration as a Dentist by the General Medical Council of the United Kingdom." There is really no change in the principle of the present law. The Bill provides for the insertion of certain words which should have been put in the Act when being put through last year. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed to a Committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to consolidate the Law relating to Cruelty to Animals."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—This Bill has been submitted by the Society for the Protection of Animals, a society which has been established many years in this Island and which has accomplished a great deal of good. I think such humane ideas as are contained in this Bill will commend themselves to everybody and will tend to instill into the minds of young persons the principle of being kind to dumb animals. This bill is a consolidation of our own law, as well as the Imperial Act and the legislation of other countries which has been found to work well in this connection.

When we go into committee at the next meeting it may be considered desirable to make amendments either by adding to or modifying the various sections in the present bill and I merely ask now that the general principle be admitted by the House. I have gone carefully over this bill and we must bear in mind that whilst a penal act like this can be carried out in large settlements where we have machinery like Magistrates, Justices, Policemen and other persons conversant with the interpretation of the Statute Law and its Administration, we must be careful not to burden the public with too much legislation in places where we have not the means to put it in operation. Very often hardships are inflicted on innocent persons by inter pretations of the law by ignorant and incompetent people. The first section of the bill is the principal one and deals with the offence of cruelty to animals; the subsections a, b, c, d, e, are from the Imperial Act consolidated and passed 1911. The penalty for violation of the first section and its sub section is a sum not exceeding

seventy-five dollars while the Imperial Act provides for a fine of 25 pounds for similar offences and an imprisonment for six months. Under this act we have reduced the term of imprisonment to three months.

The second section gives the Magistrate power to direct that any animal be destroyed if he is satisfied that it would be an act of cruelty if it were to be allowed to live. This section follows the Imperial Act.

Section 3 deals with the question of compensation and is taken from the Imperial Act and from our Consolidated Statutes. The proviso under section three is taken from the Imperial Act. The 5th section deals with using dogs under a certain weight for the purpose of drawing any vehicles but when we go into Committee it may be found necessary to reduce the weight. This Bill provides that a dog hauling a load must weigh at least thirty pounds. It is very rarely seen that a person in this country is in the habit of harnessing a dog whose weight would be under thirty pounds but the Committee may possibly amend this section so that any hardships on our people may be avoided. Sometimes we find a very small dog apparently well able to draw a small load and the animal may not be as heavy in weight as provided for under this act.

Section 6 gives authority to a constable to destroy a diseased or injured animal in certain cases. This is taken from the Imperial Act and also from a law passed in the State of Massachusetts.

Section 7 gives a constable authority to apprehend without a warrant for offending under the Act. This is the law to-day.

Section 8 gives power to a Magistrate to issue a summons directed to the owners of the animal requiring him to bring the animal before him.

Section 9 provides that every cart or other vehicle with shafts used for draft purposes shall be provided with a pritchet or support, which is our present law to-day.

Section 10 prevents persons under the age of 16 years being admitted to slaughter houses when cattle are being killed. This is taken from the Imperial Act.

Section 11 provides that no animal shall be slaughtered within the sight or hearing of any other animal awaiting slaughter. The subject matter of this section involves a very interesting problem that probably most persons are not acquainted with; which is whether animals such as oxen, sheep and pigs are or are not conscious of danger to themselves and others around them. Some authorities go so far as to say that the sufferings from terror in such cases very often have such an effect upon the animal as to render the meat injurious for food purposes. This is a matter which would affect the public health.

Section 12 deals with the disposition of animals who are suffering from debility or disease and makes it a penal offence to offer for sale animals in that condition.

Section 13 provides that it shall be unlawful for any person to shoot at or wound any animal unless there is reasonable cause for so doing.

Section 14 is in relation to the appointment by the Society of an agent for the purpose of carrying out the law, and 15 deals with the powers of that agent.

Section 16 is merely one of procedure as regard actions being taken before a Justice or Magistrate. This is the present law.

Section 17 is also the law and deals with penalties.

Section 18 is our present law.

Section 19 deals with search warrants.

Section 20 provides that it shall be the duty of an engine driver to kill an animal if mortally wounded by a train or locomotive engine; this is our present law.

Section 21 deals with the jurisdiction of Magistrates, while 22 is merely the definitions of certain expressions under the act.

As a rule our people all over the country are very humane in the treatment of animals especially those who are accustomed to rear animals and use them continuously, such as farmers and others, and it is only in a very exceptional case where parties would be charged for violating any sections of this Act. The question of protecting animals from cruelty is dealt with in every country, and although there may be no immediate necessity for the enactment of this law here it is our duty to lend every support to the Society to punish cases of cruelty which may occur. The promoters of this Act have been identifed with this good work a great many years. I may make special reference to Mr. Justice Johnson, who for the greater part of his life has been identified with this movement and who has done much to disseminate all over the country amongst our people the necessity for their earnest attention to the needs and requirements of dumb animals. Prosecutions under the law for the prevention of cruelty to animals have been taken against persons which in many cases resulted in showing that the cruelty was not caused by wilful ill-treatment but by persons who unconsciously neglected to give proper attention to the animals. This act is more to arrest our attention and to bring home to us our responsibilities and in this way a great deal can be accomplished. It is very rare in this town to meet with a case of intentional cruelty. It is very often a case of neglect such as improper feeding and sometimes overworking. In a great many cases an offence is committed under the act by persons who are unconscious of doing an act of cruelty and when their attention is called to the matter they readily respond to the appeal to their humanity. I beg to propose a second reading of this Bill.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to elaborate on the principle of this Bill for I consider it to be a good one. At the present time we have an Act which covers the principle of this Bill which is one which must commend itself to all. It is the duty of the whole community to prevent the ill-treatment of dumb animals and those guilty of such an offence should be punished. While the present act upon our Statutes is fairly good it is not as complete as this Bill, which appears to be well drawn though we may find some matters requiring amendment when we go into committee. The Act is the work of the Society who for years have taken pains and trouble to bring before the courts those guilty of cruelty to animals. I agree with the Premier that Mr. Justice Johnson has worked most assiduously in this matter and it cannot be denied that in recent years animals are treated much better than formerly owing to the watchfulness of that gentleman. If a case came under the notice of Mr. Justice Johnson which he considered was one of ill-treatment or neglect he would have immediate enquiries made and if necessary have the offender brought before the court. Those who know him will appreciate that he is not one to insist upon the punishment of an unintentional act of cruelty. It will be observed that this spirit runs through this Act, while protecting the animal at the same time. I have much

pleasure in supporting the principle of this Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed to a Committee of the whole House to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

The House then adjourned until Monday, February 2nd, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

MONDAY, February 2, 1914.

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled, in answer to the request of several members of the House, denominational figures for each district as per the census of 1891, 1901 and 1911.

PETITIONS.

HON. C. H. EMERSON.—I beg to present a petition from Boxey, Fortune Bay, asking that English Harbour West be made a port of call for one of the coastal boats. Boxey is situate within a mile or two of English Hr. West. The people think if the coastal boat called at that place their needs and requirements could be met. I may say that during the session I presented three or four petitions from different places in the vicinity of English Hr. West asking that that place be made a port of call. It seems strange that that place should have been left out of the schedule of both the Glencoe and the Portia. It is a place where there is a large amount of business done; quite a number of people live there. It is right in the track of these steamers' routes and no unnecessary delay whatever would be occasioned by calling there. There is quite a lot of trade done in that part of the district and while the Bay boat calls at all these places the coastal boat does not make the connection. I trust that the petition will meet with every consideration.

MR. MOULTON.—I beg to present a petition from New Hr. Hermitage Bay, setting forth that both the Portia and Glencoe call at Rencontre and asking that one of the boats be taken from Rencontre and call at New Harbour which is a short distance away. I think that this is a very reasonable request and I would ask that the Government have the schedule readjusted to meet the request of the petitioners.

MR. JENNINGS.—I beg to present a petition from the people of Twillingate containing 378 signatures and asking for something that has not been asked for before in this House. I may be mistaken but the question has not been raised during this session and in order that the request may be understood I would ask leave to read the petition.

The hon. member then read the petition, which was on the subject of road boards. Now I think the request of this petition is a very reasonable one and it seems to me a very easy and inexpensive way of settling the question of electing road boards. I trust that the petition will receive consideration and that its prayer will be granted.

MR. CLIFT.—I beg leave to support the prayer of the petition and I think it has been pointed out by my colleague that it is somewhat unique in its character. I have never heard of a similar one being presented to this House. The members of road boards are usually appointed by the Government but in this case it seems that the road board in Twillingate has become disbanded and the books are now in possession of one who is not and never was a member of the board and it seems to me that the matter calls for a remedy and I would recommend that the question be referred to the Department of Public Works with the request that they would act

upon it without delay. I do not personally know very many of the individual names in the petition as persons who are likely to compose the board but in view of what I can learn it will not be any partisan or political board. It represents all parties and is the choice of some 350 voters in the town of Twillingate and I hope for this reason that it will receive immediate attention.

MR. STONE.—I beg to present a petition from New Melbourne for the sum of $500 for the continuation of a breakwater there. It is a place that is not very safe and the people want to try and get the breakwater finished. This petition is signed by about forty people and I trust that it will receive every consideration. I ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. TARGETT.—I have much pleasure in supporting that petition. I am well acquainted with New Melbourne and I know that that breakwater is needed there.

MR. TARGETT.—I ask leave to present a petition from New Chelsea on the subject of a breakwater. Last year, or the year before, the Government gave the people a grant to build a breakwater but part of it was swept away and they now ask for $200 to repair it and to save the whole from breaking up in the future. I beg to support the prayer of the petition and I ask that it be referred to the proper department.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from several places in the District of Bay de Verde asking the Government to fix by law a date for the picking of partridge berries in that District. The petition is very largely signed by people all over the district and I feel sure that it would be a good move to have such a law introduced and carried into effect. In the past many unripe berries have been picked and exported to the heavy loss of the exporter. Sometimes this loss was made by the shipper in St. John's and sometimes by the agents in the district. If the berries are at all hard they are useless for the people abroad why buy our berries and very often berries are sent on to St. John's for export that are unripe and have to be thrown away.

In speaking of this industry I might say that it would be wise on the part of the Government to take further steps in the matter and introduce some measure whereby experiments can be made to ascertain if it is possible in any way to increase the output, which is falling off every year as the following figures will show:

In the year 1909-10 there were 8,600 barrels exported, valued at $40,000.00;

In the year 1910-11 there were 6,000 barrels exported, valued at $27,000.00;

In the year 1911-12 there were 2,900 barrels exported, valued at $11,000.00;

In the year 1912-13 there were 3,700 barrels exported, valued at $15,000.

The last year shows a slight increase but the general decrease is apparent. I think a short crop will mean an increase in the price for there is a tendency on the part of the buyers to pay more for the berries. It is only during the past few years that the berries have been exported at all and not many years ago they were used for local consumption only and sold in flour barrels. The value has increased considerably in the States and the berries are now sold in Chicago at $11.00 per barrel They are very much liked there and they cost the consumer much more than any other berry; in fact, the consumer paid seventy-five cents a gallon for them last year, which is a great deal higher than the price paid for strawberries.

The export of these berries was not a very profitable business until a company, called the Berry Company, was formed. Sometimes they were sold by buyers who took them at the invoice price and in nine cases out of ten they lost money. The berry company pays cash in exchange for the shipping documents and the berries are paid for before they are seen by them and the price has increased.

The berries are used in the flavoring of ice creams and for many other industries and for the reasons that I have named I think there should be an inspection of the berries. The Board of Trade has arranged for an inspection in the past but this has not always been availed of. If they are inspected, the consumer will have more confidence in the berries and this will mean an increase in the price.

Our berries are worth nearly double the price of the Cape Cod berries, for the latter are worth $6.00 per barrel whereas ours are worth $11.00. Last year 500,000 barels of Cape Cod berries were sold at that price, thereby making the industry worth three million dollars. This industry was very small at one time and it has increased from 20,000 barrels to 500,000 barrels during the past fifty years.

It will be seen from these figures that there is a great possibility in the industry and I trust that the Government will give the matters to which I have referred the necessary attention.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words with reference to the petition which has just been presented by my hon. friend, the member for Bay de Verde. As a matter of fact there are a number of these petitions to be presented from hundreds of the residents of Trinity Bay and Bay de Verde, which districts seem to be more interested in the industry than any other districts. Why the trade has grown up in these districts more than in others I do not know unless it is that the soil is more adapted to the growth of these berries or because the people there pay more attention to the industry than do the people in other parts of the Colony.

In any event when a great many citizens ask for the introduction of a measure like the one referred to, I feel certain that hon. members will appreciate the importance of the request. I have had some correspondence with Mr. W. A. Munn in relation to this matter and I have a small bill in preparation which later in the session I shall submit to the House.

The principle which is outlined in this measure is to give the Magistrate in each district the authority to fix the date when in his opinion they are sufficiently ripe to be picked, for it is very largely a matter as to what is the right season. Sometimes the berries are very prolific and become ripe early in the autumn while at other times owing to bad weather the season for picking them is very late and the crop is perhaps a very small one.

I feel sure that the matter is one of sufficient importance to require that it should be considered with a view to ascertaining if it is possible to have the quantity increased by preventing the early gathering of the berries. I was very much struck with the interesting remarks of my hon. friend, Mr. Hickman, whom I heard with great interest a few days ago on the same subject and it is possible that there may be underlying this, if satisfactorily taken up, a very large industry such as there is at Cape Cod. Many persons might believe that this trade amounting to three million dollars is the result of a nat-

ural crop of berries but from what I have gathered from my hon. friend it is largely the result of cultivation. They may have a soil there something like that in parts of this Colony, marshy places where, when they have dried up, berries grow rapidly and well.

As I have said, I shall introduce a bill dealing with this matter. It will be a matter for debate whether it will be best to give the Magistrate power to fix the date or whether this will be left to some body, such as the Agricultural Society. The whole matter deserves our close consideration and there should be no difficulty in having a law passed that can be carried into effect.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present three petitions from the District of Trinity on the same subject. These are from Chapel Arm, St. Jones Within and Heart's Ease. It is not necessary for me to say much on the matter but I am glad to learn that the Government will take it up and that some legislation will be introduced to accede to the prayer of the petitioners.

In connection with the cultivation of these berries I would like to remind the House that when we had a visit from a journalist, who is an authority on agricultural matters—I refer to Mr. Beach Thomas he stated within these walls that he was greatly struck with the natural berries of the Colony and he pointed out that the conditions that made Newfoundland so prolific in these berries are likely to increase the output very greatly if they are cultivated. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petitions.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I also beg leave to present two further petitions from the district of Trinity, on the same subject. After what has been said, it is not necessary for me to deal with the question. The petitions are very largely signed, and I think that every consideration should be given them.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I also beg leave to present two petitions on the same subject. I think enough has been said to impress upon the House the importance of the matter, and I would ask that these petitions be referred to the proper department.

The several petitions were, on motion, received and it was ordered that they be referred to the several departments to which they relate.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I beg to lay upon the table of the House the information asked for by my hon. friend Mr. Jennings, on the Order Paper of Jan 30th in relation to agricultural societies. Also, the information asked for by my hon. friend, Mr. Grimes, in relation to the Bay Roberts Agricultural Society.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to lay upon the table of the House the information asked for by my hon. friend, Mr. Stone, on the Order Paper, of Jan. 30th and also the information asked for on the same day, by my hon. friend Mr. Abbott, relating to moneys spent in Bonavista district.

MR. KENT—I would like to ask the Hon. Min. of Finance if the statement asked for by me on Jan. 20th concerning General Contingencies has been prepared.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—The statement will be furnished as soon as possible.

MR. KENT—I would also like to know through the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister if the statement asked for by me from the Department of Agricultural and Mines concerning the awards for lands taken for railway purposes has been prepared.

RT.HON ,PRIME MINISTER—Instructions have been given to have the statement prepared but I understand from Mr. Turner, the Deputy Minister, that it involves considerable work and will not be ready for a day or two.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Committee of the Whole on Supply

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. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, when I introduced the estimates on Thursday last I think I supplied the Committee with all the information possible concerning the increases in the Estimates However, if there is any further information required by hon. gentlemen I shall be glad to furnish it. If they wish any votes to stand over, it will be readily done.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the House as a whole is indebted to the hon. Minister of Finance for the general summary of the changes made in the Estimates as compared with those of last year. I think, too, that this question of preparing the Estimates for the year is one that does not receive the care that it ought to receive. I notice by the Estimates that are before us to-day that the total estimates for the year amount to $3,842,091-85. The estimates that were brought down last year amounted to $3,693,998.00. There is an increase, therefore, of about $150,000.00 but if we include the additional estimates that were passed this amount is reduced to $106,000.00.

Looking through the Estimates, I think it is probable that we shall have the same conditions to contend with this year as we have had for some years past. You will have the necessity for additional Estimates and for Supplementary Supply. This is due to the fact that the Estimates have not received that care and attention in their preparation which were due to them.

The Estimates are the cost of the public service of the colony and it is to meet them that the people of the colony have to pay taxes. Every care should be taken, therefore, at the beginning of the session to have them as close as possible to the demands of the public service. If we look back over the past four years and compare the estimates of each year with the annual expenditure which has taken place during the year we shall find a considerable difference between the amount estimated and the actual expenditure:—

In the year 1909-10 the expenditure over the amount estimated was $196,-000.00.

In 1910–11 it was $299,000.00.

In 1911–12 it was $197,000.00.

In 1912–13 it was $199,000.00.

In other words, if you take the gross amount you will find an over-expenditure of nearly $900,000 or an average of $225,000.00 a year for that period. Such a custom should not prevail for while it has been go ing on for a great many years it has neyer been accentuated as it has been during the past four years.

This year the Hon. Minister stated that he hoped the Estimates would be in accordance with the expenditure but I think that if he will examine the increases and charges made in the Estimates he will still find that it is probable that there will be an over-expenditure for the year 1913-14 This matter is becoming more and more important according as the figures become greater and the services for which we are to provide become more and more extended.

I hoped to have had before this some information that I had asked for and particularly the Auditor General's Report, which covers the year under consideration. There is other information that I should like to have, such as expenditures under the Audit Act and the amounts spent by order of the Governor-in-Council for general contingencies. All this information was asked for by me some time ago.

I notice in the Estimates that there are some changes made in the salaries The first and most important of these is the increase in the salary of His Excellency the Governor.

It will be noticed that there is an increase of $2500 on his salary and $1500 for expenses which is a total addition of $4000. Now Mr. Chairman, in reference to this increase I think that no person in this colony would like to see an incumbent of the office of Governor holding that office unless he was adequately paid for the services that he renders to the Colony. We owe this not only to the person who is appointed to the office of Governor, but also to our self respecting citizens that the man coming here performing the high functions of a Governor should be sufficiently paid and should not be placed in a position where he would have to run into debt, as the Governor states that he is enforced to do. There is another matter Mr. Chairman in connection with this to which I would like to refer. I think that the Ministers should have come in here and placed the increase on the Estimates on their own responsibility. I do not think that they should have brought the Governor's letter into this House at all. They could have made their calculations upon the statement received from the Governor and taken the responsibility upon themselves and not thrown it over on the Governor. The fact that the Governor's position demands certain expenditures and that he has the highest office in the country and must maintain it in all its dignity every person admits. And as to the necessity of an adequate salary there is no dispute particularly that the cost of living is so high in this country at present and as the Governor formerly received a salary as large as the increase now given him. The increase is based upon the fact that the cost of living and the cost of maintaining the position he holds have increased during recent years. That is perfectly true and no one who lives in the Colony to-day can deny that, but I would like to see that principle applied all round. If the cost of living has increased for the Governor it has also increased for all the civil servants. Some of course, are receiving salaries adequate to their positions, others are absolutely inadequately paid, and are not receiving a living wage at all. For instance take the police men and the Firemen, whom I have referred to here three or four times in recent years. Every person who has looked into the matter will admit that the Policemen and Firemen are not receiving adequate salaries, and that you cannot get the good men to remain in the Police Force and Fire Brigade as long as you do not pay them a salary to maintain the position which they hold. We have men in our Brigade to-day who are as splendid men as are in any Fire Brigade in the world but they are only holding on in the hope that some day their services will be recognized by the Government and adequate remuneration for the services rendered by them will be paid; but to-day every person recognizes the inadequacy of their salaries.

I regretted a few moments ago the fact that the Estimates did not show due care and that we will have the same conditions prevailing that we formerly had. Take the Estimates for Civil Government and compare the increases that have taken place in Civil Government during the past four or five years and the present increases. Now the present increases according to the Minister is intended to meet the increased cost of living and the increased cost of Supplies and other articles of that sort. In the year 1910-11 in the estimates for Civil Government there was an increase of the estimates for that year of $1250, The next year there was on increase of $37,000 and the next year $38,000, the next year $12,000 and this year $19,000.00. Now that shows Mr. Chairman that next year you will have the same condition of affairs. This is not even the ordinary increase that has annually taken place during the last four or five years. Then, Mr. Chairman, I think, if you will look closer it will be very difficult to understand upon what basis these increases have been made. We find some men doing the same work with the same responbility year after year without any increase while in other offices for some reason or other their salaries are increased. Now take the matter of Civil Government there is one office which I think would call for attention and it is the office of the Registrar of Vital Statistics. The Registrar is an experienced Civil Servant who has got very responsible duties to perform—duties upon the accuracy of which all our calculation and all our information as to the public health of the Colony, and all changes regarding the Census of the Colony are based and we find that he receives a salary of $800, while we find in other Departments that the first or second or third clerk receives as much as this man who has to do this very responsible work. The Clerk in that Department is receiving a salary of $450—that is he is receiving the salary that a stenographer receives in other offices. That office, I think, is not adequately remunerated. In other offices in the Department increases have been made and I do not understand why discrimination has been made between these offices. I do not know who the holders of the offices are or whether their increases have been granted because they are political supporters of the Government. Take the Public Works Department. In that Department you have six salaries increased whilst there are others that are not increased. The first clerk is given $1100.00. Now I know that Mr. Pearce the incumbent of that office is one of the most capable workers in the whole public service and certainly on his merits he is well worth that salary, but what I wish to say is that when you make increases they are to be made on some principle and not made haphazard or for the purposes of showing favour to any particular individual. The Superintendent of Public Works and his clerks and the Road Inspectors outside of St. John's have had their salaries increased. The same thing applies in the Post Office Department, in the Customs Department and the other Departments. Take the case of the Deputy Heads of the different Departments. We have the Deputy head of the Colonial Secretary's Department receiving a salary of $1600; the Deputy Head of the Justice Department $2200; the Deputy Head of the Finance Department $1500; the Deputy Head of the Department of the Agriculture and Mines Department $1200; then the Deputy head of the Fisheries Department receives $1200;

and the Assistant Collector who is deputy head of the Customs Department receives $1800. There is a great discrepancy in the salaries received by these various heads. Take the case of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Mr. Turner, who receives $1200; well he also receives amounts for instance as secretary to the arbitrators,and the last two years received large payments on account of railway arbitrations. He also receives certain fees. Then take the case of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He only receives $1200. I am not aware of any other payments he receives.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER- He receives two or three hundred dollars from another source.

MR. KENT—What for?

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—I think it is in connection with the Naval Reserve accounts.

MR. KENT—That would be $1400. Now the Deputy Minister of Finance receives $1500.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—$1600 He has $100 a year extra.

MR. KENT—That makes $1600. The Deputy Head of the Colonial Secretary's Department receives $1600 and also certain fees. Now take the Department of Finance. This office has been referred to over and over again nearly every year since I have been in the House, as regards the valuable services rendered by the Deputy Head. He, of course is a specialist in his own line. I think he has now been thirty years in the public service and he is a most capable officer. Surely he ought to receive the same salary that the Deputy head of the Colonial Secretary's Department receives. All the Deputy heads, who have been specially trained for the offices which they hold ought to receive salaries adequate to maintain their positions. The cost of living has been increasing and this principle applies to their case just as much as it does to the case of the Governor.

Then there is a matter to which I would like to refer before I sit down and that is in reference to the vote of $150,000, which was taken here last year as against the estimated surplus. It will be borne in mind by those members of the House who were here at that time that my friend Mr. Clift and I protested then against the manner in which that vote was being dealt with. We urged that the amount allocated should be divided and appropriated under separate heads, each specifying the purpose of the vote in each case. Now the main purpose for which that vote was taken was for defraying the cost of the General Election, and we find that when it came to the time when this amount was to be drawn against to meet the expenses of the election the fund had been exhausted by illegal payments and there was no surplus there. In fact the surplus had been overdrawn. The Auditor General's Report which is before me, and which I presume was made up about the end of September, the time of the closing of the annual accounts of the Colony deals with this matter. The actual expenditures for the year only go as far as June 30th, but the books are kept open for three months in order to enable the different Department to balance their accounts and in order to enable the Auditor General to conduct a proper audit. He refers to this matter of payments from the surplus as follows:—

"With a current revenue of $3,919,-040.13 and a current expenditure of $3,803,561.42 (the $8,000.00 interest on Old Age Pensions Fund is deducted on both sides of the account), a surplus of $115,479.01 results. This surplus has been placed to the credit of the Surplus Trust Fund by order of

the Government against the $150,000.00 the expenditure of which was authorized by Section 4 of the Public Service Act 1913. On account of this sum of $150,000 the following was expended, viz:—

Education, Augmentation Grant	$10,000.00
Extension of Telegraph System	59,223.61
General Hospital Improvements	35,999.81
Addition to General Post Office	3,000.00
Pub. Building Grand Falls	12,862.55
Public Building Freshwater	5,010.00
Public Building Bay Roberts	11.00
Public Building Spaniard's Bay	5.00
Total	$126,112.12

"The authority for the expenditure of $150,000 under the 4th section of the Public Service Act does not (although that sum was mentioned) authorize an expenditure larger than the actual surplus. Expenditure on Surplus Trust was therefore stopped as soon as the surplus was definitely known. Unfortunately before it had been ascertained, an over expenditure of $10,633.11 had been incurred."

The surplus for this year against which this vote was taken was $155,-479.01, in other words, there was an over expenditure in September at the time of the Auditor General's Report of $10,633.11. Now what does that mean? It means that this House will have to pass by way of Supplementary Supply all the expenses of the General Election, and that we will have to provide in Supplementary Supply for this $10,633.11 over-expended on the surplus year. What the cost of the election was, of course, we have no means of knowing at the present time, but if we judge by previous experience it ought to be in the neighbourhood of at least $35,000 or $40,000. Well you have there Sir, a need for Supplementary Supply this year for two items alone amounting to $50,000—which Supplementary Supply should not have been rendered necessary as the necessity of voting this amount was pointed out in the House in Committee of Supply last year. But we were ignored. Now there is another matter in connection with the estimates upon which I should like to say a word or two and that is the use that has been made of the Audit Act. The entire intention of Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act has been abused. The intention of that Section of the Audit Act was for unforeseen emergencies and any cheques that are paid for overdrawn balances of any Department are improperly paid. There is no authority until you come and get authority from the Legislature for payment. The Auditor General, I notice by his report, has been covering items such as overdrawn departmental accounts by cheques drawn under Section 33 of the Audit Act. Now section 33 of the Audit Act provides: "If when the Legislature is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or public building, which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen and provided for by the Legislature is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then upon the certificate of the Minister of Finance and Customs that there is no Legislative provision and of the Minister having charge

of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared to be signed by the Governor for the issue of the amount estimated to be required, which shall be placed by the Minister of Finance and Customs to a special account against which cheques may issue from time to time in the usual form as they are required."

Now what has been done during recent years. Take the Department of Public Charities. A special grant of $15,000 is provided over and above the amount allocated by the Legislature, not because any special necessity has arisen, not because the Governor in Council when he made this allocation could point out the need for a certain expenditure the amount of which was ascertained or ascertainable, but a general authority up to $15,000 is drawn and that is in addition to the amount voted in Supply by the House. As a matter of fact, in that particular department the authority to overdraw was not fully availed of in the year under reference. Some $7,000 of that grant was a dropped balance. Take the vote for General Contingencies. The same thing happened here. The General Contingencies account was found to be overdrawn and an amount practically equal to the whole vote was covered by a Special Warrant under Section 33 (b) and new life was given to the grant for General Contingencies. This is entirely beyond the authority and intention of the Audit Act If it is the intention of the Government to make overdrafts of this kind notwithstanding the Audit Act why let them amend the Audit Act to enable them to do so.

Each particular department and their respective votes will come up for consideration later on. I do not intend to deal with them at the present time. I should have liked to have had the Report of the Auditor General on the accounts outside of the ordinary appropriations, but I shall take another opportunity after having seen that report, to deal with the matters to which it refers.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, just one or two words in reply. It has been remarked by the hon. member that the estimates as brought down to the House have not received sufficient attention. I have had a seat in this House for over twenty years and every year that I have had a seat here I have heard that same remark. How can one prepare the estimates and bring them down perfect. We bring them down to have them criticised by the House. This is the place to correct the Estimates, in Committee nobody believes that they are absolutely correct when brought down here. They are brought down here for discussion and for corrections to be made by the vote of this House. He also referred to the practice of bringing down additional Estimates year after year. Various things may happen that will make it necessary to have votes passed before the House closes. That has happened every year since we have had responsible government. We have had estimates, additional estimates, Supplementary Supply year after year.

The information asked for, in the Auditor General's Report will be tabled today, and I will give every facility to hon. members to discuss the items and criticise everything that

is here. They are here for criticism. We do not expect them to go through the House without criticism. That is what we are here for and that is what we know is going to happen.

Any information that is within my power to give that will help out the discussion of these estimates I shall be only too pleased to give.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman I have just one or two words to say in reply to the matters referred to by the hon. Leader of the opposition. I have no special objection to anything that he has said, and on the whole I think it will be found that his criticism was both reasonable and fair.

But I would like to correct the impression which he conveyed quite unintentionally I feel sure, that anything wrong has been done by the tabling of the statement that was tabled in connection with the increase in the Governor's salary. My hon. friend made it appear that in reading the letter we wished to rely upon it as a justification for the increase. Now, Sir, there was no such intention. But it was the desire of the Governor that that document should be tabled. The salary was raised at the Governor's request after he had made known to the Government the circumstances under which he was living. Sir Ralph Williams, Sir Wm. McGregor, and other governors made no such request. But I have no doubt that had they done so, had they laid the facts before the Government of the day, that government would have felt bound to adhere to the principle that it is not in keeping with the dignity of the Colony that the Governor should not be given a sufficient sum to pay the expense of the office. He is the representative of the king here, and if we want a man to fill this high office as it ought to be filled he should not be left dependent upon the private means which he may or may not have. We were not seeking for a justification. If we had not tabled that letter we would have been in a very anomalous position. We would have been asked for a justification for the increase and in the end we could only have produced that letter. Before we got that letter we had no information. We did not know whether the Governor was losing money or making it until we had the facts.

My hon. friend then went on to point out the position of the police and firemen. Now last year I went to some pains to find out about the vote for police and fire department.

In 1904 there were 78 policemen getting $300 a year. That was the year I went into the department of Justice. I brought the matter before the Government and afterwards before the House and the salaries were increased. If you will notice in 1904 every man in the force was paid $300 without reference to their seniority or service. Whether they had been there 50 years or five minutes. That was absurd, because every idea of service and promotion was lost sight of. After consultation with the chief of police, I recommended a regular scale by which the men's salaries increased automatically as long as they remained in the force up to a certain point. The year that I introduced that, there were 41 constables increased to $456, an increase of 50 per cent. Then 5 at $438; 7 at $419; 13 at

$401; and 9 at $365. These latter had only been in the force a few months. That scheme has worked satisfactorily ever since. The hon. member for Bonavista Mr. Coaker, referred to the matter and said that the outport policemen received pay that only worked out at something like $350 a year. That is not so. No policeman outside of St. John's draws lessthan $440. Then you must take into consideration the perquisites. Their salaries range from $781 to $441 and the greater number are over $500. Then they get uniform, rent, special duties such as quarantine, licenses, services of legal process and other sources of revenue and I feel sure that no man outside of St. John's last year drew on the whole less than $480. Now take St. John's. The smallest amount received last year by any Constable was $418.00. The lowest salary was $365.00. Then there were uniforms,special duties at theatres, rinks, and other places, the service of legal process, and, as I say, the smallest amount received last year was $418.00. A number received $500, a number $455, $460, $550, $557, $600, $628, and so on up to $920. So that the voted salary does not indicate the total amount received by these men. I am not desirous in any way of discounting their value. I should like to see every man in the Police department and in every other department paid a salary to enable him to meet all the demands of the cost of living. But we are up against the same problem all around the Island. Go round the coast and see the number of assistant light keepers and their small pay. The same is true of outport post offices and many other public positions. Some day it may be necessary to take the whole civil service and increase it a certain amount to meet the increased cost of living.

We now come to the Fire Department. Here, however, we meet with a distinction. My hon. friend, Mr. Kent, said that these men are underpaid. I admit that. These men do splendid work and take great risks protecting our lives and property. But it should be remembered that what is here voted is a mere contribution to the City. It is a Municipal Department, and since 1893 we have voted this amount as a contribution to the City of St. John's. In other words, the whole country is being taxed to pay this amount of $12,000 to keep up a department which cost somewhere in the neighborhood of $20,000 or $25,000 to maintain. But as has been pointed out, the Municipal Council contributes also about $12,000. Our contribution is a gift from the general revenue to the city of St. John's. The proper place, therefore, for these men to look for their increase of salaries is from the Municipal Government, and the Municipal Council should pay it, and they should pay something more than they are paying to-day. As to the actual salaries themselves, no man last year with salary, extra pay, and allowance had less than $516.00; some had $575 and $600. These were the officers. Then those that did not live outside had free quarters. So that explains what appears to be a disparity in the vote.

The hon. member then went on to point out that the Deputy Heads of Departments were not fairly paid, and that the salaries they were receiving did not meet exactly the duties performed by them. If he had gone back previous to 1898 he would have found that these gentlemen were then known as first clerks—the first clerk to the Colonial Secretary's Office, and so on. In 1898 when the various departmental Acts were passed, they were all called Deputy Heads with the

exception of the Department of Customs. I think Mr. LeMessurier is still called the Assistant Collector of Customs. In 1898 the Deputy Minister of Justice had a salary of $1200. I think the gentleman appointed to that office surrendered it, and each government has found it very difficult to obtain the services of a competent professional man to discharge the duties of that office for $1200. No man who would value himself at $1200 was a fit one for the office, because the Deputy Head was a man who must be able to perform the duties when the Attorney General is away. The Attorney General is what may be called a parliamentary head of the office. While the Head changes with each administration, the Deputy carries on the work of the office and is the permanent Head. He is supposed to supervise every detail of the administration of the department. But it was found that a competent Deputy Head could not be obtained for $1200. It has been increased from time to time until it now stands at $2,000. If he was in practice to-day I am sure he could make more than that, and he is probably only kept in office at that figure by the considerations of pension and the attractions of a quiet life after the hurly burly and competition of legal life.

Then we have the Department of Finance. The Deputy Head of that Department had the same salary, $1200. I think it was in 1906 or 1907 that the late administration increased it to $1500. And in addition to that Mr. Keating gets, I think, $100 for keeping the accounts of the Internal Economy Commission—in other words, he gets $1600.

We now come to the Department of Agriculture and Mines. That was originally $1200, and it remains so today. The reason is, as has been suggested by the hon. leader of the opposition, that there are perquisites in that office. All during the building of the road from St. John's to Port aux Basques Mr. Long received certain payments in connection with arbitrations. It is important when it comes to arbitrations such as these, that someone should be attached to the board with a knowledge of the question, and with full knowledge of plans, maps and records. Mr. Turner continued at that work, and I think his payments in this connection brought his salary up to that of other departments.

As to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Goodridge gets, I think, $1500 and an additional $200 for keeping the accounts of the Naval Reserve, and I think another $100 from another source.

It will be seen from this that the salaries were originally fixed in 1898 at $1200. But as the years went by each successive administration has realized that they cannot go on on the same basis as they were originally fixed. I know something about it. I was in one myself for six or seven years, and I have a knowledge of all departments, and I know there are some who come down to work not much before 11 o'clock and go to lunch at 1; return at 3, and leave for good at 4. In others they are there until seven every night. In the Colonial Secretary's Office the Deputy Head, Mr. Mews, is there every night until 7 o'clock. Colonial Secretaries may come and Colonial Secretaries may go, but he goes on forever. These Deputies are the permanent Heads, the permanent administration. Mr. Mews conducts the business of the whole department. He is a most valuable man, and one on whom one can always rely. He has charge of all the correspondence of the Department. The Government and the chief of the department know what his work is.

You cannot very well put all these Deputies at the same salary, because the positions vary in responsibility and in the amount of work to be done. Then my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, asks how these men whose salaries have been increased have been picked out. Well, all I can say is that as far as the Government is concerned there has been no picking out. If we had our wish there would be no increases at all, but men will apply for increases in the various Departments. I suppose there is hardly a firm on Water St. which does not have, week after week, and month after month, applications from their hands for increases. I don't know a case for the last year where an application for an increase has been turned down by the Government. We have not gone out looking for applications for increases, and if it is desirable, the correspondence in connection with any of these increases can be tabled.

MR. COAKER.—Have all the applications for increases been acceded to?

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER.—Well, as I have said, looking back over the year, I don't know of one application that has been turned down. I think the Receiver General will bear me out in that. Then, again, none of them were picked out. As far as I am concerned (I speak for myself), I have no personal connection with any of the increases. I never suggested to any man to apply for an increase, and never promised my support to one of the applications; and I think that probably the same can be said by every other member of the Government. My learned friend cited the case of Mr. Doyle, the Registrar of Vital Statistics—a most reliable and trustworthy official; a man who gives every satisfaction and has done so for years. He receives $800 a year. That is his voted salary. I think he receives some addition to that. I don't know that he has received it this year, but I know that in the past he has received some slight remuneration from the tuberculosis fund for certain work. But I can assure the hon. member and the House and the Committee that there has been no discrimination whatever. The desire of the Government has been to give increases only where the applications could be justified, because after all any increase that is given is subject to ratification by this House. I think every Government would be delighted if they could remove from themselves the responsibility and trouble and bother of these increases, but some one has to shoulder the responsibility and look into the merits of every application that is made, from the small boy who acts as a letter carrier right up to the Governor. This House could not do it, because it would take us the whole year, and even then we would not have sufficient time to go into every case. As I have said before, there has been no picking out, and we are only doing this year what our predecessors have done for the last fifty years. If you will go through the estimates for the last 25 years you will find that there has never been a year when increases have not been made in exactly the same way as they are being made now; and there have been precisely the same questions and comments when the House met by members of the Opposition, and the same answer given.

My learned friend said that the Estimates have not been carefully prepared. Well, I can tell him that for over a month the various Departments have been figuring on these Estimates with a view to making them as complete and as perfect as it has been possible to do. Over a month ago the Minister asked the heads of each Department and sub-department to prepare them estim-

ates, and every care and every consideration has been given to them. There is not an item in this printed book that has not been gone over by the Government. I don't know of any other way in which they could be prepared more carefully. And here again we are following the same course that has been followed by other Governments. This is exactly what was done by the late administration, under Sir Robert Bond, when he was in charge. My learned friend pointed out to the House as a justification for what he said that for the last four years there has been an increase in expenditure over estimate of:—

1910-11	$ 1,250
1911-12	37,000
1912-13	12,000

and last year $190,000. And next year, he went on to say, you will have a further increase. Well, that has been going on for the last fifty years. It is perfectly impossible for the Minister to come in here and make an estimate to the dollar of what will be required for the coming year. The only things that he can estimate for certain are the salaries, the education vote, the subsidies paid the mail boats, the road vote, and the lighthouse vote; but there are matters happening every day that no living man, unless he were a prophet, could estimate for. There is hardly a day that there is not some unforeseen and extraordinary expenditure. A telegram comes that a crew has been left on the Labrador, and you have got to charter a steamer to bring them home. But. you will say, why not estimate for that? Well, we do pass a vote for it, but it is impossible to name a figure that will cover everything. Last year we paid Job Brothers & Co. I think, $4,000 to send a steamer down to Labrador and bring home one crew. We had to do it. We could not leave that crew down there to starve during the winter. It was a question of saving lives. A few years ago our men had the misfortune to come in from the icefields with smallpox, and it cost the Government something like $15,000. We had to build a hospital for the men. They were put in stores on the Southside, but that might have meant death to half of them; there was no where to put them, and we had to build a hospital. You could not make an estimate for that. And so it goes on year after year, every day bringing something that calls for an expenditure that could not have been estimated for. We have no idea today as to what the coming year is going to bring forth. We can only estimate that which is certain,and then come in next year and ask the Legislature for indemnity for expenditures that could not have been estimated for. Over-expenditure always has been and always will be—you cannot get away from it—but it is no proof that anything is wrong or that things are not being attended to.

Then my learned friend raised a question in relation to the Audit Act, and he claimed that the accounts tabled support the principle that he has laid down that the Audit Act has been violated. Well, all I can tell him is this, that we have done nothing that has not been done since the Audit Act has been in existence. Of course, he may say that that is no justification if other administrations have done wrong that is no reason why you should do wrong. But we don't admit that; we say that the government of the colony cannot be carried on in any other way than that in which past administrations have acted in relation to these matters.If you take the Auditor General's report for the last twelve or fifteen years you will find the very same references to this section; ex-

actly the same correspondence, and exactly the same objections that you will find here today. He may be right enough in his way. No doubt, he is doing his best to carry out the Audit Act according to his interpretation, but, as I have said, cases arise every day which necessitate these expenditures. The amount of expenditure over estimate during the last five years has been greater in proportion than the previous five years, said my hon. friend. I admit that, but I might tell him that that is due to the fact that expenditure is increasing in every Department of the Government, and where we expended $3,000,000 in 1908, we are expending $4,000,000 today. We are collecting $1,000,000 more today than we collected in 1908, and we are expending $1,000,000 more. You ask, where is it going? Well, you have only to compare the estimates of five years ago with those of today to find the answer to that question. We are voting today over $100,000 more for education —a hundred schools at $1,000 a year or 200 at $500 a year. We want more schools and better paid teachers. The children of the country cannot be taught unless the education vote is increased; and that is what we are oing. We are voting $60,000 a year for Old Age Pensions, and $25,000 for the relief of the poor more than we voted five years ago; we are voting $25,000 more for hospitals; and that is another $100,000. That is $200,000 of the million. Then if you go to the Post Office department you will find an increase there of nearly $100,000, due to more outport post offices, increases in the salaries of outport postmasters, fifty more telegraph offices, not one of which is paying; and the same might be said of lighthouses; lighthouses do not pay except indirectly, and the reason why they are kept up is because the people all over the Island need them to safeguard their property and their lives, and their businesses, and the same argument applies to the telegraphs; the people need them. Five years ago when we came in there was not a mile of telegraph wire from Trout River, Bonne Bay, right around to St. Lawrence, a distance of nearly five hundred miles. Today there are four hundred miles of wire and twenty new offices in that section, and the people all along that great stretch of Coast are now in touch with the rest of the Island. Then if you go down to the General Hospital you will find down there a staff of nearly 90 persons from Dr. Keegan down to the lowest person in the institution with near 150 patients. That institution is costing nearly 25 per cent. more than it did five years ago, and it is not large enough today. There are in St. John's now a number of patients from the outports waiting to get into the hospital, and boarding at private houses in the meantime. Then if you go down to the Department of Marine and Fisheries you will find a considerable increase in the expenditure of that Department. Lights and fog alarms have been erected all round the Island, and it costs a good deal to operate them. Then you have a dredge costing something like $25,000 a year to operate. The Labrador coastal service costs another $100,000. Then look at the votes for steam communication. Where formerly you only had one steamer crossing the Straits you have now got two, and where you formerly only wanted $20,000 a year you now want $40,000. Of course, they are a convenience to the whole public—to the trade, and the man who has to buy from the trade, because he can buy cheaper. Then you have got a service on the Labrador. It was only a few years ago since the "Lady Glover" performed the Labrador service; now you have got two first class boats, one of which was put on

last summer for the first time at a cost of $250,000. You have got two steamers crossing the straits, a steamer running from Bay of Islands to Battle Harbour, a second steamer down in Twillingate district, a steamer in Fortune Bay, costing $20,000 a year (which was the very lowest estimate we could get after advertising for months); and so I might go on. Now, you cannot have all this unless you are prepared to pay for it. If the members of the Committee will carefully go through the Estimates, they will see that there is hardly a dollar that can be cut out. I heard the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, the other day make the statement that the public service was underpaid and overmanned. Now, I would like to ask him where he would begin if he wanted tomorrow to reduce the crew? I invite him to name the man in the public service that he thinks ought be dismissed in order to reduce the staff. It is a very easy matter to say that the public service is overmanned and underpaid, but it is quite another matter to begin the reduction. If my hon. friend, the member for Trinity, were in the Government tomorrow, I wonder whether he would begin to reduce the number of Civil servants by dismissing his own friends? Because, after all he would have to be the final judge. It would not be easy to go down to the Custom House, for instance, tomorrow and say to a man who has been there perhaps for ten or fifteen years that he has to get out. Go down to the Hospital and ask Dr. Keegan how many nurses does he not require. He will probably tell you that he needs four or five more; that the nurses down there have more than they can do. Go down to the Custom House and probably Mr. LeMessurier will tell you the same thing. There may be men down there who are idle sometimes, but you have got to have them there when the rush comes. There are people who think that there is no work done in the Custom House. How do they think we got the $4,000,000 that was collected this year? Do they imagine it walked in the door and fell in the safe? There may be no work for a week, and then they may have to work day and night. And it is the same in every other Department.

I think on the whole that we can fairly come to the conclusion that it is not an easy matter to reduce the Civil Service list by dismissing a number of officials. You would soon find in that case that you would be obliged to increase the salaries of the remainder. In 1897 the Government used what was then known as the 'political axe' by chopping off, figuratively speaking, the heads of some of the officials, but the result was that in a very few years afterwards, they were reinstated, and those whose salaries at that time were reduced, were afterwards increased to the former rate. It is very easy for hon. members to advocate reform, but the man who undertakes to perform such a work generally meets the fate of all reformers We claim that under the circumstances we are doing everything in our power to keep down our expenses and not to pay out any more money than is absolutely necessary tc keep up the efficiency of the public service.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: With reference to one or two remarks made by the hon. premier, I wish to make a reply. That hon. gentleman had referred to a civil servant, the Deputy head of a Department who spent about a couple of hours in his office in the morning, and about one hour or two in the afternoon, and that he had not sufficient work to do, when he was there.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I said nothing of the kind. What I did

say was, he went to work about 10.30 and left at 4.30, and that he was able to perform all his duties within that time.

MR. LLOYD—This is an instance where reform is necessary and the hon. Premier had not the courage to undertake the task. However, I must congratulate the Premier and the Minister of Finance on their courage in presenting to this House, Estimates which to some extent took up what was generally left to Supplementary Supply. The Auditor General has been continuously complaining that the Estimates should provide for the actual expenditure, and in the present instance the Government had pluck enough to present increased estimates for the consideration of the Committee Since 1898 the Auditor General has been complaining that this has not been done. We are told that the increases arose from the fact that coal, light, supplies and such like had gone up in price, but I estimate that an increase of at least $48,000 dollars is due to the increases in salaries during the past year. The Minister of Finance has stated that these estimates were of course not finalized, but were brought in for the purpose of being corrected by this House. It is impossible for this House to correct them, nor is it its business to do so. The rules laid down by the House of Commons and other Parliaments are, that no member is entitled to move for an increase of any vote of the Crown. I am not going to take any exception to any of the increases in these estimates, for I consider that public officials are just as much entitled to a living wage as any person in any other walk of life. I am prepared to accept any of the increases which are recommended by the heads of the various departments. I do not believe in underpaying any civil servant. The Hon. Premier had stated that any application for an increase of salary last year had been acceded to. If that is so, I do not envy the hon. member his job for the next six months. I would like to mention that I consider the political heads of the Departments are treated unfairly in the matter of salaries. Take the Colonial Secretary for instance. In 1895 his salary was $2,400, and since that time his salary has been $2,000, although the cost of living has gone up very considerably during the past twenty years. In other words his salary has been reduced by one sixth since 1895, and the cost of living has gone up at least 50 per cent. The head of the office is now paid $2,000, but if his present pay had the same purchasing power as before that date his salary should be something in the neighbourhood of three thousand dollars. The same portion applies to the other heads of departments. I would like to say a word in connection with the permanent heads of the departments some of whom receive supplementary salaries. I think the time has now arrived when supplementary salaries should be done away with, and a straight salary voted with which they shall be content. Why should a man get twelve hundred dollars a year as salary and then receive another two or three hundred dollars for services in connection with his office.

The case of the Deputy Minister of Mines is absolutely objectionable. I do not say he is not worth the money paid for extra services, such as Secretary of the Arbitration, but I do say that a straight salary should be voted for him for which he would be obliged to perform all services in connection with his Department. The Hon. the Prime Minister has stated that expenses very often under the head of unforeseen contingencies arose, such as sending steamers to

Labrador for wrecked crews. We do not take any exception to any extraordinary expenditure in such a case but what we do take exception to is the payment of salaries and increases which are not provided for in the Estimates. I hold in my hand the report of the Auditor General which shows page after page that increases have been made which should have been placed in the Estimates during the last session of the Legislature. These amount to $48,000 a year.

Now Sir, there is no need to go further, I shall have a later opportunity to go into this matter in greater detail. I must however congratulate the Government on having been honest with the country at least to the extent of reducing by nearly $100,000, the sum which is short-voted and has to be made up in supplementary supply.

(A number of votes were read and passed.)

DR. LLOYD.—What is the position in respect to the Judge of the Central District Court?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I may say, Mr. Chairman, that Judge Conroy asked for leave of absence two years ago, and is still on leave. He is now, I believe, at Montreal, and is advised by his physician that it is not safe for him to return to our climate. He has arranged with Mr. Knight, the acting Judge, to perform his duties. It was hoped, up to lately, that his health might improve sufficiently to enable him to return to work.

DR. LLOYD.—That is only an official answer. The post should have been filled.

MR. COAKER.—I consider that this Judgeship should not have been left practically vacant so long. Judge Conroy is so old that it is evidently impossible for him to continue to do the work, and he is only left there for political expediency. Now that the elections are over the Government need have no hesitation in filling the vacancy. Why not give it to our friend Mr. Morris, at once. I would also like to see Mr. Morison given an appointment to the Supreme Court Bench without delay.

I am glad to hear from the Premier that the Police and Firemen are actually getting more than is set down in the Estimates. These men work very hard, and they deserve good pay. The outport police get quite enough, and do very little work, but the city men do hard work and deserve to be well paid. They should get at least $50 a month.

An increase has been made in the Governor's salary, and travelling expenses. I do not dispute the necessity for this, and no doubt he well deserves it. He should not have to spend his own money in keeping up his position when he comes here. But here we are giving him practically $4,000 increase, and that shows that the figures should have been faced before. It is a long time now since that salary was reduced. We don't object to the rise, we don't say he should not get it. But what about all the aged widows in this country who are receiving doles of from $16 to $25 a year? None of them ought to receive less than $30 when they are over 60 years of age. They ought to be attended to at once. Otherwise there will be a feeling of unrest and trouble created all over the country. And look at the pay given to outport officials. (Here the hon. member read a letter from Post Office Keeper at Newman's Cove, asking for more pay,

and a house allowance, and saying he only received $3.75 for 3 months' work.)

I have not yet had a reply to my question asked some time ago about elective Municipal Boards in the outports, and I want to know if the Government intends to continue the practice of letting defeated candidates control the affairs of our Districts. If they do we will not take it easy, we will not put up with it. Besides that, it would be in the Government's interest to let us do the work, because all the responsibility and blame for everything falls upon those who have to distribute the money.

As it is now 6.30, Mr. Chairman, I will stop for the present.

The Chairman of Committees left the chair until 8 p.m.

The Chairman of Committees resumed the Chair at 8 p.m.

MR. COAKER—At the time we adjourned today I was speaking with regard to the resolutions of the F. P.U. asking that the elected members of districts which were represented by the Opposition be given free charge of expenditures in their districts. I wish to emphasize what I said by reading a letter which I have received from Pinchard's Island for it shows very clearly the difficulties which have to be contended with under the present circumstances.

Hon. member reads letter.

This letter supports what has been said by the hon. member for St. Barbe, Mr. Clapp, with regard to the mail carriers in that district, and it shows also how very unsatisfactory to the people of the district the present conditions are. Here is another letter, which I have received from Jamestown.

(Hon. member reads letter).

I read these letters in order to show the Government just how the situation stands among the people in the northern districts, for I think that if the resolutions with regard to elected local boards which have been laid before the Government, were acceded to, we might be able to bring matters into more harmony than exists at present. As it is now, I have all I can do to stop these men from taking the matter into their own hands for they feel very much aggrieved. It is very easy to see what their position is and it does not require any consideration to know that what they ask is fair and reasonable

As I have said before, I have no desire to shoulder the responsibilities of the management of the expenditures and affairs in my district. I would rather not do it, for my opponents would be able to make political capital out of it. If however, the Government does not accede to the wishes of the people, and allows defeated candidates to control the affairs of the district, I shall do all in my power to resist them. My position is that, while I would like to be relieved of the responsibility, I am anxious to do what I was elected to do and what my constituents wish me to do. The people of the northern districts want fair play in this matter, and I cannot see any possible reason why the Government should not accede to their request.

With reference to sub-collectors, the Rt. Hon .Prime Minister has stated that it would be impossible to know where to start if there were any reform made in the present system. Now, the first place I would advise a reform to be made is Botwood,

where there is a magistrate with a salary of $500, and one or two sub-collectors or customs officials. The magistrate there has no hing at all to do and, if the Union had control of public affairs we should certainly make the magistrate's office and the customs au'hority one office. There is nothing for the magistrate to do now but to draw his salary and have a jolly time and the people in the dis rict are disgusted when they see a place like that with two or more Government offiicals when there is not work enough for one.

There is a grant for a sub-collector at Exploits amoun ing to $400, but there is not five hours work in twelve months for a sub collector at that place. The man there would not earn $100 in five years in any other position, but not only did the Government put him there bu they took the office of post master from Mr. Winsor and handed it over to the sub-collector. One official, an operator at Exploits, could do all the work of these offices at a salary of $400. The office of sub-collector could be done away with and this would save the colony $500. I could say more on this ma ter, but I know that my hon. friend Mr. Jennings, can give the Committee much information as to the duties which the sub-collector at Explo'ts has to do.

At Fogo there are a lot of public offic'als and they have so little to do that one keeps interfering with the other. They never seem satisfied except when they are making trouble. There was a time when the magis. trate and sub-collector were one offic- ial and the salary was quite suffic- ient for the work that was done. Nobody had any objection to make to the way in which the work was done then but for political reasons the Government put back the man who held the position as sub-collector there. Perhaps to some extent they were justified for the people had no obligation and when they do not object, nobody else should interfere. However the work can be done by one man and the Government can save $1000 at Fogo alone. I know very well that if the F.P.U. had control $1000 would be saved there and I know that the Councils were very definite in their demands for a thorough reform of the public service at Fogo.

We next come to Gambo where the sub collector receives $550 as a salary. What is there to justify that expenditure? I have had communications from the people there asking that the office be given to a doctor, for a large section of the people there are entirely without any medical attendance. They thought they could raise some money if the doctor were made sub collector and it would also mean the saving of about $400 for the colony. I told the people that it was a matter for the Government to take up and that it would be of no use for me to do any th'ng unless the Government acted upon the suggestion. I do not know who is drawing the salary but I do think that if the suggestion of the people is acted upon and the office is given to a doctor as is done in several places on the West Coast the Government will be taking a wise step.

I notice that the salary of the sub collector at Greenspond is going to be raised from $300 to $500. I should like to know the reason of this. I

presume the reason is that the holder of the position is a cousin of Mr. Blandford the defeated member. He has been there four years at a salary of $300 and perquisites, which amount to about twenty per cent. of the imports, and I do not see why there should be an increase of $200 given to him. The increase will create a great deal of dissatisfaction in the district, for the man in question is very unpopular, not even the friends of the Government there will uphold them in this action. The magistrate there has not much to do and he could do the work of the sub collector for $100 whereas the present holder will receive $500.

I was once in a public position at Port Blandford and before I went there there were three officials drawing salaries. I did the work that these three men had done and I received $500 and $100 for perquisites. Still I did not have to do more than fifteen minutes work a day. I remained there eighteen months and if I had remained there longer I would have been a ruined man. It was all I could do to keep myself from falling asleep. If I did not leave the place and go to work on a farm I knew I would become useless so, when an opportunity came in 1904, and a friend of mine went to Green Bay to oppose Sir Robert Bond. I left my position and went down to Green Bay and worked for him. That man for whom I then worked was the man I ousted from Bonavista last fall, Mr. Morison.

We come next to King's Cove where we find a sub collector in receipt of a salary of $230, but there is nothing there for him to do. You could give some official already there $50 a year and he would be able to do all the work of the position. At one time King's Cove was an important place but the sub collector has nothing to do there now and his position could be given to the operator. I know several people who would be glad to do the work of the office for the figure that I have named. In speaking of this office. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that there is a sub-collector at Salvage who receives only $15.00 for his services, for there is very little work to be done there. The point I wish to make is that if the work can be done at Salvage for only $15.00 there can be no reason why more than $50.00 should be paid the official at King's Cove. I do not mean that a man should be sent there to do the work at that figure, but somebody there could do it.

I notice also that Moreton's Harbour has been made a port of entry but I submit that there is no need of a sub-collector at that place, for there is very little to do there. The same applies to this place as to the others I have named and a capable man could be had to do the work for $40 or $50.00 whereas you are going to pay $300.00. My hon. friend, Mr. Jennings, belongs there and I feel sure he could perform the work in a most satisfactory manner for that figure.

We next come to Tilt Cove, where there is a grant of $400.00 to the sub-collector there. I have nothing to say, against the official there, Mr. Cunningham, who is a very efficient man and able to occupy any office in the public service, but he cannot possibly earn his salary there, for Tilt Cove is not what it was, and its work is a thing of the past. What the Government should do is to put Mr. Cunningham somewhere where his ser-

vices can be availed of with advantage. It is a pity that such an efficient man should be wasted there.

In Trinity the sub-collector receives $400, but there is no need for a sub-collector there. There is a magistrate there and he can do the work. If he is not getting enough you can add another $50.00 to his salary and it will be sufficient for the work. A few years ago the man who was sub-collector was pensioned and a man named Jenkins was appointed in his place. Jenkins was exceedingly unpopular with the people, who petitioned to have him dismissed. The Government soon found out how matters were and they removed Jenkins to Bonne Bay and put a Mr. White at Trinity. He has so little to do there that he spends a lot of his time writing editorial notes for the "Enterprise." He is not any the worse for that, but when he holds the office of sub-collector at Trinity he should confine himself to his work. If not, let him get out of the public service like I did and start a paper of his own.

The Government officials in St. John's have all they can do to live on their salaries, and I have considerable sympathy for some of these officials. But, I have often seen some of them parading Water Street at 3 and 3.30 p.m. dressed off. There are too many of them in the Custom House. It is true that a large number are needed during a busy period. Everywhere I went I heard complaints about the wonderful number of officials in the Custom House at St. John's. We object to paying these men their salaries for walking around the streets. We want you to turn out two of every three officials. I would far rather see two doing the work of three, and getting decent salaries. You would very likely get good service. Many a time have I seen a public official in this House at 4 o'clock. They cannot be so very busy. I would very much like to see the Minister of Finance and Customs giving a small amount—say $50,000 to encourage the fishermen in getting Motor Boats. We would be very pleased and would say that the Minister is trying to benefit the fishermen. If the Minister is good, we may get something. We hope that, if there is nothing now, we will get something in the future. I hope that next year he will give us $50.000 for this purpose; for we intend to have the Motor Boats, if we get on the other side of the House. I would like to see an amount in the estimates put aside for this worthy object. No money could be spent in a better way. I would also like to see a grant for the upkeep of Night Schools. We will not wait for another 12 months before something is done in connection with this matter. If the Government takes 18 months to bring in a measure, they would just be getting into working order, when the new elections would be near. We will all help you, if you introduce this system. I would like to see something in the way of a vote for the construction of a Harbor of refuge along the Strait Shore. There are 60 miles of very desperate shore and there is no harbor near. Some years ago, a schooner went aground there and the eight lives on board were lost. That was about 4 o'clock in the evening. A storm overtook them two hours before. If a harbor of refuge had been provided, these men would have escaped. $100,000 would provide a first class harbour. Every Northern man would like to see a harbor established on the Strait Shore. Railways they will never obtain. As long as we are fishermen, we must have protection on the water. We

must have a Harbor of Refuge. It will do more good than all the railways that were ever built. I hope that the wishes of the Northern people will be attended to, and that the Government will do something towards providing a Harbor of Refuge on this shore.

There is just one more thing I would like to say, and that is in reply to the member for Bay de Verde.

There is nothing that I have done in my life that I would be ashamed for any man to show up here on the floors of the House. There is no excuse for his using the language that he did use. I am able to take my medicine and I am content to sit down and take what is administered to me. Yet for the sake of the dignity of the House, for the sake of example, we should remember that we are responsible and that we are not free to come in here and indulge in all kinds of language. If I had said anything in my remarks that would call for such conduct, I would not have said very much; I would not have thought very much about it. The trouble about this is that he is a responsible Minister of the Crown and a responsible member of the Government. He should remember that the dignity of the Government is in his hands; he should remember that supporters of the Government are looking to the Government and to responsible men in the Government to do what is right in our discussions. I thought how pained the Premier must have been to hear one of his colleagues doing and saying as he said on Wednesday night. Such a thing does not add to the prestige of the Government.

I say that the Premier is to be pitied for his relations with some of the men in the Government. There has been tirade after tirade thrown across the floors of the House. The people will begin to think that all the rumors are not without foundation, if the Premier can allow such proceedings to continue in this House. If he does he must count the cost. When the Premier is called upon to punish for misconduct, he will find that this side of the House will uphold him in his action. He will be upheld in keeping his men in their places and making them understand that they are responsible to the country. If the Premier thinks there is no necessity of chastising what has been taking place on that side of the House, I don't think that he is the man I thought he was.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, as regards the vote for Magistrates, I would like again to refer to a matter to which I referred before. It is in reference to the administration of Justice generally, to the unsatisfactory state of jurisdiction of the Magistrates. I mean as regards the territorial jurisdiction. We have here no system of jurisdiction at all. It has often been discussed, and the former Minister of Justice on two occasions told us here in the House that the matter was receiving the consideration of the Government; and he hoped that some plan would be produced whereby consistency would be obtained in this matter. At present a Magistrate is appointed for a particular place. There is no territorial limits to his jurisdiction. That means that a Magistrate at La Scie or a Magistrate at Bonne Bay can issue a summons and bring a man from Placentia to answer to the summons. Take some of our Acts that are at present on the Statute Book. In many cases they appear to contemplate a territorial jurisdiction of Magistrates, whereas in fact there is none. Many of our Acts appear to be based on the assumption that there had been some defining of the district of a Magistrate. We ought to have judicial districts just as we

have electoral districts, and as they have them in other countries. This is one of the matters that ought to be taken up, before any consolidation of the laws takes place. Our laws are in a very unsatisfactory condition. The Premier stated that he would have the matter of a Consolidation of our Statutes taken up shortly. If amendments are going to be made this matter of judicial districts ought to be dealt with. I again call the attention of the Government to this state of affairs, and I hope that the matter will receive attention before the Statutes are Consolidated.

RT. HON. THE PREMIER—There is a great deal in what the Leader of the Opposition has said, though I don't know whether any practical inconvenience has arisen out of the fact that a Magistrate's jurisdiction is not defined. A Magistrate now is appointed and in his commission he is merely appointed for Bonne Bay or whatever the place may be. His jurisdiction is limited in that way only. The Sheriffs have territorial jurisdiction, and so have the district courts but these are the only two. All the Magistrates are Justices of the Peace and in this way the question of jurisdiction is often got over. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that something should be done, when we are considering this matter. I remember these matters coming up before and I understood that they were being considered. I shall take the question up with the Department of Justice and shall have a little map made out showing the various Magistrates' jurisdictions. I may say that this is a matter with which it is our intention to deal.

MR. CLAPP—I beg to ask the Premier whether any steps have been taken to appoint a Magistrate at Bonne Bay.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. gentleman, I wish to say that the matter is being dealt with.

MR. HALFYARD,—Mr. Chairman. might I ask who is the Magiscrate at Grand Falls.

RT. HON. THE PREMIER—In October last Mr. Fitzgerald resigned—None has been appointed since.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the item "Compensation for deceased constables" what compensation is paid to these Constables?

RT. HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman,that depends upon their rating. It depends upon the length of service.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman. In 1904 think the compensation paid was for four years $200, five years $250, six $300, seven $350, eight $400 and so on. I suppose there has been no change since that time.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman before this vote goes through I think we should understand the exact position with regard to the fire department. It is common knowledge that the Municipal Council recently refused to consider the application for an increase of salary from the members of the fire department. In fact the Mayor refused to allow the motion to be considered in the Council alleging that it was none of their business. Now we have the remarkable feature this afternoon of the Premier practically saying the same thing about the Government. It is none of their business. Then where are the firemen to look. The Premier said that this vote is a mere contribution and that the real responsibility rested with the Municipal Council. Now the Municipal Council says the responsibility is not theirs. I may say that I am more inclined to agree with the Municipal Council. At all events, I put the suggestion to the Premier that he ought to explain the position more

fully and point out the authority for his statement this afternoon, because we have before us now these salaries voted by this House. The Head of the Police is the head of the Fire Department and the whole control as far as we know is in the officers appointed by the Government. Is the money contributed by the Municipal Council or by the Government to the Council.

RT. HON. THE PREMIER—They contribute $4,000 to the Government.

MR. LLOYD—Then that settles the question. The contribution comes from the Municipal Council. It comes from them to the authority that is responsible. The authority that makes the appointment and dismissals. So that it is a matter for this House to deal with. I do not mean that it is the province of the Government to see that the Municipal Council makes an additional contribution. But to my mind the authority that has the say as to what salaries shall be paid is the Government. The whole control is in their hands and they should say what salaries are to be paid. If I understand the Prime Minister correctly, he said that the responsibility is not the Government's but the Municipality's.

RT. HON. THE PREMIER—No, I did not say that.

MR. LLOYD—Well anyway it was said in such a way as to give that impression. The consequence is that the firemen are falling between two stools. I should like to have the matter cleared up.

RT. HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is perfectly right in asking for a full statement and I shall be only too delighted to give every possible information in relation to the Council and the firemen and the government in their joint responsibility for the payment of these men. The history of the whole question goes back to 1892 after the great fire. There was no Fire Department then, and those who represented St. John's brought the matter before the Government of the day,which was then led by Sir Wm. Whiteway and we put the position to the Government in this way. St. John's has been destroyed. The amount lost aggregated $12,000,000 and the insurance was $6,000,000. There was consequently a dead loss of $6,000,000. A great deal of that property would be renewed by importations and the revenue would benefit to that extent by the duties collected on goods imported to repair the loss. This would justify their doing something for the city. So they gave an annual grant to the Fire department. We asked for a reasonable amount of about $10,000 or $12,000 and the Municipal Council of the day were prepared to contribute also. I think before this regular department was inaugurated the fire protection used to cost between $8,000 and $10,000. It was proposed that something larger and better should be established and the Government of the day undertook to build three halls at the cost of the general revenue and to equip them from the same source, and they then undertook to pay an annual sum toward the upkeep of the department. Since 1892 the Municipal Council have been contributing towards that department. I think they pay over $12,000 or $14.000 to the Treasury and we vote the whole sum This matter of increases has come up before the House before this and the invariable reply has been that it is a matter for the city authorities. If any good and sufficient reasons exist, why the general government should further contribute to the upkeep of this department, then they have never been put forward before as far as I know. As a matter of fact small increases take place every year, the votes for machinery, fuel etc. For instance we are now voting an in-

crease of $1000 under the head of supplies. That is a very small increase and I have no doubt the House will not question it. But when it comes to larger increases such as increases of salaries, then it is a question largely for the Council, because after all this is a municipal department altho' controlled by the Government. That is the justification for the government contributing one half the cost of the department. If the members on the other side have any reason to show why we should further tax the general revenue for an increase of salaries, I should be glad to hear them so that the matter may be dealt with now.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I think it is a most regrettable state of affairs that men who are so deserving should fall as it were between two stools There is the City Council on the one hand and the Government on the other. Of course the Government is the authority to which the firemen are entitled to look, and if the representations of the firemen as made to this House are just then it is the duty of the Government to make official representations to the Council with regard to a further contribution. I think that the general revenue should contribute more liberally to the upkeep of this department. Because although it is the property of the citizens of St. John's that they are called upon to protect, the whole colony is affected by this protection. It is the centre of trade, the centre of commerce and the whole colony is interested in seeing that proper protection is given to the city of St. John's. At the same time I think that the city itself ought also contribute something further. Every citizen in St. John's irrespective of political feeling admits that the fire department is underpaid and I think the Prime Minister will admit that they are not receiving the consideration they deserve. At present they go to the Council and by them they are referred to the Government and they are sent back again. They are paid by the Government. They receive their salaries by vote of this House and they are entitled to look to the government for an increase, and the government should make the Council contribute their quota toward the increase.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this question I am an outport man and I represent an outport district and I do not see why the general revenue should contribute more to this department. What the Government contributes now comes out of the general revenue of the country. If the city thinks the firemen underpaid then it is surely their business to pay them properly and not the Government's. The Government built three halls. They then equipped them and since then they have been paying annually $12,000 towards the up keep. I consider that this amount is quite enough for the government to pay, considering that St. John's is only a very small part of the country.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the leader of the Opposition that it is a regrettable condition of affairs that such a deserving and meritorious body of men should as he put it, fall between two stools. I do not think any member of this House will deny that the firemen are deserving of every consideration at the hands of the government and of the Municipal Council. It is a very difficult position for us who represent the city of St. John's to ask this House which represents the rest of the Island to advance the pay of a service that is of a purely municipal character. As the Prime Minister has pointed out after the fire of 1892 the surplus revenue at that time due to the necessity of making

good the losses was the justification for building the fire halls at government expense and of the annual grant towards the upkeep of tbe department. It was contended that were the surplus revenues of that time (which were of course the immediate result of the fire), placed at interest the amount received would have more than compensated the government for their outlay. That is the position relied upon. It has now arrived at a time when the affairs of the Municipal Council should receive attention, and if possible their duties and obligations extended. As it is now it is their peculiar relations with the government that is responsible for the firemen's peculiar position to-day. The time has arrived when the fire department should be placed on a basis where they will know where they are. I contend and I contended when I was a member of the Municipal Council that a joint control of the fire department was not desirable. It should be under the Government, or the Municipal Council. They should be responsible to one or the other. At present considerable friction occurs when a big fire takes place. The firemen blame the Council for want of enough water and the Council blames the firemen. Personally, I think the Council is the proper authority to control that department.

A few nights ago the firebrigades of St. John's were called upon to fight a fire that threatened to wipe out a large section of the city. I refer to the Cochrane Street church fire. Their work that night deserves special mention and it only shows how deserving they are of the consideration of this House. I should like to see the government make an advance out of the revenue of the whole island. On the other hand we have Mr. Moulton here, one of the most liberal minded of men representing an outport district, who objects to any further payment being made by the Government, so that the learned leader of the Opposition will recognize that the position is not without difficulties, and that we have to wave our personal inclinations in favor of those that concern the colony at large.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman,I do not agree with all this talking and doing nothing. Let us do something definite. We talk here about these wonderful men who risk their lives in protecting our property, and the admiration we all have for them. Then let us do something instead of letting it run on for another eighteen months until the Government decides whether they are entitled to it or not. Last year the average payment including perquisites was $500. Who are you going to get in St. John's to do any kind of work for that pay? Why you won't get men to work on the wharves for that, or do any other kind of work. What is the use of all this talking. Do something. Give them an increase of $50, and then we will have done something. I am an outport man and I represent an outport district, but no outport man is going to say that I have done wrong because I backed up the firemen. I am here to fight for the fishermen. I am also here to see that the working man and labouring man are treated fairly. Put $2000 on the vote now, that will be $1000 for the Government to pay and $1000 for the city, and it will give 40 firemen an increase of $50. You have plenty of justification.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Rt. Hon. Premier if the gaoler at Greenspond made application for an increase in salary last year?

RT. HON. THE PREMIER—I am not aware of any application having been made. I will be glad to look into the matter at once.

MR. WINSOR—I am not opposed to advancing salaries, where the advance is needed. For instance, none of us thought that His Excellency the Governor needed an increase, but his letter tabled here to-day shows that he did; and there are, no doubt, a good many cases like his. The Customs official at Greenspond who was receiving $300.00, has got an advance of $200. The gaoler I refer to gets $84 a year. He met with an accident some time ago and lost one of his hands. The position that he holds would be a good one for a man like him if he got a salary which he could live on. Last year he had to try and earn some money by knitting trap twine, which is not a very easy matter with one hand. Now, I think the Government should look into this matter and give this man an advance of at least $50.00. The people of Greenspond would appreciate the action of the Government very much if this were done, and I think it would be money spent in the right direction.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to support my colleague in connection with this matter of increasing the salary of the gaoler at Greenspond. I do hope that the Government will give this matter consideration. I am not well acquainted with the man, but I think he is a man with one arm, having met with a misfortune that cost him the loss of the other, and the Government endeavored to help him out somewhat by giving him this position. Now, if you can give the gaoler at Ferryland $200.00 a year, and the gaoler at Placentia $140.00 a year, I think that you ought give this man, for doing the same work that they do, a little more than $84. Then again this is a deserving case, as my friend Mr. Winsor has pointed out; this man having to try to add to his salary by knitting twine, with one arm and his mouth. I think that the Minister of Finance and Customs is really and sincerely a friend of the fishermen, especially of the men who have met with misfortunes in life such as this man has met with, and I hope that he will see his way clear to have this man's salary advanced to $100 a year, at any rate. That is only an increase of $16. If he will do that, I will pay the additional $40.00 out of my own sessional pay to bring his salary up to that of the gaoler at Placentia.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to the case of the Local Constable at Little Bay. I think that that official is unnecessary at the present time. I am sorry to say that since the mining industries closed up in Little Bay, there are very few families living there, and I don't think they need all the legal machinery they have there at the present time. They have a Magistrate and a regular constable, and now I note that there is an amount of $50.00 voted here for a local constable. I think that that salary should be cut out. There is no necessity whatever for any such official.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, from the remarks made by Mr. Jennings, the hon. member for Twillingate, I think that if his description of things at Little Bay is correct the salary of the Magistrate should be cut out and that of the local constable left in; and that would apply to a great many places in the country at the present time. There are a number of regularly appointed magistrates in the country, now receiving very large salaries—perhaps four or five hundred dollars—who have scarcely anything to do, and local constables could do the work just as well. It is generally understood that a great many of the small outport magistrates try and make cases for them-

selves. They are only too pleased when there are some civil cases brought before them, so that they can send reports to the Department of Justice and give the idea that their presence is greatly needed.

The Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister said that there had been no magistrate at Grand Falls since October and that no appointment has since been made, but I notice that there is a salary of $875.00 voted here for that position. Now, if Grand Falls can do without a Magistrate for three or four months in a year, why cannot they do without one for the balance of the year? If any special emergency arose, it would be very easy to send out a man from St. John's to deal with it, and in that way this money could be saved. And then, I understand, that there is a Magistrate at Botwood, only fifteen or twenty miles away. I think that we might have a revision of salaries, and that thousands of dollars could be saved and the work done just as efficiently as at the present time. I want to say that generally speaking I do not find any fault with the increases in salaries. Every man must have sufficient to live on, and that applies especially to those who live in the city—the firemen and constabulary, those in the Post Office and the Customs, and every other Department of the Civil Service. I believe that the Government with its extraordinary revenues should give these men at least seven or eight hundred dollars a year, or a thousand dollars a year. The lowest salary should not be less than $750.00 in my opinion. Then you would keep men honest. At present we have men brought up before the Courts for dishonesty,whereas it is the powers that be which keep a man in a position where he has thousands of dollars passing through his hands on a starvation salary. It is the first law of nature to protect self; and therefore you must pay the government officials a living wage. If you cannot do it close up the civil service and make a Crown Colony of us and let somebody else do it. We hear a lot of talk about keeping up the dignity and prestige of the Governorship of the colony, when we have thousands of men living on starvation salaries in the Civil Service and out of it.

Now, with regard to postal matters in this country. It is generally agreed that this is one of the most important public services, and yet you have a system which puts a premium on carelessness. You open a post office in somebody's kitchen, and pay the man $10 a year to look after it, with the result that those who want mail come in and assort it themselves. In some cases if you go into a post office and ask for a letter you are told that it is too late, they are all given out. But what can you expect for a salary of $10 a year. I have in mind the post office at Carmanville, the postmaster of which gets $24 a year, and during some months he writes out post office orders for $1000. Two steamers call there; there is no telegraph office so that they don't know just when the steamer will arrive and they sometimes have to wait up all night for her; then they have to open the house to people from adjoining places who wish to connect with the boats; and as I have said the post master gets $24.00 for doing all that work. That is only one example of what is happening all over the country. It is a crying disgrace to the country and to the Government that our mails should be handled in the way they are. I trust the Government will take some notice of what has been pointed out by those who have spoken and those who will speak in connection with the Estimates, and take this matter

into consideration even if they have to overdraw the accounts for next year and to increase the Supplemental Supply.

It has been said by the Premier that every application for an increase of salary during the past year has been acceded to.

RT. HON. THE PREMIER—That is not exactly what I said. I said that I had no recollection of any application having been turned down.

MR. HALFYARD—Well, that is the general opinion just before an election. All you have to do is to ask the Government for anything you want and you get it, and the Premier's statement shows that they are not very far out. I think it is a pernicious practice to be increasing salaries on the eve of a general election. The time to increase salaries is when you come back from the polls, not just before you go to them. I don't object to the increases, because there are just as good men in the civil service as in any other business, and they should be paid, but the increases should not be given just prior to an election.

The Premier pointed out where $300,000 had gone of the increased revenue. He said that $100,000 was added to the education vote. I am very sorry to see that there is no additional vote for education in the Estimates brought down now. That $100,000 is not a flea-bite so far as filling the requirements of education in this country is concerned. It had only meant the opening up of schools in some places where schools were never opened before. It is alright to have schools in sparsely settled localities, so that every child will have a chance of getting the common rudiments of education, but in the larger places the teachers are no better paid now than they were twenty years ago. Take Bonavista and Catalina, the teachers there get the same salaries to-day that they got ten years ago. We want another $100,000, so that the schools which are now in operation will be better equipped. Of course. you will say that you have done more for education than all the other governments that have preceded you. Well, I will give you credit for that, but still only half enough has been done, and money could not be spent in a better way than in educating the people. You should, therefore, try to increase the vote for education, and thereby give the people a better chance of educating themselves than they have now.

It seems to me that this objectionable habit of making false statements during the time when this House is actually in session should at once be discontinued, for it tends to lower, in the minds of the general public, the members of this House who have to hear them. The position of the speakers, who make remarks, similar to those which have lately been heard from the lips of a certain Minister of the Crown, were some of the things told this evening, that I had the misfortune to hear during my recent election. Everyone would hold up their hands in horror that such things should be allowed to continue. It is not a rare thing to find a member with a certain show of frankness, admit that he avails himself of every opportunity to obtain whatever money he can from the Government, and openly and candidly advising his constituents to do likewise. Perhaps he imagines the frank admission of these things excuses them. Committing an offence in the light of day does not palliate it, and this show of bragging candour is a mere insult. The Government it seems have made no effort heretofore to control the language of the newspapers, which is sometimes offensive and untrue. I can only say that I hope I never will be a party to tactics such as these. In Fogo last election it was said that I was a Soc-

ialist; it was even written up under my name when posted up at the Court House: "Halfyard—Socialist." These things are unfair. They poison the minds of the people, and unequalize the positions of the candidates at the onset of the election. Of course in my case, it availed but little; still the time has come now for these things to cease, when the papers are full of catch-cries and untrue statements. The public are tired of it. They want to see it stamped out once and for all. It is time the papers discontinued these tactics, for as long as they do, politics will continue to be a bye-word for disgrace.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, in considering this vote for legislation, I wish to say a few words about the publication of the debates of this House. Under the present system sometimes three and four weeks elapse after the speeches are delivered in this House before they are published. A much better arrangement could be made; if not, it is just as well to do away with the reporters altogether. To-day the Government newspapers are publishing four columns of matter, instead of which four pages should appear in every issue. If the Government newspapers cannot give that space to the publication of debates, the Government should ask for tenders. I have seen speeches published in the month of August which were delivered in the month of March. The work should be divided amongst say two newspapers, one of which should publish a portion of the debates and the other another portion. This would do away with the present day custom of both papers publishing the same matter. We must now be an object of laughter to the outside world, for it is ridiculous to publish debates six months after they have taken place. I trust the Government will take this matter up, and insist upon the papers publishing at least four pages every day, so that all interest in them will not be lost before they appear.

MR. HALFYARD.—I have to draw the attention of the Committee to the report of the speech delivered by the hon. Premier, Jan. 19th, in answer to some remarks made in connection with "The Fisherman's Advocate." I stated on that occasion that I had nothing to do with the 'Advocate,' but in the debates Mr. Coaker's name was substituted for mine. It would be ridiculous to say Mr. Coaker had nothing to do with the Advocate. In another part of the Premier's speech it is made to appear that I stated that the people had intentionally starved the animals given out by the Agricultural Society. I said nothing about animals being starved, and would like to have the matter set right in the official reports. I said nothing about animals being starved in Fogo district.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, as we are considering the vote for Public Charities, I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the case of Mr. Dunphy in the Poor Commissioner's Office. He is one of the oldest of publc servants. His duties are onerous, and as he has to handle something like $200,000 his responsibilities are great. He should be placed in the same position and receive the same salary as first clerks in the other departments of the Public Service.

MR. COAKER.—This summer a man from the Labrador died on one of the islands and a steamer came along and the purser refused to take the body on board. It remained there for several days. These things are not right. There was a great deal of talk at the time about the occurrence. In any case a person has to pay a great deal of money, though in some cases the Government pays it. Why should they charge more for a dead body than for the same quantity of freight? A bundle of fish would

not amount to any more than a dollar, whereas the body of a poor man cannot be brought home without paying $24 or more. It has to be accompanied by some member of the family to look after the remains. I went to some trouble to find out the facts of this matter, and I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should know something about this matter. It would be well to make some grant. It costs $25 or $30 to bring the body home and very often the man has not got the money. There should be some arrangements whereby the purser of a steamer should look after these bodies. Some four years ago, I brought this matter before the Government and it was then arranged by the Government and by the Poor Commissioner that all persons would be brought home at the expense of the Government. I called on the Red Nfld. Co. and found that they charged two first class fares. That is done all over the world. Some railway companies will insist on a person being with the corpse. Some five years ago, I first became aware of this case. A young man once died at Port de Grave and his brother wanted to bring his body home, but he was refused until the money was paid. It required $28.40 or two first class fares to bring that body home. I think that that is too much to pay, as there is not much trouble taken with the body. Often it is placed on the deck and not looked after. I have spoken to some captains about it. These men have tried to look after any corpse coming on board.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, just a word in corroboration of the hon.member's remarks. A few years ago, arrangements were made for the payment of expenses, so that the case referred to was outside of this. The case referred to by Mr. Coaker was the body of a man belonging to Pilley's Island. The body was brought into Conche and the Purser of Reid's boat refused to take it on board, because Pilley's Island was not on his route. That was the reason. I remember the case and I have the greatest sympathy with cases of that kind. The Government is prepared to do everything in their power. The body was brought to Conche but was refused because the steamer was not going to Pilley's Island. In other countries they charge double the ordinary rates for a dead body. In Canada the express rates are double on bodies. We hope that the cases will continue to be very few; but, when they occur, the persons in authority will be instructed to bring them home at the expense of the Government in any case where it is necessary.

MR. ABBOTT.—About three years ago a man was brought home from Salmon Bay and I heard that the relative had to pay $70 to get the corpse home.

MR. COAKER.—I heard of a similar case in the District of Twillingate. As the report reached me, it was as follows:—This man died on the Labrador. He was the skipper of a schooner and instead of being brought directly to his home he was carried to St. John's by the steamer and then brought home. The cost of his carriage was about $50. The impression was that the wishes of the friends of the deceased man were of no account whatever. Whether that is correct or not I am not able to certify.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I don't know the facts of these cases; but, if the hon. member will furnish me with the facts, I will have an enquiry made.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask whether this is a general thing, for the expenses of these men to be paid by the Government wherever they may die. If a man is a Newfoundlander, I think that he should be brought home, in case of

death in Sydney or in other places, as well as on the Labrador.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, in relation to the bringing home of a body; when the person in charge is unable to pay the expenses, the Government will pay the amount, wherever it may be brought from. The reason for this rule applying to Labrador is that generally those who are down on the Labrador have not the means at hand to send the dead home. The mail boat comes along of course; but the pursers on these steamers will not take a body without the money. The Government has therefore made arrangements with these steamers in order to get over the difficulty, that they shall be taken on board and brought home and then paid for. As to the case referred to by the hon. member for Burgeo, where the man has not the means, the Government will on application provide the money to pay the carriage home from Sydney or any other place where he may have been working.

HON. MR. CROSBIE.—Mr. Chairman, I wsh to state an instance that happened in Fortune Bay, a few years ago, when the Government paid for a tug boat to take some men off the Island and bring them to their homes. I have had quite a lot to do with the friends of men who have been killed at Sydney, and the Company was always willing to pay the carriage of the bodies to their homes or pay the expenses of the funeral.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how matters stand in connection with the new Lunatic Asylum.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the position of the new Lunatic Asylum stands thus: Plans were made for a building to be erected near the site of the present building. Plans were prepared for a building to consist of a centre block and on either side a department for the males and for the females, respectively. These were sub-divided into wards for those who were sick—really a hospital—and other portions for violent cases, and so on. The plans were made after careful study and consideration by Sir James Moody and other experts. They appeared expensive and we had them revised; everything that was not absolutely necessary, all expenses that were not really required were eliminated,for the purpose of keeping down the cost. Tenders were then asked for; but the lowest tender was at so large a figure as to make it impossible for the Government to undertake the matter. I don't remember what the lowest tender was, but I shall be glad to table the tenders if desired. I think it was about half a million. That would not include the furnishing and the heating and lighting and the other accessories that were not included. The tender was merely for the building. The Government did not think that they were warranted at present in accepting a tender for the building at such a cost. The plans are still under consideration by the Government Engineer, and it may not be very long before we shall take up the matter again and see what can be done.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I beg to say that I have received an anonymous communication containing a statement that some defalcations have taken place at the Hospital The letter pointed out that beef and poultry had been used by the Doctor and had been charged to the account of the Institution. I think the Government should take the whole House into their confidence as to the matter, before we grant more money for the upkeep of the Hospital. The public should be informed of any wrong-doing, if there is any. I think that something should be done to find out what is going on.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I am taking the Committee into my confidence with all sincerity, when I say that this is the first time that we have heard of it. If there are serious defalcations going on in the Hospital as the hon. member has stated, if certain things have been mis-appropriated by the Doctor in charge, that is the first time the Government has heard of it. Of course the statement is so serious and so important that I shall be glad if the hon. member will give it to me in writing, so that I may forward it to the Doctor and ask for an explanation. I am quite satisfied that he will give an entirely satisfactory explanation of it. I have the fullest confidence in him. In relation to any things taking place, I may say that the Government are not aware of anything of a serious character. There may have been some little differences between the various departmental heads down there. I regard them as trifling matters which have not been of sufficient seriousness to need inquiry, and these have come to the head of the Department, who has righted them. With regard to this present charge, I will make inquiries during the next few days, so that the question may be finally settled. You can readily understand that in an institution like that, where you have a staff of nearly ninety persons, it is almost impossible to define their several duties so that one will not sometimes overlap another. It occurs in every department of life and in every kind of business. People are always rubbing against one another, and, as I have said, little differences have arisen as to the jurisdiction of one over the other. Beyond that the Government have nothing whatever to deal with. The whole staff has been working under Dr. Keegan, since he came back, after being away for nearly a year, has worked as hard as it was possible for him to do to bring that institution up to what it should be. In fact, he has worked as if it were his own personal business, and he has brought it up to the very highest pitch. Visitors who go there and patients who have been down there, all vie with each other in praising the care and attention and skill displayed; and I am sure that we are all delighted that it has been such a success, and it would be a very great pity if anything were to occur to mar the general efficiency of the institution. The statement by the hon. member is the very first that the Government have heard in connection with the matter to which he refers, and if he will let me have the complaint I shall be glad to communicate with the Superintendent and ask him for an explanation.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, I notice there is no vote for Dr. Grant, quarantine officer at Port aux Basques, or [illegible], Outport Health Officer.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—They are both dropped as unnecessary.

On motion the Committee rose, reported that it had passed certain votes, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining orders were deferred.

The Speaker informed the House that His Excellency the Governor would receive the members of the House to-morrow at noon, when the Address in Reply would be presented.

MR. CLAPP gave notice of question.

MR. HALFYARD gave notice of question.

MR. STONE gave notice of question.

MR. ABBOTT gave notice of question.

MR. KENT gave notice of question.

MR. JENNINGS gave notice of question.

MR. HICKMAN gave notice of question.

MR. TARGETT gave notice of question.

...stion the House adjourned until noon to-morrow.

TUESDAY, February 3rd, 1914.

The House met at half-past eleven ...e clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that in accordance with the intimation received, His Excellency the Governor would receive the Address of Thanks at 12 o'clock to-day.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House proceeded to Government ...use, and being returned to the Assembly Room Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency had received the Address of Thanks, and had been pleased to reply thereto as follows:

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

"I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which our present Session was opened.

(Sgd.) W. E. DAVIDSON,
Governor.

February 3rd, 1914."

Mr. Speaker then left the chair un...l ee of the clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair at 3 o'clock.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I beg to lay upon the table of the House the returns asked for by the hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Stone, as to the amounts expended by my department at Fox Hr. and Elliston.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I beg to lay upon the table of the House the reply to the question asked for by the hon. member for Fogo, Mr. Halfyard, as to the officials of my department in Carbonear District. I may say that there is only one such official—the lighthouse keeper on Carbonear Island.

I also beg to table the statement asked for by my hon. friend, Mr. Abbott, as to the moneys allocated to Mr. Laurence Carew of Broad Cove from 1909 to 1913.

QUESTIONS.

MR. CLIFT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing (1) the total amount of Life Insurance in the Colony on 31st December last, giving the total amount held by each company licensed to do Life Insurance business; and (2) the total annual premium income of each of such companies for such insurance.

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

MR. CLAPP asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the amount paid for the conveyance of the ballot boxes by the S.S. Earl of Devon in so doing, and the amount per day paid for said steamer.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to lay on the table of the House the statement asked for.

MR. CLAPP asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary why Stephen Jacobs, mail courier from Westport to Baie Verte, District of St. Barbe, and who has had charge of the winter mails for the past six years, and, I am informed, did the work faithfully, has been superseded? and to lay upon the table of the House all matters appertaining thereto.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In reply to the hon. member I beg to say that Mr. Jacobs was not superseded. Tenders were asked for. His was for $10.00 a trip and George Hierlihy's tender was $7.00. The latter tender was accepted.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Justice to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement showing all personal allowances paid to the Carbonear Magistrate from May, 1909 to date, together with the nature of services rendered for same.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The statement is being prepared.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House the names of all officials in Carbonear District receiving pay from his departmennt on January 1st, 1914, together with the amounts paid annuallly to each.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The information asked for has been tabled. (See above.)

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of the expenditure of all grants, other than local, issued by his department to be expended in Harbor Grace District during the year 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—The statement is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the amount paid Edward Gardner and Edward Cooper for carrying the mail from British Harbor to Ireland's Eye, in the District of Trinity, for the year 1913.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I shall be in a position to table the statement to-morrow.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House the names of all widows and orphans in Bonavista District who receive amounts as poor relief, and what amount is annually given to each.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In reply to the hon. member I wish to lay upon the table the statements for the last quarter of 1913. These are original documents as it would take considerable time to prepare copies. My hon. friend will find the complete list there and if he will multiply the amounts stated by four he will have the totals for the whole year.

MR. ABBOTT.—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of all monies allocated by his department during the years 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913 to Lawrence Carew, Broad Cove, Bonavista Bay.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The statement asked for has been tabled.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary whether any reports have been received from the Government Engineer upon the Newfoundland lines being constructed under the Railway Extension Act, 1910, and amendments thereof, since January, 1912; if so, to lay a copy of each such report upon the table of the House.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In reply to my hon. friend I beg to say that reports have been furnished by the Government Engineer and copies of the same are being made.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the amount paid to W. J. Scott, Magistrate at Twillingate, for travelling expenses and extra services during the years 1911, 1912 and 1913, giving details of such expenses and services.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—This statement will be furnished at the next sitting.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House all Policies of Marine Insurance on the Dredge Priestman, and rates paid since she was purchased; and state if any insurance on the hull was taken over when the purchase was made.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—This statement is being

prepared.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House an itemized statement of all money, local and special, allocated to Blaketown, Trinity Bay, during the years 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I hope to be able to furnish this statement in a few days time.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House (1) the names of all officials in Carbonear District receiving pay from his Department, together with the amounts paid annually; (2) a detailed statement of all incomes and disbursements of the Carbonear Water Co. from 1909 to date, together with a statement showing the surpluses of each year, from 1909 to 1913 inclusive, and if said surpluses were expended, for what purpose were they?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—This statement is being prepared.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain resolutions, which were read a first time, as follows:—

Public Debt, Management and Exchange	$ 12,000.00
Civil Government	235,958.33
Pensions	1,461.00
Administration of Justice.	199,492.73
Legislation	33,780.00
Education	5,300.00
Public Charities	400,274.00

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.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER tabled answers to question asked in relation to the Magistrates at Carbonear and Twillingate.

MR. KENT asked for answers to his questions of the 20th and 23rd January. He was informed that part of these had been tabled. The reply to his question to Rt. Hon. Prime Minister was lengthy, but was being prepared.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. Minister 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.—The next heading in the Estimates deals with Lighthouses, blockhouses, etc., and is under the control of the Marine and Fisheries Department. This and the other departments that follow furnish the House every year with a report of their transactions in addition to the annual statement of account set out in the Public Accounts, and I submit that all these reports should be tabled before the votes are taken up by the Committee.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—The report of my department will be here to-morrow.

MR. KENT.—Since the Committee met last I have had an opportunity to read over the Report of the Auditor General under section 33 (b) of the Audit Act. The report deals with the period between the date of his last report under this section and December 31, 1913. It is an interesting and illuminating report. There are many things in it which call for comment and for the serious consideration of the Legislature. The special authority conferred on the Governor in Council by the section was exercised in February 1913, to relieve the vote for General Contingencies to the extent of $1,500. The vote for General Contingencies has been fixed every year in the ordinary estimates at $10,000. It is never varied in spite of the fact that year after year it is demonstrated that the vote is inadequate for the purpose. It has al-

ways to be augmented at the next session by a Supplementary vote. In 1911 it was supplemented by $25,-426.57; in 1912 by $25,117.90. Last year the vote in supplementary supply for this service was only $5,-000.00, the lowest during the Government's term of office. This apparent shrinkage in the supplementary vote made last session is due to the manner in which the powers of section 33 (b) of the Audit Act, were acted upon to cover expenditures made out of this vote and not to any lessening of the actual expenditure. I referred to this matter last year, when the Committee of Supply was dealing with the vote for $5,000.00 supplementary to General Contingencies. It appears that in February, 1913, the ordinary vote of $10,000 was exhausted, and the Auditor-General refused to issue any further credits on the Bank on this account. The Government, however, to give the vote new life and enable their drafts upon it to continue, invoked the powers given by section 33 (b) of the Act, and ordered a special warrant for $15,-000.00 to relieve the vote of expenditure made against it. The warrant was really supplementary to the ordinary vote of $10,000, making it $25,-000.00, which was further added to in Supplementary Supply last year by the vote of $5,000 I have referred to. This made a total vote of $30,-000 for General Contingencies last year. This whole proceeding was an improper use of the powers given under section 33 (b) of the Act. This section is limited in its operation and the powers of the Governor in Council are strictly defined. The section deals only with expenditures required to meet the case of accidents to public works not forseen or provided for by the Legislature, and the outlay is immediately and urgently required for the public good. The section was never intended for the use to which it has been put by the Government. It should not be resorted to to replace moneys improperly spent or improperly charged to legislative votes, or to augment any of the ordinary appropriation grants. If it is necessary to overdraw any of these votes there is no power in the Government to do so. The proper course is to prepare a special statement of that vote and the expenditures made under it with a memorandum giving the justification and necessity for overdrawing, and to submit them to the House as the grounds for a request for a Supplementary vote. The way in which the General Contingencies vote was dealt with last year was entirely irregular and beyond the scope and intention of the section under which the Government claimed its authority. If the Act is ignored in this way it is utterly useless, and even worse than useless. It would be better to have no Act at all. The Government should observe the provisions of the Act as it is—or if it does not suit their system of financing, it would be better to amend it to meet their requirements.

The next matters to which the Auditor General draws attention in his report are two special warrants dated the 8th July, 1913, and 9th September, 1913, authorizing respectively $29,258.88 by the Customs Department to meet liabilities of the Department for the fiscal year ending June last, and $14,751.44 by the Public Charities Department for the same purpose. It is difficult to justify these warrants under the power conferred by section 33 (b) of the Act; in fact the whole transaction is wrong and ultra vires. These amounts were authorized after the close of the year to meet liabilities that had accrued during the year, and should have been met out of the year's votes. They are really drawn to pay overdrawn accounts, a use which is utterly for-

eign to the powers given the Government, which is, as I have said, confined to cases of accident where the outlay is urgently and immediately required and there are no funds. To use such authority to meet overdrafts on current expenditure after the close of the financial year is a gross abuse of the Act and the authority it confers. The Auditor General sets out the items to cover which this warrant was issued. These items were not of an unforseen nor of an urgent character. They are:—

For salaries in St. John's	$74.50
Contingencies St. John's	2388.91
Outport Supernumeries	1536.55
Boats and Boat hire	92.74
Offices and Office rents	415.31
Commission on Duties	2704.40
Commission on Light Dues ..	401.68
Outport Contingencies	1821.28
Labrador Salaries	138.00
Refunds	5294.38
Coal Duties and Water Rate .	13939.94
Fines and Forfeitures	4.10
Bank Fishermen's Funds	30.00
Revenue Protection	417.09
	$29268.88

All these items should have been foreseen and provided for if not when the ordinary estimates were going through in the session of 1912 at least when Supplementary Supply was asked for in the session of 1913. The warrant to cover the expenditure under the Public Charities Department is also to cover overdrafts on ordinary current expenditure and in no way came under this section of the Act. If I am told that this practice has been adopted for years past I do not regard that as any justification. There is another vote which calls for remark. In July last a special warrant authorized the expenditure of $1,000 for the repair of the main road on the Cape Shore in the District of Placentia. The most remarkable fact about the issue of this warrant is that it was necessary to issue it in the month of July—the first month during which the Legislative grants were available for expenditure under the Act. This warrant was issued because at the time it was issued, in July, "the Legislative Grant for that District in respect of roads was exhausted." It seems strange that these grants should have all been exhausted within a month. The district had its main line, ordinary and special grants, also its proportionate share of the Surplus Trust Fund. These grants were appropriated by the Legislature which did not prorogue until near the end of April, but they did not become available for expenditure until the 1st of July and we find that during the month of July they are all exhausted and the special powers given under Section 33 (b) of the Act had to be resorted to by the Government for the repair of this road. These grants were intended to repair these roads. What became of them during the first month of the year. It is surely a most extraordinary condition of affairs. The same thing happened last year in the District of Ferryland, the Minister of Finance's own district. In July also was a special warrant of $1,800 for repair of roads and bridges in that district. The grants were exhausted during the first month of the year and to effect repairs an additional sum of $1800 had to be provided by the Government.

In the case of the votes for the Game and Inland Fisheries Board the whole expenditure for the year had to be provided under this Section. No provision was made in the Estimates of last year for this service. The service is of course a necessary one and provision ought to have been made for it. The Government intended last year when the House was in session to continue the service and it should have been included in the Estimates. The Auditor General is most emphatic in his condemnation

of this method of using the Audit Act. He says: "This expenditure is irregular," and again: "The Department of Marine and Fisheries was quite aware that this sum would be required if the arrangements of Game and Inland Fisheries Board were carried out.

The report next deals with increases in voted salaries, salaries for new offices and other expenditures not provided for by the Legislature but which were made under order of the Governor in Council on Executive responsibility. This whole subject is irregular. The proper place to vote salaries is right here in this House, through this Committee on Supply. The Act provides that all salaries should be voted by this House and expressly forbids the Governor in Council from paying salaries, from increasing salaries or from paying salaries to new offices, until they come here to this Legislature and get authority to do so. Section 13 of the Audit Act which deals with this subject, says:—

"The Governor in Council may from time to time determine what officers or persons it is necessary to employ in collecting, managing, or accounting for the revenue, and in carrying into effect the laws thereunto relating, or for preventing any violation of such laws; and may assign their names of office, and such salaries or pay for their labour and responsibility in the execution of the duties of their respective offices and employments as to the Governor in Council seems reasonable and necessary, and may appoint the times and manner in which the same shall be paid; but no such officer so appointed shall receive a higher annual salary than is allowed by the Acts of the Legislature for the office to which he is appointed; nor shall any such salaries be paid until voted by the Legislature."

That is the authority of the Governor in Council. He has the power to name the officers and to appoint them and to fix the salaries but he has not the power to pay them until they are submitted to the Legislature and the salaries are voted. That is what the Audit Act provides. If we want to carry out the Audit Act that is what we must do. If we do not intend to do that then we ought to change the Audit Act.. But whatever we make the Act we ought not to override it.

There have been new offices created and increase of salaries to the extent of $48,740. That is certainly an extraordinary abuse of the power of the Governor in Council. It is very difficult to understand the relation of these increases to the Estimates that we have here at the present time. Take the Marine and Fisheries Department. I find that Mr. Goodridge is voted a salary of $1200. That is the same as voted last year. It is the same that has been voted for a number of years in connection with the Deputy Head of that Department. I find in the Auditor General's Report that Mr. Goodridge was given an increase of $200 since last session. Is that a permanent increase or simply a payment that will be dropped next year. If so for what services was it paid?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is an error that will be corrected in the additional estimates.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Harris of the Board of Works is the same.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—That is also a mistake that will be corrected.

MR. KENT.—That brings us back to the discrepancies that appear in the payment of the permanent heads of departments. I do not see why you should make fish of one and flesh of another. They are the permanent

heads of the departments. They are the men responsible for the whole department. As the Prime Minister said: "Heads may come and heads may go but they go on forever." They keep up the continuity of the Department.

Take the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Agriculture and Mines, the Deputy Heads are voted $1200. Now if we want to get good men to act as permanent heads in those offices we must pay them and there must be no discrepancy between the head of one department and the head of another. They are equally responsible. They are generally expert men. They spend a lifetime in the Department. They instruct the Ministers in their duties when first they go there. In fact they are invaluable and you would find it hard to replace a man like Mr. Mews or Mr. Keating if they left the Departments to-morrow.

With regard to the salaries referred to yesterday, those of Mr. Jones and Mr. Grant, these are dropped this year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—That is a mistake that will be rectified in the additional estimates.

MR. KENT.—When I read the Auditor General's Report these things occurred to me and I thought them worth mentioning to the Committee. We ought to recognize that we have an Audit Act. If it meets the purposes of the Colony then we ought to observe its provisions. If it does not then it ought to be amended. But the exercise by the Governor in Council of a power to raise and make alaries is a misconstruction and misapplication of the Act. It gets away entirely from the intention and restrictions placed on the Government by the Legislature 15 or 16 years ago —instructions placed round the handling of public monies. Another matter to which I have referred before is the inauguration of a system that prevails in England and Canada in relation to public accounts. It is, I think the one thing in which we do not follow the Imperial practice and if we had it we would have a better check on public accounts and upon public appropriations and a greater interest would be taken in matters of this kind. If we had in this country a standing public account committee to which the public accounts would be referred it would be a very desirable thing. That committee would sit during the whole session, take evidence of the officials of each department with vouchers and other documents, have witnesses up for examination where necessary and report upon any item of expenditure that they thought worth reporting upon to the House. It would be a great improvement upon the present system of tabling the public accounts as they are now tabled as a whole and the Opposition would not have to go through them in a hurry without a chance to go into necessary details without any explanations or scrutiny whatever. At present it is impossible to examine them. We have large accounts going through en bloc and no chance of checking them. They have such a committee in nearly every other country. They enquire into all kinds of expenditure. They are a check upon the payment of exorbitant and extraordinary amounts. I hope we will have this committee and I will consider it my duty to move in this House at an early date unless the Government is prepared to take the matter up that a standing committee drawn from both sides of the House be appointed to enquire into public accounts. It is one of the greatest means of keeping down expenditure. The public accounts would thus be conscientiously and fairly audited and this in all the circumstances is a most desirable consideration. We are

receiving and paying out some $4,000,000 in a small community and it is very necessary to have this properly checked and economically spent.

Before passing away from the vote on roads and bridges I would like to refer to the vote for St. John's East. I referred to it before when I sat on the other side of the House and I have referred to it two or three times since; that is the need for making the road from St. John's to Outer Cove and the road on Bell Island to Lance Cove, main lines and that a vote under this head be made for these main lines. The road to Lance Cove is the main artery for traffic on the Island and the one from St. John's to Outer Cove is in reality a main line. They ought both be made main lines and a vote passed for them under this head.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr. Chairman, while on the question of main lines, I would like to say a word or two in regard to the main line from Placentia along the Cape Shore to St. Brides. I notice here that there is a vote of $1,000 for this road. I know that road very well. I have travelled over it considerably within the last four or five years, and I may state for the information of the Committee that that $1,000 is totally inadequate to meet the requirements of that road. It is not one quarter enough to keep it in repair. I do not know whether any member of this Committee has travelled over that road, but I know of no main line in Newfoundland that suffers from such disadvantages as that one. For four or five miles from Placentia you meet a succession of the very steepest kind of hills, hills compared with which the Southside is a plain. That is no exaggeration and that continues until you get to St. Brides. There is no harbor from Placentia along the Cape Shore and round Cape St. Mary's until you get to North Harbor in St. Mary's Bay; not one harbor of any size for safe shelter. It is a straight shore right up. It is one of the best fishing grounds in the Island and a great many people reside in the settlements along that shore. But they have no large boats or vessels, as they all fish in dories. So that when they want to go to Placentia or elsewhere, they have to travel this road and it is impossible to keep it in any state of repair for $1,000. For the past five years, I have had immediate supervision of the grants that go out to the Commissioners over that section of the District, and I have travelled over this road once or twice every summer, and know the necessities and requirements of it. I would like the Government or this Committee to increase this vote, because it is impossible to maintain this road on such a small grant. I think my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, referred to a sum of $1,000 by way of emergency grant given for this road. That is quite correct. Two bridges were carried away. One over the Barrachoix River, which bridge is some 300 feet long and if that bridge gives out,and is carried away the whole population of the Cape Shore will be isolated and cut off. The construction of that bridge cost something like $800. It was carried away in the Spring. Such a condition of things should not be allowed to go on, that a road of this importance should be allowed to get in to such a state of disrepair as to be impossible of travel. The rivers of water that flow over these hills carry away everything, and this vote is totally inadequate to repair the ravages caused by floods and freshets. I hope the Committee will consider the matter, and that when the Finance Minister brings down his Estimates next year they will contain a vote of $2,000 instead of $1,000 for this road. The people

who live along this shore are of the finest type of manhood, good fishermen and farmers, and if they only had a good road and transportation facilities they would add fifty per cent. to their earning power by marketing their farming produce. I trust, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that next session when the Estimate for Main Lines are before us, that the Cape Shore Road vote will be not less than $2,000.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, I concur to a great extent in what has been said by the hon. member for Placentia. It brings me back to the observations that I have been making in this House for the past three or four years when this vote comes up. This vote for main line roads and bridges is very important. We have been voting the same amount for the past ten or fifteen years, if not longer, for the upkeep of these roads and bridges, without regard to the extent of the roads, and without regard to the requirements for their upkeep. We make no provision for the upkeep of main lines or other roads that have been constructed since that time. The same vote comes in here year after year, and no provision is made for new roads. The inspector of roads should be sent over every main line, and a detailed report should be furnished to the Minister of Public Works, so that he could inform the House what the extent of the various roads is, what need there is for new roads, and what is the estimate for their upkeep. That would be money well spent, because there is no money that we expend more important than that voted for the upkeep and construction of main lines. It is one of the most important votes, and here we are year after year voting the same sum of money, regardless of the extent of the roads or of the amount that is really required. If a sufficient sum of money is voted for these main lines and the repairs are done efficiently and at the proper season of the year, it will be money well spent. I hope that the Government will take steps in the direction of a reform in this matter at an early date. I know that in the District of Twillingate there are main lines that are not repaired, because the vote is insufficient, and the money expended on these roads is practically lost for this very reason. Mainlines are to my mind one of the most important matters with which we, as a legislature, have to deal. The roads connecting settlements with one another, and which afford people in the settlements means of transacting business with each other, are the mainstay of the business of the outports, and as a House we know nothing about them. The way to get information on these matters and the only way in which the Minister of Public Works can make an intelligent report as to the amount required for their upkeep is by having the Inspector go over these roads and get some information about them.

I did wish, Mr. Chairman, to have an opportunity to make a few observations upon general matters in connection with the Estimates, but up to the present time I have not been able to give the Estimates that consideration I should like to. I should also like to have an opportunity of reading the report of the Auditor General upon section 33 of the Audit Act, which was referred to this afternoon by my learned friend, Mr. Kent, but as you know, Mr. Chairman, that report was only tabled yesterday, and since then I have not had an opportunity of reading it, as it has been in the possession of other members. Mr. Kent's reference to it, however, is sufficient for me to know that it is simply a repetition of the old, old

story of the increasing of salaries and the voting of money by the Governor in Council which are not authorized by this House. The Audit Act is very explicit. It prohibits the Governor in Council from spending any moneys except those voted by this House, and yet, notwithstanding that we find year after year the Government coming down to the House and asking for indemnity for moneys expended without any authority and contrary to the provisions of the Act. I don't mean to say that this is new; that it was never done by any previous administration; but I do say that during the past few years the practice has grown to a very considerable extent—to a much larger extent than ever before. When we find that the sum of $48,740 was expended by the Government in increasing salaries since the last session of the Legislature, I think it is pretty near time for us as a House of Assembly to make up our minds whether the provisions of that Audit Act are to be carried out or not. If they are not to be carried out, then let the Audit Act be wiped off the Statute Book. I know that it is quite useless for attention to be called to this; I suppose it will still go on; but it seems to me that sitting down here and discussing and voting salaries for civil servants is nothing more than a farce, if the day after the House closes the Governor in Council can by mere act increase those salaries. I don't contend for one moment that the increases given these various officials by the Governor in Council are too great. I am not finding fault with the increases themselves; what I do find fault with is the fact that the Governor in Council exceed their authority in granting the increases. I note that the salary of William Cochrane, the messenger of the Supreme Court, is increased from $312 to $374. I think William Cochrane is well deserving of that increase. I don't know of anyone more deserving. He is a very efficient official, and his present salary of $374 is altogether too small for him, but the matter should have been dealt with at the last session of the Legislature and not by the Governor in Council. Edward Collins, a Postmaster was voted a salary of $140.00, he now receives $160. Why was that increase granted without the sanction of this Legislature? Mr. Thompson, Assistant School Inspector, is increased from $700 to $800, and Mr. Lodge, Assistant School Inspector, from $700 to $800. Why could not these increases have been made during the last session of the House instead of waiting until after the House closed and then making an order in Council, contrary to the provisions of the Audit Act? Mr. Eli Whiteway, the hospital clerk has an increase of $120. Now, Mr. Whiteway is a very excellent official and a very necessary official, one to whom the members of this House, I am sure feel very much indebted, because he relieves them of a duty which of late years seems to have devolved upon members of conveying their constituents from trains or steamers to the hospital, when they come here for treatment, and I have no objection whatever to the increase. In connection with Mr. Whiteway's salary I notice that the official report as published in the Daily News states that his salary has been increased from $720 to $840. The Auditor General's report refers to an increase of from $600 to $720. I would like to ask the Minister whether this official's salary is $720 or $840.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—$840.

MR. CLIFT—Well, then, that is a still further increase for Mr. Whiteway. He began with $600, was in-

creased to $720, and now he is receiving $840. Why was that increase not made in the regular way? Why did not the Minister wait until this House was in session and put it in his Estimates instead of violating the provisions of the Audit Act? The Audit Act seems to me to be an Act that nobody can violate except the Government. The laws are there for the guidance of the Government as well as every other individual in the country, but when it comes to the Audit Act and the Government wants to increase a salary, of course the Audit Act must stand aside. The next increase is another typist. The salaries of typists are going up. There are two typists' salaries here—one increased from $300 to $480 and the other from $300 to $400. Now, there must be some explanation for that. First, why were the increases made at all, and secondly why does one typist get a greater increase than another? Mr. Hutchings of the Marine and Fisheries Department is increased from $700 to $900. A very excellent official is Mr. Hutchings, but his salary should have been increased by this Legislature and not by the Governor in Council. There are also a number of increases for lighthouse keepers—one increase of $180, several of $50, and one of $190. A keeper had a salary of $50, and he is increased to $240; another had a salary of $360 and he is increased to $470. Now, there should be some explanation given as to why these increases were made.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I gave you all information.

MR. CLIFT—I don't think you gave us any of the details. But I am not objecting so much to the increases as to the manner in which they were made. I do most strongly object to any increases being made except in the regular way by this House. I might continue naming these increases indefinitely, but I don't wish to weary members. The report is tabled and they can see for themselves. It seems to me that the principle is altogether wrong and contrary to law. If the Government violates the law in this respect how can they expect other people to abide by it. The Government should set a good example by observing the laws. Mr. Chairman, I may avail of a later opportunity to make some further comments upon the Auditor General's report. It has only come into my hands now. I cannot, however, help reiterating what I said when I began to speak, and the reason why I rose was because I feel so strongly upon the matter of our roads. Too much attention cannot be paid to our main line roads. We ought to have some information tabled here every year as to the various main lines of road throughout the country. A sum of money should be voted for their upkeep, and it should be expended at a season of the year when it could be used to best advantage. I would like very much to see something done in this direction.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this matter of roads I would like to say a word in reference to the district of St. Barbe. This district has a coast line of something like 650 miles, and it is the most scattered district, I suppose, in the Island. The grants are allotted to that district per capita, their grant amounting to something like $2,225. Now, that has been going on for years, and I think it is time for the Government to say halt. The Premier himself has been through the district, and he knows the condition of the roads there. It is impossible for the people to construct good roads and keep them in repair with the grant which they have. This district is not like any other district in the Island—it is not

like Harbor Grace, Carbonear, Trinity or Fogo—and it is unjust to the people that they should not have a larger grant. The Northeast coast of this district will probably never see the iron horse running through, and therefore the least we could do for the people would be to give them passable roads. People who have to go through the district, find that they are not able to travel on the roads, and if they go out in the night time without a lantern they are liable to kill themselves. Most of the other districts of the Island have good roads and why not St. Barbe? The Premier in his speech at Bonne Bay said that the district had been sadly neglected. Well, it is time now for us to open our eyes and do something for it. I am of the opinion that if good roads were built in the district of St. Barbe they would advance the interests of the people—I was going to say even more so than a railroad. For instance, if there was a good main road from Bonne Bay to Port Saunders, it would be of immense value to the people around there, but with the small grant which is placed at the disposal of the district it is impossible to construct good roads. I think now that the Government should consider the matter of placing the district of St. Barbe on a footing with other districts. I have brought this matter to the attention of the House time and again, but nothing has been done. Now, let us not look back——let the dead past bury its dead—let us look forward and let us take this opportunity of doing something for that district. I don't say that something has not been done in the past, but I am now referring particularly to the matter of roads. I agree with the member for Placentia that good roads are an essential to every part of the Island, and before we begin to connect the settlements with branch lines of railways we should have good roads, and you will find that they will be a greater help to the people even than the railways. Another matter which I would like to bring before the attention of this House is in relation to post offices. I have been harping upon that since I have been a member of this House, and I was glad when I heard Mr. Coaker and other members behind me refer to the matter. I was also glad when I found that the postmaster at Bonne Bay was receiving $200. It is little enough for him. Now, then, take Flowers Cove. This is a distributing centre for the offices in that neighborhood, and the Postmaster General himself told me that Mrs. Way, the Postmistress, was one of the most efficient officials in the service. In connection with this office there is also a Money Order office. Now, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to help our officials to deal honestly with their fellow men we must put them in such a position that they will be placed above temptation. We have an instance of that in the post office in St. John's, where a man when he entered the service in 1893 received a small wage. He was afterwards transferred to the money order office, where thousands upon thousands of dollars were passing through his hands and he was in receipt of the beggarly salary of $750, after 20 years of service, and that but recently and with a large family and a delicate wife to support. Now, that man may have been tempted to do wrong. Indeed, it has since been alleged that he was. But it is my opinion that a man holding a responsible government position should be given a decent salary. I know a case where the postmistress receives forty dollars a year, and she handles something in the thousands. All over St. Barbe district are Post Offices, some men are

paid as little as ten dollars, often having to provide a room, coal, wood and office necessities.

I would also like to say a few words in reference to the mail-carriers, men undergoing the greatest hardships. They have often to feed a team of dogs for the winter service during the summer months. I already have given notice for certain information as to why certain mail carriers were dismissed. One man in particular carried the mail from Cow Head to Daniel's Harbor for ten years. He was dismissed and a pet of someone who had authority, was given the position. Another case occurred at Griquet, St. Anthony, where the same thing happened, although this man had been authorized by the Postmaster General to continue the work. He for six years had carried the mails to the satisfaction of everyone with whom he came in contact, and I find upon enquiry that he was the father of six children and supported an aged father and mother. He had applied for an increase of three dollars per trip. When the work was pressing he had to procure assistance. The position was given to a man evidently the pet of my political opponent.

During the session of 1909 I asked similar questions concerning the case of a man Raike, who carried the mail from Deer Lake to Bonne Bay. I have it on the authority of the biggest business men of the district that he was a most efficient, capable and industrious man. I would like to ask why he was dismissed. That it was through no fault of his own, I am certain. I asked if any tenders had been received. G. T. Raike applied for the position at $25 and it was given to a man Sheppard at $32.50. It is unfair to turn a man out of office because he voted against the Government. Every man is entitled to a freedom of vote. I do not refer to this particular case, but to the principle of the thing. In this case I do not know whether that man voted for or against me. I fail to comprehend why the defeated candidate of a district should have any control whatever over a district.

Now I would like to turn the attention of the House upon the question of a ferry boat at Woody Point, to Norris Point. It used to be an ordinary row boat. Now it has a motor engine, and it is not, in my opinion, sufficient, for if the weather is at all unpleasant the passengers get wet through and through. What is required is a housed in boat. It is only fair that the people of Bonne Bay should be given a suitable ferry-boat

We now have a very fine steamer on the northwest part of the district taking the place of the Home, and are well satisfied with it. I can only hope that this steamer will be allowed to continue.

Another great necessity is a ferry-boat on St. Margaret's Bay. Missionaries and travellers who now have to go right around the coast would find their journey facilitated by this ferry which would cost not more than about $40 or $50 a year. I trust this will receive the earnest consideration of the Government.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks in connection with roads, and wish to be as brief as possible. I would like to refer to the present system of Road Boards which as every one knows is very unsatisfactory. We need Elective Road Boards and some machinery whereby their election would be convenient and inexpensive. In the northern districts the men take a great deal of interest in their Roads. I would suggest that a Magistrate or Justice of the Peace should be ordered by the Department of Public Works to call a public meeting. Due notice

of the meeting should be given to that official who should preside over the election of 5 or 8 men or whatever the number may be. The people can be assembled, and nominate the men,and the election can take place as is done in our own councils, or by some other simple method. The election should be held every two years. A correct account should be given of all moneys received and also of all money spent over the period of 2 years, and these accounts should be posted up so that every man would be able to see it.

In large matters such as the building of breakwaters, where an expen diture of over $100 would be involved, I agree that the Government engineer should have the supervision of the work. I trust that this vital matter will be taken up this session so that the people will have the power to elect their own road boards. It is to be feared under the present system a great deal of the money is not spent as well as it might be. Twenty dollars would go as far as fifty under the system I have just explained where the elected board would be held responsible for the expenditure; each cent should be accounted for. A great deal of talk is going around town lately as regards the hospital, but not as to the medical part of it, for as far as an outsider can judge things are very satisfactory there from the patient's point of view, the food is good and they are treated as well as possible. Out of 118 operations for appendicitis 117 were successful, a record which cannot be beaten on this side of the Atlantic. I trust this matter will be taken up. A commission of enquiry should be organized with the fullest possible power. The pub lic will be the better for it. Another matter about which I would like to say a few words is the ferry at Goose Bay, a place of some five hundred people scattered around the bay in settlements. This in my opinion is the most beautiful place in the Island,and when its beauties are discovered, the number of tourists will increase tremendously. A ferry costing probably five or six hundred dollars would give all the people there their mails once or twice a day. It could take passengers, and relieve the work of the S. S. "Dundee." I have petitions from that section of the district demanding that this place be made a port of call, but this would not be required if a ferry-boat were given, the ferry would cost say $1000 to build, and five or six hundred a year to maintain. The building would give capable men down there work. As regards the matters mentioned by Mr. Clapp who pointed out that certain efficient men had been ousted from their positions and men recommended by his political opponent have taken their place. The charge against them was not incompetence, but that they supported by their vote a man not on the Government side. The people fail to understand why since they elected Mr. Clapp, Mr. Mott should control the Government positions of the district. This surely demands our attention. I think it would be ridiculous to expect that the three Union representatives from Bonavista district who have been elected by such tremendous majorities, are going to sit idly by and see the affairs of our district administered by Mr. Morison or Mr. Blandford, or Mr. Winsor, the defeated candidates. I certainly do not intend to let these men run affairs in my constituency. The people elected us as their representatives. Give them fair play and give them what they have asked for. The Government ought to be only too pleased to relieve themselves of responsibility in these matters. I know that as long as I have my health and strength there is no possible chance for the

Tory party, or the Liberal party to again win a Union district. We intend to do our duty. So far as I am concerned my connection with public affairs will not alter me. I do not intend to take any public money. The $200 sessional pay that I receive I am going to give away to the poor in my district, and I do not propose to be one cent better off from my connection with the House of Assembly or with public life. I have no desire for money. It is no good to me. If I had $10,000, I would give it away —spend it it motor boats—try and do some good with it. I am one of these peculiar men who do not see the use of money. You may do what you can to accumulate money, but in the long run a time will come when it will be of very little use to you. I am a rich man, although I have not twenty cents to my name. In fact I am as rich as W. D. Reid, who is probably worth twenty millions. I am rich in that I do not want anymore and am content with what I have, whereas he is not content because he wants more. Now as to these poor men that Mr. Clapp has referred to. They cannot get their jobs back now I presume. The other men have them and will hold them unless the Government will come forward between now and next year and say to the members of the district you have charge of your own districts. In that case I have not the slightest doubt that Mr. Clapp will do his best for these poor men. But if the Government does not give the elected members control of their districts what is going to happen? I can tell you that our Councils are very much interested in this matter. They are resolved that unless their elected representatives have charge of thse things they will not allow any public moneys to be expended in their localities. We had our Convention here a little time ago and 160 harbours were represented by 161 delegates, and this matter was discussed. What they want is an elective board in each locality that will have control of all public expenditure in that locality. Usually the money going to the Road Board is well spent and all are satisfied; but they object to special grants being sent to individuals and they also object to defeated candidates having control of these matters, and they do not intend that it shall be allowed to continue. Now this matter of Elective Boards is one of much importance to us; and I hope that the Government will see their way to give us fair treatment and the districts fair play. I hope they will increase their reputation for fairness and wisdom by bringing in a Bill during the session that will provide for these Boards

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, just a word in reply to the honourable member on that point. I should like to say that he mentioned it to me early in the session, and I then said I should give the matter very early attention. My recollection of the position is that the legislation we have at present will probably be sufficient for Boards in most of the settlements. For instance it has been already availed of in Bonavista. I think you have a Board there.

MR. COAKER—Not under the Act.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—At Bell Island they have one. About a year ago we gave the Magistrate instructions to hold a public meeting and he was given full instructions about the manner of conducting the election. They have had one at St. Lawrence for scme time. In fact I do not know that any place asked for a Board where the request has not been acceded to. However, it would be well no doubt to have a uniform law, and it will be considered at a very early date. Now as to the references made

by the hon. member for St. Barbe, Mr. Clapp, in relation to the men removed from offices and positions by the Government on the advice or recommendation of a defeated candidate or other person; I am not aware of any case, and I should be glad if the honourable member will let me have the name of any man in his district that at any time has been dismissed on the recommendation of the defeated candidate, or any recommendation. The cases he has referred to have never come before the Government in any shape or form. I hear them to-night for the first time. I do not know of one case, of one dismissal, in the last five years on the recommendation of any defeated candidate. But of course charges are made, that this is done, and will continue to be made, and have been made the last fifty years.

MR. CLAPP—In the cases I have quoted there is no necessity for any particulars.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I submit that that is not a fair way to make a charge. I merely ask the name, the date and the nature of the dismissal, and I will undertake to prove to the satisfaction of the Committee that the Government never heard of the case. The charge is that the Governor-in-Council has made a dismissal on the recommendation of a defeated candidate.

MR. COAKER—What about the Postmaster General.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—I do not know anything about him. What I am certain of is that the Governor in-Council has made no dismissal during the last five years in the district of St. Barbe on the recommendation or advice, or interference of Mr. Mott or anyone else

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Chairman, This was a case that happened in 1909 or 1910. A new man named Sheppard was appointed. I knew him to be a strong supporter of my opponent. He was given the work of carrying the mail from Deer Lake to Bonne Bay in the place of a man named Raike. This man Raike was an excellent man and an honest man. He had been carrying the mail for years and was getting $25.00 a trip. He was dismissed and Sheppard was appointed and paid $32.50 a trip. That is the position.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, my reply to that is that I hear it to-night for the first time. I am dealing with the charge of the hon. member that this man tendered at $25.00 and the other man who tendered at $32.50 received the contract. I will enquire into the facts and satisfy the Committee that there was some reason for it. It is a matter for the Postal Department, and I shall enquire from that department and get the facts for the Committee.

MR. CLAPP,—Mr. Chairman, If it is a matter for the Post Office, take the case of the man at Griquet—John Peyton. He had been carrying the mail to St. Anthony. He did faithful service, so faithful that the Postmaster General told him to resume his work the next winter and gave him some instructions over his own signature. That man is isolated at Griquet and someone steps in and gets his position.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—There was a tender called for in that case.

MR. CLAPP—There was and another man was given the contract and Peyton thrown overboard. Now if it is a matter for the Department of the Postmaster General to appoint these mailmen, why was this man thrown overboard, and this man Weir, who was working tooth and nail for the defeated candidate, placed over him. I am not standing up to find fault with the Government if they

have been just in their dealings, but I do not call that justice. I do not know if this man ever voted for me, neither do I care, but I know he was a man who honestly performed his work.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman. That is the very point I want to explain. As far as the Governor-in-Council is concerned, they know nothing of the two cases. In the case of John Peyton a tender was called, according to the statement of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. CLAPP—In the case of John Peyton, his appointment was made previous to any tenders being asked for, and he received his instructions from the Postmaster General and assumed he was to go on with his work. The next thing he finds out is that tenders have been called or probably he may never have known about it. He may or he may not; but he assumes that he has the position. Now a man who was active in opposing me in the district is rewarded by being placed over this man; although the Postmaster General, as the Premier says, has the appointing of these officers. Why should a man be dismissed without there was some fault to be found with him. That man kept his dogs thinking he was to carry the mails again; but he was dismissed and the man who was in favour with my opponent was appointed.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I would like to call the honourable member's attention to the information tabled. The Postmaster General. I think in the month of November, instructed Mr. Peyton to take up the mails after the steamer stopped; but he did not say how long to continue carrying the mails. Then there was a tender called for and it was naturally supposed that Mr. Peyton would tender, but there was no tender received from him. There were three I think, and Mr. Weir's was the lowest, and the contract for the year was awarded to him. Mr. Peyton was not dismissed or thrown overboard. He had the same opportunity as anyone else to tender. Suppose a man is carrying the mails for twelve years, it does not follow that others have not the right to tender for a public contract, as well as the man who has it, supposing he has it for fifty years. Other men have the right to tender. He was not dismissed and no injustice was done him.

MR. CLAPP—The Hon. Colonial Secretary is not going to get over me in that way. I tell you here that there was a dismissal. The man had his instructions from the Postmaster General. I read the letter of instructions to this House.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the Hon. Colonial Secretary that a man who has done good work in the public service has no claim on the position he holds. If he has done his work faithfully for twelve years you are taking a serious step in saying he has no claim on the position. There is a great difference in Couriers, and when you get a good honest efficient man you ought to keep him. Last year our Union store posted a letter at Doting Cove, and it only had to go to Wesleyville, twenty-five miles away, but it never reached there. We lost $83.-00 by the mistake of that man. We made our complaints, and it took six months to investigate, and then the Government found that that man was not trustworthy, and that dozens of letters had been robbed on that service. Nothing had been found out before; but because it was our letter that was taken and it contained a large amount,and because we took the matter up with the Postmaster General the whole thing was found out. I think when you have had a man for

12 years, and he has been honest and square you ought to make every possible effort to keep him. Do what you can to keep the men who are doing good work, and do not disturb the service by making appointments for political reason.

I have heard of this man that Mr. Clapp has spoken of. He is a member of the Union and our Council has taken the matter up with the Postmaster General. These small matters go a long way in exciting the people and if Mr. Mott went down there now they would probably pitch him into the sea. I hope that the Colonial Secretary will look into these matters now that they have been drawn to his attention.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman; now that we have come to the votes for Fogo district, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the condition of the roads in that district. It is debarred from the facilities and conveniences of the railway. The Government should consider this and vote a little more money for that district. In some parts of the district when you land and see the condition of the roads you would think the place was deserted for a dozen years. Let me refer to a small place called Island Harbor in Fogo district. The people there are very industrious. They own twelve or fifteen small schooners and prosecute the fishery, chiefly at the headlands, Little Fogo Island and down around Tilton Harbor, and so forth, and yet a stranger visiting this locality would think they had no Government to care for them or to look after their public affairs. These people are within a few miles of Fogo proper, and the telegraph runs within a mile of the locality, but they have no means of communication, and if they want to send a message they have to go to Fogo. It would not mean a heavy expenditure to connect the telegraph system, either by telephone or telegraph. I do not know whether anyone ever interested himself in this locality or not. So far Fogo proper is the only place in the district that has got any conveniences. It has a Magistrate and a Customs Officer and the principal business of the district is carried on there, and any money that is spent is spent there. I am not find fault with spending money there; but these little outlying places, are cut off from all communication and all conveniences of civilization, and are in a bad condition as regards being cared for by the Government of the country. Go down to Tilton and look at the road from there to Joe Batt's Arm. Through the courtesy of a friend I drove over that road last fall with a horse and waggon and at times I was afraid I would never reach Tilton, as I thought the life would be shaken out of me. I cannot understand how the clergymen and doctors manage to get over these roads. This District is neglected in this manner and yet the southern districts are clamouring for the railway, and are not satisfied until they get every convenience. They must have a mail every day and a railway to their back door; and yet the people of Fogo District, who are most industrious and independent are neglected. I do not know whether it is that no one has hitherto drawn the Government's attention to this matter or not. The people have been treated as though they have no vote or voice in the country's affairs.

With regard to their conveniences for getting mails. The 'Sagona' or 'Fogota' calls there weekly. The mail that goes down and connects with the 'Clyde' they do not get. It goes to Fogo. Joe Batt's Arm is only fifteen minutes run from Fogo, but still they do not get the mail. The mail is taken

by the 'Clyde' and taken up to Horwood. I do not believe this matter has been brought before the Government, as I do not think they would tolerate this condition of affairs, and now that I have had an opportunity of bringing these matters to their attention I hope that they will look into them and that greater facilities will be given.

Speaking of ferries, I may say that there is a ferry from Ragged Harbor North, to Ragged Harbor South and a man receives $100 a year to give his whole time to it and to support his family. He was promised a motor engine to be placed in a boat built by himself but in spite of the promise he has received neither the motor nor the increase in the salary. It is disgraceful on the part of the Government to expect a man to serve the public when you do not give him enough to keep himself. This is not the only case, for several men receive only $80 for public services in the district of Fogo and they are expected to give their whole time to the work. The result is that they don't give all their time to the work and the public have to wait for the ferry. This happened to me not long ago when going from Musgrave Harbor to Ladle Cove, for I had to wait two or three hours for the ferry. When the man told me what he was receiving and that he was expected to give all his time to the work, I could not blame him for the delay. The matter of the proper payment of Government officials is an important one and it should be enquired into.

I know that some dismissals have been made by the Government but I cannot see why they were made otherwise than for political reasons. Who could have authorized the dismissals except those in authority or some defeated candidate? One thing is certain, and that is that politics was at the back of it. The Government should not allow dismissals of this kind to be made at the whim of a defeated man; in fact, a candidate, who has been defeated should have nothing whatever to do in the management of the affairs of a district which is represented by opposition members. I would think it a blessing not to have the worry of looking after a district, but when the people of a district have thrown the responsibility of doing so on me, they expect me to have something to do in the matter. I have been elected to represent the people of Fogo and I intend to represent them. It is an easy matter for the Union members to do so, because there are Councils formed throughout the district and grants will be dealt with much more properly and effectively for the benefit of the settlements than they could be by one person. It would be the best thing the Government could do to pass the control of the district matters to us, for these are the very matters that upset Governments. The people of the districts talk very little about railways and the prices of bonds and they do not trouble about these matters. What affects them most is how the local grants are expended, and, if we do not expend the amounts properly, the blame will be on us. If the Government assumes the responsibility the blame will be on them.

It is right that these matters should occupy the attention of the House and unless the Government takes the suggestions of the members of this side of the House, the people will not be satisfied. There are some elected road boards at the present time but, as my hon. friend, Mr. Coaker, has pointed out, the surplus grants do not go to them, but are given to individuals. This is why they are called 'hush' or 'family' grants. Certain families in close touch with the Government re-

ceive thirty or forty dollars and this causes dissatisfaction among the people. If the amount went to the people as a whole, it would be all right, and I contend that every cent should go to the boards. These private grants are nearly all made for political reasons to some men with some Government pull. The Government should have the courage of their convictions and not give these private grants. If they will give grants only to the Boards they will find that they will have the support of the people in their action. Many of these men who are supposed to have influence have very little, for the fishermen are not influenced by half a dozen people as they used to be. Men in the punts have the most influence now, for the fishermen rightly look upon the suggestions of those above them with suspicion, and feel that they are looking for their support in order that they may obtain something for themselves. In the majority of cases where money has gone as a sop to get the votes of certain people, it is money thrown away, for the fishermen have their eyes open. That is where great wrong is done, for thousands of dollars are wasted by grants for individuals and not for the good of the community. The public utilities are not improved in any way by such grants as these, some of which are merely to give a man money to dig a well in his own backyard. Hundreds of instances of this kind can be quoted, and the result is that whereas in former days men did this work for themselves, they now wait for a grant from the Government. You cannot blame the people, but you must blame the bad politics. If a man wanted anything else he would not mind the inconvenience of getting it done, but when he sees others getting grants for private wells and such improvements he naturally looks for the same himself. This state of things has been getting worse and worse, and is a direct result of the bad system of politics that has prevailed in the Colony.

If the Government will take a firm stand in this matter there will not be as many demands for grants of this kind and soon all the grants that will be sought for will be those that are for the general good of the community.

Fogo is a district that is not getting its share of public moneys, when you take into consideration its situation and the fact that it has no railway connection. I have brought to the notice of the Government the fact that the people desire some improvments that are urgently needed, and I trust the demands of the people will be acceded to. I do not state this merely for the sake of talk, for it is a fact that the District has been neglected and I trust the Government will make up for the lack of attention given the District in the past by giving a large grant to the District for ferries, main lines, and local roads.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on the Estimates before the Chair and particularly in relation to the expenditure in the District, which I have the honour to represent. When the Hon. Minister of Finance spoke of main lines, I took a mental survey of the main lines in our District, and I have no hesitation in saying that the need for new roads in the District of Twillingate is very great. One of the chief reasons for this is the fact that people very often leave their old settlements and locate in the extreme parts of the Bay, where they settle down, because of the fact that it is easier to obtain wood and engage in agriculture there. It is needless to say that they feel the need of communicating with the more populated

parts of the Bay and they are always crying out for new roads, which are very necessary to them, as it is almost impossible for them to get along without communication with their neighbours. Particularly is this the case in the mails and freight, both of which they find it very hard to obtain.

I have examined the Estimates as a fisherman, and from the standpoint of a fisherman, and the first thing that impresses me is the fact that the Government requires $100,000 more for the Public Service for the coming year, than it did last year. I come from a class who have been taught to look before they leap and when I buy my winter's supplies, I look at what cash I have to buy them with. In other words, I have to cut my garment according to my cloth. In face of the deficit in the revenue, it appears to me that the Government is cutting a garment which is larger than its cloth. It may be that I have not the experience to look at this matter in the proper way, but that is certainly how it appears to me.

We are told of some increases in the salaries of public officials, but when I consider how poorly some of the outport postmasters and postmistresses are paid, I do not see how I can vote for an increase of salary to those who already have a comfortable living. The question that comes to my mind is whether it is justifiable for the Government to make these increases when they take the other matters into consideration. For instance, I take the interest on the Public Debt from the Estimates, and I find that the civil service costs us $2,717,428 a year, and this amount has to be paid by 240,000 people. This means that every man, woman and child in the Colony will have to pay eleven dollars towards the cost of carrying on the public service of the Colony, not including the interest on the public debt. This to a man with a family of eight or nine means a considerable lot if he makes only about five hundred dollars. When the matter is looked at in this way it will be seen that those who receive very small salaries are hard hit.

The first increase that I notice is that of the Governor. I know it would be tremendous disloyalty on my part to say anything against this, and I do not intend to do so. It is one of those matters that a fisherman cannot understand, but I presume that the social functions and other affairs of that kind bring about this heavy expenditure. I wish we had a great many more people living in the island, for the cost of carrying on the Government in all its departments would come more easily on our shoulders. However, we have to take matters as they are, and if it is necessary to pay these high salaries, I do not see how we can very well get out of it.

I am quite in accord with what has been said from this side of the House concerning the appointment of officials in the outharbors, for I am very sure there can be a great saving in the public expenditure if the whole matter is reconstructed and put on a proper basis. If we go right down to the bottom of the whole matter and work up, we shall find the means to bring about a change.

At Moreton's Harbor, where I live, and which has a population of 1,375 people, there are a magistrate, a sub collector, a tidewaiter, a postal clerk, a jailer, a fire-warden and an operator and assistant. The public service there is over-manned, and there is room for a great saving of public money there. I know one old gentleman in the public service there, who is getting up in years, and cannot do the work. However, he managed to make himself very busy at election

time, for he went around to the old fishermen, and told them that if they did not vote for the People's Party they would lose their Old Age Pension. I mention this particular place but there are many others where the same state of affairs exists, and where money can be saved.

There is a section here that deals with Education, and when that subject comes before us it brings to my mind the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, who spoke of us as illiterates. I go back forty years when I left off going to school, and I can remember very well the conditions that existed then. We had two weeks holidays in twelve months, but under the present system the teachers have their holidays in the summer months, which is the very time that children can get to school in the outports. In the winter months there are weeks at a time, when the children cannot go to school, and since I have been here I have heard that on several days it was impossible for the children to go there. In the summer months the school is closed and there should be some new regulations made in this matter. The teachers have been geting an increase in their salaries and I think that two weeks holidays in the summer should be sufficient. If they want more let them have them in the winter months when the weather conditions often make it impossible for children to attend.

We did not have the same opportunities of learning forty years ago that children have now, and my hon. friend can see why it was that we were illiterates. I am glad to be able to say, however, that many of the children of these illiterates are making a good showing, for they have a chance now that their fathers did not have. I know one boy, a fisherman's son, whose father sacrificed a considerable amount to give him a good education. He came here to college and not a boy came out ahead of him.

That boy got the chance, whereas many of us never did. Still, I have met one school teacher that the hon. gentleman has met, and that teacher's name is Experience.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I have met that teacher years ago.

MR. JENNINGS—I wish I had the hon. gentleman down herring fishing for ten months, at eighteen hours a day. I would like to see him at the end of that time.

That brings me to another matter, but as the hour for adjournment is come, I shall hold it over till we next meet.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the Committee rose.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred, and made some progress and asked leave to sit again. On motion the report was received and adopted.

On motion, the remaining Orders of the Day stood deferred.

It was moved and seconded, that when the House adjourn it adjourn till three of the clock on to-morrow (Wednesday), afternoon.

And the House adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, February 4th, 1914.

The House met at 3 of the clock, pursuant to adjournment.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled the report of the Postmaster General.

PETITIONS.

MR. M. J. KENNEDY.—I ask leave to present a petition from the District of St. John's West which is signed by some 500 persons. They ask that the Government may grant a small bonus

for clearing land. They are industrious and hard-working. They did not do much at the fishery, and if the Government could grant them a bonus it would be a great help to them. They have good land and a ready market for their produce. I ask that this be referred to the proper department.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to corroborate the remarks of my hon. friend, Mr. Kennedy. These people have made great strides during the past few years and have greaty developed their land. I would like to point out that a bonus for clearing land would be a great assistance to them and to other localities where agricultural development is desirable. Bell Island is a market for them that is growing every year. This part of the country, from an agricultural standpoint, is very valuable. I trust that the Department of Agriculture and Mines will consider that petition.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from St. Jones Within, Trinity District, asking that some roads in that section be finished. I know that the roads of which they speak are in a terrible condition and that they are perfectly justified in making this petition. It is signed by L. Robins and many others and I think the Government should give it their consideration. I recommend this petition to the proper department and I hope that the Government will give it the necessary support.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support that petition.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Heart's Desire in relation to the three mile limit for cutting timber. It is signed by about 120 persons and I hope that the Government will see its way clear to grant their request.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support this petition.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question asked by the hon. member, Mr. Abbott, on Jan. 20th, I beg to table the information. A statement of the Contingency Account for 1912-13 which was asked for is not connected with the Department of Agriculture I have asked the Department of Finance to have it prepared and it will be supplied n a day or two.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House answers to various questions asked for.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister 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. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee begins, I have a few remarks to make concerning things that have been discussed. The claim has been made since this House came into session that the recent election campaign was carried out fairly. I think that in law there is such a thing admitted as a person being an accessory to the fact. I understand that a man who did not actually commit the crime, but who knew the person who committed it and who had any knowledge of what was going to happen is in the eyes of the law considered as guilty as the person who really committed the act. I suppose that I have the privilege of being one of the representatives of a district that has been one of the cleanest districts, politically in the whole Island. As far as I am concerned, I would not go into the House of Assembly, if I could not get there without personal jobbing and offering money. There is one particular occurrence to which I want to refer. I hold a precious document here in my hand. It is dirty from falling in the mud but it is still

dirtier because of what is printed on it. This thing was got up in the night and circulated on the public streets of Twillingate. It contains a libel upon Sir R. Bond and Mr. Clift in connection with their dealings with myself, a libel that was unfair to them and it injured the credit of the people of Twillingate. I got hold of it on the evening of the 29th so that I denied the statement by telegraph and it rebounded onto the heads of those who concocted it. Now I do not say that one of the Government candidates got up that libel. But they were in a position to know that it was got up. There is only one printing office in Twillingate and we know to-day the man that set the type and who got it printed. I have a letter from Mr. Temple. I am not going to read it because it is a private letter but he asks me to believe that he was ignorant of the matter and that it was done without his consent. I wrote and asked him in the interests of fair play and in justice to my two colleagues to publish the letter in the "Sun." He did not do that for reasons best known to himself. Now I am told that it is against the law to issue any printed matter without the name of the office at which it was printed being attached. If that is so I hope the Government will prosecute the man who got it up. That would be the best way to deal with such a matter and would perhaps prove a lesson in the future.

But that is not all. I called at Twillingate to arrange for two friends to act for me on Nomination Day. They promised. Before the time came one of those men was called away. He went to the Magistrate who was acting as Returning Officer and asked him if he could put a man to act in his place. The Magistrate said yes he could. As a matter of fact the old gentleman had acted in the same capacity before. Nomination Day came. Two or three candidates were nominated before me. Then my name came. This old gentleman stood up but the Magistrate objected. He was on the Road Board. He asked why the Magistrate did not tell him that before. Then the next man had been on the Education Board for twenty years. The other man went out and got a man to act in his place. Now Mr. Scott made no objection to the other men. However, my man resigned his office and got over the difficulty that way. Why was my man objected to and the Government men not? However, it did not keep me out of the House of Assembly.

I will now pass to the actual debate on the Estimates and I take the matter of lighthouses. What strikes me is the disparity that exists in the salaries of men doing the same duties and I will draw attention to a few. The first two that strike me are, Fortune Harbor, Twillingate and Little Bay Islands. There is no difference between the duties and if $204 is sufficient pay for Little Bay Islands then $204 is enough for Fortune Harbor, but the man at Fortune Hr. gets $300 Again Peckford Island gets $360 while Penguin Island gets $580. They are both the same kind of light and the same duties attached. There are a few others with which I am not so well acquainted on the West Coast, to which I would like attention to be drawn. Bay Bulls, Ferryland Head and Cape Pine, getting respectively, $526, $600 and $650. There is very little difference in their duties.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—They have to pay their own assistants.

MR. JENNINGS—Does the light of one entail more duties than those of the other?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—They are open for twelve months of the year.

MR. JENNINGS.—That is so as regards Peckford's Island and other

lighthouses. But as far as I understand if it is a reflecting light it requires more attention and an assistant with whom the night is divided into watches.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—For the information of the hon. member I may say that a light keeper is not supposed to turn in when he lights the lamp.

MR. JENNINGS.—I am perfectly aware of that. He is supposed to watch the light all night. But why one should be paid $300 and another $600 or $800 is the point I want explained. I think there is great room for the evening up of those salaries. Those that are paid well are not getting more than they deserve. I know that certain keepers have a way of evening up their salaries to a certain extent but there is no reason for this tremendous difference in the salaries of keepers of similar lights. I am not saying this by way of finding fault. I have two lighthouses in my mind the salaries of which were fixed by the Bond Government. The light at Double Island, Battle Harbor is a fixed light. The lighthouse is closed for four months in the year and the keeper gets $528. At Indian Tickle the same salary is paid. But at Domino and four other points although the same duties have to be performed and the same kind of light the salary is only $360. I should imagine that where the lighthouse is only open eight months that $360 is enough and $528 too much. And it would be a saving to the Revenue if these things were evened up. The last one I would mention is the light at St. Michael's Head. I may be misinformed but I understand it is only a lantern light, lit in the evening and I notice he gets $204. That is overpaid.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—That was so but we have put a different light there. It is all very well to say that men are overpaid but when these men are earning their living at this work they must be paid a living wage. Personally I think them underpaid and would like to be able to pay them more. These men live at their posts and when they are worn out they get pensioned at 2/3 of their salary. I think that for a man to spend the best part of his life at a salary of $240 or $340 and then be laid aside on 2/3 of his salary is not enough to keep him.

MR. JENNINGS.—I quite admit that. But my main argument is that there is too much discrepancy between two salaries of $360 and $520 for men doing the same duties.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—You have already admitted that the present Government did not fix those salaries. I might say that two of my friends keep those lights. Does the hon. member think that I am to begin reduction on my friends first.

MR. JENNINGS.—If you want to get down to rock bottom you have to deal with friends and foes alike.

However, I pass on. There is one other matter in connection with lighthouses which I think very important. Probably members of this House will remember the unfortunate affair of Penguin Island when two men drifted past the island and there was no boat there and the keeper was unable to go to the rescue of those two men.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I might clear up that matter Mr. Chairman. That report whoever started it was wrong. There were two boats on the island belonging to the Department. One belonged to the Government and the other to the keeper. They were seven trap skiffs there also. These boats were on the other side of the island and they or the trap skiffs could have come round and attempted to save the men. I do not think that any blame attached to the light keeper who was an old man,

My own opinion is that no new light-house keeper should be employed over the age of 40 years.

MR. COAKER.—And how long would you keep him there.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I do not think any man hould hold such an important position after sixty years of age. It takes a strong man to go over and round the rocks. I beleve in the men keeping boats and knowing a little about life aving. Men after sixty years of age have not the same nerve to do that work as younger men. But in that accident I do not blame Mr. White. I believe he did his best at the time. But as I say had he been a younger man the accident might not have happened.

MR. JENNINGS.—I am very pleased to hear that it was not due to any carelessness on the part of the Department or the light keeper and possibly the report was incorrect. I was only speaking of what I had heard. I am quite willing to admit that in time of need a younger man would probably be more active, but this matter of boats is one needing consideration. And where there are boats the keepers should see that they are in repair. A boat may get dried up with lying up for the season and it is necessary that certain rules should be observed in regard to these boats. Another thing I notice is that there is no provision of material for preserving life. I do not lay any particular blame to the doors of the present Government on this account. I have seen lighthouses that have been open for thiry years with not an inch of Government rope and no life buoy of any kind. I have seen some rope sent out by the Department for this purpose but it was too large. There should be a quantity of light, strong rope that is used in other places.

Another matter that I would like to call attention to is in reference to the supply of coals. Sometimes the Government gives a contract to supply a station with 10 or 12 tons of coal. There is no chance to check this quantity at these stations. If the keeper is provided with proper measures, I am speaking now from experience, and if these measures were supplied to the various keepers the saving to the Government would be very great.

Another matter that I wish to bring before the House is the expense entailed very frequently by dismissals. A keeper gets word that his services are no longer required. Before he has a chance to get out the new keeper comes and expects the dismissed man to teach him how to run the light. Now the rule which the dismissed man enforces is that no one is allowed in the lamp room except the keeper so he will not allow the new man in until his time is up, so that the new man cannot learn the light. And it often costs the Government dear. I know at Cabot Island it cost the Government $100 before he learnt how to light it. At the station where I was it cost the Government $10 for burners alone. The new man knew nothing about it and the consequence was that new and expensive burners had to be bought. Some thought that I was the cause of it but when I had charge I only had one burner and it lasted for four years and it was just as good when I left as when I first went there. But the new man did not understand his business.

I am not making a bid for myself. I am never going back to a light station unless I am forced to, but I think those things should be taken into consideration. If a man doesn't see anybody for four or five months in a year he cannot do very much in an election campaign.

I will now pass on to the matter of couriers, and I would like to mention two couriers who do not I think receive fair remuneration for their services. Those are the men from Herring Neck to Comfort Cove and from Moreton's Harbor to Comfort Cove. They are now receiving $75 and $68 respectively. I think those men should receive at least $100 each. They have quite a number of hardships to contend with, in fact they sometimes have to risk their lives in the performance of their duties, and they should receive consideration. I believe that the couriers of Twillingate are very well paid as a rule, but these two men are not.

There is another department in the service that, I think, has the same trouble with regard to salaries as the lighthouse department, probably a little more. I refer now to telegraph operators, especially in the outports. Now, I have no particular axe to grind in mentioning any particular stations, and I mention those I am about to refer to simply because i tseems to me hat the differences in salaries are not justified. The first two I have noticed happen to be Fortune Harbor and Three Arms. At those places the operators receive a salary of $240 each, while the operators at a great number of places of equal size or probably larger, only get $120. I think that of the 200 (or a little more) operators in outports, 118 get under the sum of $200. Now, I don't see why a place like Three Arms should get the same salary as Twillingate. I don't know who fixed the salaries, and did not bother myself to find out, but I consider it unfair. I think a readjustment of those salaries would be beneficial o all concerned. It creates dissatisfaction and a certain amount of jealousy when an operator at one place gets $120 and the operator at another place of the same size, gets twice as much.

I will pass on now to another matter that my friend, Mr. Halfyard, termed a pernicious system. Now, that was probably a strong term, but there is one system that I consider pernicious and that is the giving of special grants to private individuals. I don't know who introduced that system, but I suppose it was introduced in the early days and succeeding governments have followed it. To my mind that system is a demoralizing one, and gives more trouble to a Government than any other that I know of. I believe that no grant should be given from the public revenue to anyone except under petition signed by a majority of the people of a settlement. If the majority of the inhabitants of a place will sign a petition stating that certain money are needed, why, of course, they take the responsibility, but when a grant is given to a private individual on his own suggestion you don't know whether the money is needed or not and don't know whether it is properly spent. At the present time we are plying the Government with questions relating to matters of this sort, because the people of our districts have asked us to get the particulars of certain grants which have been sent in this way. One man gets $50, another man $100, and nobody knows what becomes of it, and the people want to get particulars of the returns. Of course the fault is not the fault of the Government, but of the system, and I don't think we could do a better thing than get down and knock that syste mout and have done with it once and for all. I have been very much interested in looking over the particulars given us by the Department of Public Works. I spent part of last night going over them, and almost the first thing I saw was a grant to a man by the name of Jacob Manuel of Cottell's Island of $200. Now, I want to say that there is no man by that name on Cottell's Island,

Notre Dame Bay, and there never was a man by that name there, and the Hon. Minister of Public Works need not be surprised if one of these days he is asked for returns of that $200.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Will you let me have the date of that?

MR. JENNINGS.—Yes, I have not got it now, but I will let you have it. Now, the next thing I take exception to is the fact that two allocations for Bonne Bay have been charged to the Twillingate account.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Chairman, I may say in connection with this matter that I have never had an opportunity of ascertaining what moneys have gone to my district. I have always een refused by the clerks of the Departments, who stated that instructions had been given by the heads of the Departments that no information was to be given to anyone except members of the Government, and I have never been able to ascertain as to how affairs in my district were be ing conducted.

MR. JENNINGS—There is another item that I don't quite understand. I don't want to suggest that this money was not spent properly, I take it that it was an error on the part of the person who entered the matter. The district of Twillingate is charged with an allocation to A. Brett in connection with a railway station at the riverhead of Moreton's Harbour. Now, that is the first intimation I have had that we are going to get the railway, but it seems that a station is being got ready down there. As a railway in that section is, of course, geographically impossible, I presume it is an error on the part of one of the clerks in the Department, but I thought it was too good to pass. Another item that is a mistaken entry, I presume, is an allocation to Rev. R. H. Mercer of Musgrave Harbor of $150. That should be charged to the district of Bonavista, not to Twillingate. There is just one further item that I would like to mention in the latter part of the returns. H. N. Burt, the Stipendiary Magistrate at Botwood, received $60.00 as arbitration award and expenses in connection with some matter down there. Now, I am not acquainted with the particulars of the case, in fact, it is the first I heard of it, but I think that a Magistrate receiving a salary of $500, should have undertaken this work free. By the way, I notice from some of the returns sent in that the worthy Magistrate at Twillingate, W. J. Scott, got the sum of $780 for extra services outside of Twillingate. That is an eye-opener to me. I understand now why that gentleman is so officious going around to different places and hunting up matters—it is because he gets $5 a day for it outside of his fine, fat salary. I think it is right that everybody should know these things. I also notice here an allocation of $30 to a man for repairing the road to his stage. No doubt this money was properly spent, but I am afraid that when this gets around the Minister is going to be flooded with petitions asking for money to make roads to stages and flakes.

Before I sit down I am going to make a suggestion with regard to the expenditure of road money. It might not be a popular one, and it is not likely that it is going to get much consideration, but I will make it all the same. It is this. I understand that the districts near the city are fairly well off as far as roads are concerned, and they also have the use of the railway. The suggestion I am going to make is that the money allocated to them for road purposes should every second year be sent down to the northern districts or to the western districts, where it is so badly needed.

If the people from whom it is taken grumble, as no doubt they will, tell them that they can go down if they wish and work it up. I am quite aware that that would be doing something that has no precedent. However, I think there is room for improvement and reform in the expenditure of our road moneys, and I hope that some of us here in this House will live to see the change.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I may say for the Premier's information that the date of the allocation to Jacob Manuel of Cottrell's Island was October 10th. It was a special grant. Now, in going through the sheets to look up that item I notice an expenditure of $400 for a road at Beaverton. I happen to know a lot about Beaverton, and I believe that if there is any settlement in the country that has had its share of road moneys it is Beaverton. There are 14 voters at Beaverton, and these men must have done pretty well from the money that was given out before the election. I am afraid that if we go through the expenditures for last September and October in Twillingate District we will find that a good many of these grants were issued for political purposes. I am very sorry that the men who had the giving out of those moneys in that district did not exercise more discretion in connection with those large expenditures. There was a large sum of money spent in Twillingate district last fall, and I am afraid that a good deal of that money was spent in order to get votes. I hope now that we are going to have some alteration in the expenditure of public moneys in outports that we won't hear so much about large expenditures just prior to an election. This is only one out of forty that I went through the other night. There was one vote to James Burridge, of Bishop's Cove, worked out by three women—Mrs. Samuel Phillips, 2 days, $2.30; Mrs. Samuel Tucker, 2 days, $2.30, and Rosie Tucker, 4½ days, $4.25. I don't know how the Commissioner would be able to justify this expenditure. I have not the slightest doubt that the explanation is that these ladies owed Burridge an account, and they had to go on the roads and square it up in this way. There was another grant to John Moss of Openhall, for $25.00 to construct a road and bridge. The only item on the return is "$25 spent by John Moss (of George)." There are no further particulars, and we have absolutely no means of knowing whether the money was spent or not. Another grant of $30 was sent to Charles Best of Brookfield. The authority is to spend this money on repairs to roads and bridge at Brookfield. I find from report that this $30 was spent on repairs to his house. It is actually inserted in the returns: Repairs on a house, $30—30 days at $1 a day to this one man Charles Best. Now, these things are too serious to pass over lightly.

I won't take up the time of the Committee by referring to roads, as there are one or two other matters that I want to mention briefly. The first is that for Tuberculosis. I note that the Medical Officer, Dr. Rendell, receives a salary of $2,500 a year. I also understand that he receives a grant of $500 a year for medical attention to the Constabulary. He also receives, so I understand, the sum of $600 to keep a horse. He pointed out he had to have a horse and asked for some recompense towards keeping it, and he received $600.00. In other words, he receives a salary of $3,600—a better salary in every way than the doctor in charge of the hospital. Now, I hope that as the doctor is getting this magnificent salary that he will do some good work towards stamping out Consumption from our midst. I notice by the account that a tremendous

amount of money is expended for medicine. I thought that what was wanted to fight it was good food and fresh air. There is one item here for McMurdo & Co. amounting to $547.03. That would buy quite a lot of drugs, I should imagine. There is also an item here of $3,000 to R. White, being the purchase price of a site for a sanatorium. I understand that this R. White is the Inspector of Lighthouses, and that he has a farm up in Waterford Valley, a portion of which farm he sold for this site. Well, if he has many more applications for sites of this sort, he will be able to afford to let someone else draw the salary of Inspector of Lighthouses. I understand that the whole farm ten years ago was to be sold for $1,000, whereas he has now got $3,000 for a small portion of it. The value of land in Waterford Valley has no doubt increased during the last ten years, but if it increases to the same extent as that during the next ten, I would advise any one who has land there to hold on to it and they will be rich men in the course of time.

Some references have been made to lighthouses. There is quite a lot of dissatisfaction in connection with lighthouses. I do not think that any man in the House can envy the Minister of Marine and Fisheries his position so far as lighthouse crews are concerned, because no doubt he has any amount of applications for increases, and correspondence and complaints in connection with them. The dissatisfaction is caused because of the fact that one man gets $100 more than another man for doing the same work. The man at Twillingate gets $450; the man on Baccalieu North is down for $230 (I think that is a mistake; he gets more than that). Now the man on Baccalieu has a far worse position than the man on Twillingate in many ways. He has got to live on an island and has got to keep a man and go to the mainland for everything he requires. The man at Twillingate has to do none of these things, and yet he gets $450 for work that you ask someone else to do on an island for $230. As long as this condition lasts you will find that the men concerned will be continually kicking until they get what they consider their rights.

Coal is supplied to lighthouses in a very wasteful and extravagant manner. Only a short time ago a man from Bay de Verde informed me that coal was sent down there. There was no one to look after it and in a few days it disappeared Now I very much question whether every bag of coal sold to the Government contained its proper weight of 224 lbs. As everybody knows there are about 10 bags to the ton. Well in many cases the added contents of 10 of these bags would not have amounted to a ton. It is the current belief that goods sold to the Government need not have the strict measurements and straight dealing that would exist in dealings with a private individual. Captains in conveying Government coal from one place to another could in a few trips save a sufficient quantity to last them the winter. I know of one contract to erect a certain building. The builder took his time over it. A man of good authority said to me that he could perform that for about $1400. It was a Government job and the building cost $2,200. Were I on the other side of the House, I wouldn't take 99 cents for any dollar, and fewer people would take that keen interest that so many rich people of Government connection do. Names like Bishop & Sons, The Newfoundland Produce Co., stand out on the list of people who do work for the Government. When the former sent a boat to collect the ballot boxes in St. Barbe district, they evidently did not hurry about it. They received $100 a day

from the Government. They would not have got $550 for that trip from me. The boat itself cost $9,000 the day they bought her. Last year alone she made seven to eight thousand dollars of Government money.

Another matter about which I should like to say a few words is this. In Conception Bay they get their "daily mails" every day and they will also receive them regularly where the train service is settled, in places such as Bonavista. But in Fogo and Twillingate they get it but once a week. In the winter people have plenty of time to read and they look forward to seeing their papers. The Telegram and Herald come regularly but the Advocate comes once in three weeks. Fogo is a well-off place. I received over 100 orders for motor engines from there. They contribute as much as any other place to the public revenue. I agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with regard to the age-limit of lighthouse keepers who live on islands and I hope it will receive the consideration it merits at the hands of the Government. I wonder if the Premier has done anything regarding an enquiry about the Hospital.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I forwarded your letter to the Colonial Secretary. It will take some little time as it will have to undergo the usual formalities.

MR. COAKER.—I do not want to press the Hon. Premier with the matter. I would like a committee, however, to investigate the alleged irregularities. The public are I believe, strongly in favour of an enquiry and report.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The proceedure is this. The hon. member made certain charges, that defalcations had been reported to him. I asked then that the hon. member put this in writing, which he did. Thereupon I forwarded the same to the Colonial Secretary. The matter will be dealt with at the first meeting of the Executive Council. I am as anxious as the hon. member that this enquiry shall take place and I feel sure that Dr. Keegan courts the fullest enquiry.

MR. COAKER.—I am sorry there is no reference to free and compulsory education about which I have received many petitions from the northern districts. I am surprised too to find how this matter fell through when petitions on the subject were presented by Messrs. Blandford, Morison, Squires and those who professed such a strong interest in it when they asked for Government concessions. It seemed to me at the time that those gentlemen were not as sincere as they pretended to be. The F.P.U. were carefully watching at that time because we knew that these men pretended to be in favour of free and compulsory education. This question is becoming more and more acute every year and the time will soon arrive when this benefit will be conferred upon the country. We do not want a system such as is known in connection with public schools in Canada. We want every child to go to school and receive an elementary course of education. One might say that this is but a matter of thirty-five or forty cents a quarter to be paid for a child's schooling, but in many cases fishermen with large families after a poor summer at the fishery cannot afford to pay even that small amount for each child. I say let us have free and compulsory elementary education for it will have to be taken up some day and it is going to be a live issue in the near future. We want every child to go to school seven months of the year, say, from November to May. We do not expect to see this reform effected in every part of the country as yet, but the law can be enforced in large places

by Justices of the Peace or Magistrates and in course of time the people of the smaller places will appreciate the advantages of the system and will be only too anxious to have it in vogue also. Under the present system there is too little care taken of the interests of the education of the child, in this country. If a system of free and compulsory education works satisfactorily in countries such as France, Germany and Canada, why should it not do so here? I believe that an effort should be made in this direction and the system introduced as soon as possible all over the country. I remember bringing the matter before the Government three or four years ago but nothing has been done. How can any sensible member of this House with a full realization of his responsibilities, quietly sit here and allow hundreds of the children of the country to be denied a suitable education. Let us get to work and put in vogue such a system as will compel the attendance at school of children from the ages of seven to fourteen for seven months out of the twelve.

MR. GRIMES.—With reference to this item re the sub-Collector on Labrador, I should like to know the name of the sub-Collector.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—His name is Greene.

MR. GRIMES.—I understand there was an appointment made last season, a Mr. Bartlett.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—He is on the mail boat. He is paid by the Customs Department and by the Post Office. I think the Customs Department pays him $250.

MR. GRIMES.—I may say in reference to these amounts I do not think that the services rendered are at all commensurate with the salaries paid in many cases and there is practically no work being done by that sub-Collector and it is this system which is causing such dissatisfaction with the Government—making these appointments and paying money for practically no services. We heard a great deal the other day from Mr. Currie, the member for Burin and from Mr. Higgins, the member for St. John's East, about the increase in the cost of living that is going on in this country to-day, and they spoke very eloquently about it; but, Sir, they failed to tell us all in connection with this matter. We admit that the people today are living on a higher plane than they did years ago; and they ought to be given credit for attempting to do this and for trying to obtain more of the necessities and luxuries of life than their forefathers did. Now we find somewhat of a difficulty in meeting these desires owing to the way we are burdened with taxation and this increased taxation is one of the great causes of the increased cost of living. When the hon. gentlemen spoke the other day it reminded me somewhat of the ostrich which has a habit when danger is around of burying its head in the sand as it then feels safe because it does not see the danger. Although they referred to the high cost of living they did not refer to what the Government has done to bring this about by increasing the burdens of our people by increased taxation. Now this is still going on because we have to-day in the Estimates another increase in taxation amounting to $106,000. We do not object to certain items on that list which go to make up the increased taxation, but there are certain items we do object to. One thing is an increase in the Governor's salary. His salary is increased by $2,500 and he gets an addition of $1,500 for expenses, making in all an addition of $4,000. Now there are lots of people in this country who would be well satisfied if they were in receipt of a salary of $3,000 a year but we find that the Governor is unable to live on $10,000. I do not want

to speak disrespectfully of the Governor, but it seems to me that looking at the condition of this country at the present time we are unable to afford the increase. It has been said that it is rendered necessary by the number of social functions which the Governor is forced to give in connection with his position. I would like to know if the Governor really thinks that the great majority of the people of this country are in any way interested in these social functons. I do not think that you will find in this country more than two or three hundred people out of the whole two hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants who are concerned about these social functions of the Governor; and they will want to know why this increase of four thousand dollars should be made for the purpose of giving social functions when there are so many demands which cannot be acceded to in connection with the public services.

We have heard much to-day about the salaries paid to our public servants. The Government is the largest employer of labour in this country and it pays the worst salaries of any institution in the country, private or otherwise and it seems to me a disgrace that the present Government should allow this condition to prevail; while this continues we are not going to make matters better in the public service; it is going to go from bad to worse. Of course the argument has been brought forward that the Government are only doing as their predecessors did. But this is no argument, because we are told we have a progressive Government in power to-day. I would like to see some of their progressive ideas put into practice. At the present time we do not see much of it in any Department. The only thing they can claim in the way of progressive measures is the amount allowed for old age pensions. These were promised by the previous Government and some steps were made in that direction. The present Government granted these pensions because they had to show some step in advance of their predecessors.

The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries thought that the wages paid to lighthouse keepers were too small in comparison to the work they do. This same thing applies to other officials in various Departments. He also thought that some men were too old for the positions that they occupied, and that from time to time appointments had been made without much attention to qualification. Now what has placed the service on such a low plane is that appointments have been made for party reasons of men with a political pull, and while this condition prvails you cannot expect to have the civil service in any way improved. In the Post Office we find certain officials who do not know how to handle the mails and because they owe their positions to influence they think they can do as they like in carrying out their work. Let an applicant for a position in the civil service have some kind of an examination to show his fitness so that appointments will not be made solely upon the amount of pull with the party in power. Until that is done we cannot expect much improvement in the various Departments. If any business man on Water Street conducted his business in the way that the business of the Government Departments is carried on he would be laughed at by the other men on the street. In previous years some of the Water Street firms had a ittle experience in connection with this manner of doing business; men were employed simply on the recommendation of certain dealers. The effect was most demoralizing. It was found that these employees who owed their positions solely to influence did pretty much as they pleased and they had to be got rid of in quick time.

Now as to the question of salary. We find that men have been placed

in Government Departments with a salary of $1,000 or more a year whilst men who had been in the service for years were only receiving five or six hundred dollrs. Is there anythng that could do more harm in a Department than to bring in a man who has had no experience and who knows nothing of the work of the Department and give him a salary of a thousand dollars a year, while a man who has been working there for years is only being paid five or six hundred? As I said before we should adopt some other system, a system whereby a man who has been in the service for years, and a man who has just gone into the service will know that their salary will depend upon the work they do, and that no man can get ahead of them merely by influence. If it is found that the Government are managing things that way they will get better service than by following the line that has been followed for years in this country. Now, I know that the Government cannot do everything at once; but I think they should make some endeavour to have the various Departments of the Civil Service carried on in that way. Of course we are glad to find that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is endeavourng to follow that line somewhat in looking to the fitness of applicants for positions under his Department; but how can this be effectively done under the present system? No doubt there are many good men in the various departments, but others are simply as a reward for political services; and whilst some Ministers may not make appointments in this manner we cannot depend upon two or three men to follow these lines and try and improve the service; but we must institute some general system for a reform of the service.

We have heard some comments about dismissals in connection with the Postal Service. Mr. Clapp, the hon. member for St. Barbe, referred to some dismissals which occurred in connection with his district; and I have reason to believe that these things occurred not only in St. Barbe but in Port de Grave as well. There was a Poor Commissioner there who had held the position for fifteen or twenty years and as soon as the present Government were returned he was dismissed. I do not know whether the Premier or the Executive knew anything about it when he was removed. He was not a supporter of the Government, and the position was given to one of their own supporters. The people then got up a protest and sent it to the Government or the Department to which it related, but no heed was paid to it. Now, Sir, my object in dweliing on this at the present time is to show the correctness of and emphasize the position taken by the hon. member on this side of the House yesterday. This condition of things is partly the cause of having so many defalcations in connection with our Post Offices. It is unfair to the Government, unfair to the people of the country, and unfair to the districts concerned to allow this condition of things to prevail. It may be all very well if the man appointed is an honest man; but it has not always turned out that way. We have heard from Mr. Jennings, the member for Twillingate, what happened in his District, and the same applies, I daresay, to most of the districts in the Island. If a man has been given a position, and has shown that he is honest and industrious he should be left there.

Now, Sir, there are some matters in connection with the District that I represent that I would like to draw to the attention of the House, and that is that in going over the Estimates I notice no ferry has been provided for Port de Grave District. I think that every year during the past four or five years petitions have been sent to the House asking the Government

to provide a motor service from Port de Grave to Brigus calling at the settlements lying between. The need for this service has been pointed out the past four or five years by Mr. Warren who represented the district but no attention has been paid by the Government. There is a very rugged road leading up from Blow me Down and Clarke's Beach and sometimes in the spring and fall seasons it is almost impassable. This fact was set forth in the petition and it was pointed out that it would take some time for a horse to drive from Clarke's Beach to Brigus and it was set forth that if the motor service were put there it would shorten the distance by half and the business needs of the different parts of the District need this service. Down around Blow we Down and Port de Grave some of the people have to go to Clarke's Beach and Brigus to get supplies and they travel this long distance sometimes losing a whole day. If the motor service were put in there they would be able to take advantage of it and transact their business in half the time it now takes and I think, Sir, the sum of $500 would answer the needs of that part of the district and you could get a capable man to run the ferry from Port de Grave to Brigus and intervening settlements for a small sum. I hope the Government will give their attention to this service.

There is one other thing that I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance and Customs and that is in relation to the salary paid to the Collector at Brigus. I notice he receives two and a half per cent. on duties while in other places officers receive ten per cent. and five per cent. I think that this officer is most capable and no man in the public service is better qualified for the position than he is. Yet he is only allowed $500.00 with two per cent. while others receive five, ten or even twenty per cent. This is an instance of gross unfairness and it must be very discouraging to this official to see the favoritism that exists. I trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not allowed discrimination to be used against such a capable official.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Do I understand from my hon. friend that I have used my influence with the Hon. Minister of Finance against this official or in favour of any official in my district?

MR. GRIMES.—No.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I thank the hon. gentleman. I know the duties of that office for I have held it myself at a salary of $19.60 a month and ten per cent. of the dutes collected. I collected from seven to ten thousand dollars in duties. The official at Brigus receives $500 and two and a half per cent. There was no work there and he was well paid for his services.

MR. GRIMES.—There is work there now.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—There is some work of course but the official at Bay Roberts is only receiving $19.60 per month wth ten per cent., the whole not to exceed $600 even if it collects a tremendous amount.

MR. COAKER.—What did the commissions amount to?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I cannot tell the figure without reference to the lists but I know I did not receive more than $600. A little while afterwards Mr. Gushue obtained another $100 for me. I believe in a public official receiving a fair wage and I consider that some of these salaries, that have caused criticism, are not fair while others are too high. It is difficult to give each man just what he is worth. I would like to see such a plan inaugurated here but I am afraid that I shall be

a very old man before such a reform takes place.

MR. KENT.—There was one matter referred to by my hon. friend, Mr. Grimes, which deserves more than passing notice and one which should receive the very serious consideration of the Government. I think that when he referred to the manner of appointment of civil servants to-day and to the need of a radical change in that system he laid his finger on the weak spot. If there is an efficiency test for the offices in the various departments of the civil service it will mean an improvement all round. Efficiency is an essential principle in carrying out the service of the public and the sooner we face the matter fairly and squarely the better it will be for the Colony. We are the only country in the world where the different public offices from the smallest messenger boy to the head of the service are filled only by those who have some political pull or influence. When you come to ascertain why such a person obtained such a position you will find that he was appointed because he or his friends were the most active for the party who put him there. He could bring the most influence to bear on the Government of the day. We should face the position at once and there should be a competitive test as to the competency of those who seek to fill positions in the civil service. There should be a system of regular gradation to be pursued automatically. No man should be thrust into an office and placed over those who have been in the service there for twenty or thirty years. I know of one public official in the Customs Department who has been in the service for twenty-five years and he has to do the same work to-day as he did twenty years ago. I refer to Mr. Dryer, who has been there over a quarter of a century. There is not a more capable civil servant in the Colony but owing to this weak spot in the system he has not received promotion.

Civil servants receive their appointments and their promotions because of certain circumstances and conditions that have nothing whatever to do with the efficiency of the service and the result naturally is that the whole service suffers from the top to the bottom. It will continue to suffer until the present system is abolished for we shall never have a competent staff as long as appointments are made for political reasons only. It is not long ago that the Postmaster General referred to the incompetency of one of his officials in connection with the mail service and it is not surprising when we take into consideration the fact that men are placed in that department without any regard to their qualifications.

I think the Government should take up the whole matter and remove this blot from our service. If they will adopt a competitive system it will be an easy matter in the future to have the service supplied with good, qualified officials. I know it is a big problem but it is one that must be faced. It can be commenced best on what might be called the inside Civil Service; there ought not to be much trouble in that part of the service. I grant that the outside Civil Service is a more difficult problem altogether. But the inside Civil Service at any rate should be dealt with quickly.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two remarks in reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition concerning the question of competitive examinations for civil servants.

I followed with a great deal of interest the remarks of the hon. member for Port de Grave as well as the very pertinent points made by the hon Leader of the Oppostion. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition himself has hinted at and suggested

the very great difficulties surrounding this question. He has stated that it would be a very difficult matter to apply the competitive system to the outside civil service, and in this I entirely agree with him.

I would go further and say it would be a very difficult matter to apply the system to the inside service, that is the clerical service. It is well for the Committee to remember that this is by no means a new discovery: this matter has been thought of for years and years. It has been studied and discussed on many occasions by different Governments, who desired very sincerely to improve the public service, but the difficulties to overcome were so great that it had to be dropped in every case.

In England you have a competitive system for the civil service, and nobody can obtain a position in the War Office, the Colonial Office, the Post Office, the Army or the Navy unless he has passed an examination that shows him to be qualified to take the position. Some of these examination tests are very severe, so severe in fact that few in this Chamber could pass them, but you must remember that if England has a service on this system the people there have centuries of education behind them, and before our Island was known to exist they had Universities.

If you apply the system in vogue in England to this Colony you are going to exclude nine-tenths of the people of Newfoundland from the possibility of availing of it. No man from an outport, in fact no man who has not received a college education will be able to obtain a position in the public service. If we adopt this system and have these examinations, which will be very severe if we are to be in earnest in the matter, and a man at Trepassey or Bonavista or Twillingate is unable to pass them in order to obtain a position in the Post Office, or Customs House, or some other department of the Civil Service, who is to be blamed? Certainly he is not, for the fault is not his. The blame will be on the Legislature, which has not provided him with the means to qualify himself to pass these examinations. Why, when the neighbouring province of Nova Scotia had a University, it was illegal to plant a potato in this Colony. It was a penal offence to dig a garden here when for years Nova Scotia had Responsible Government. We cannot suppose it is an easy matter to apply competitive examinations to the Civil Service of the Colony merely because that system has been adopted in other countries, where such a service was in existence before our Colony was known.

I would like to see every public office filled by a competent man, who should have a fair salary, for it would be in the best interests of the public to have it so, but until every citizen is given a chance to qualify, you have no right to penalize anyone on that account, for that is what it amounts to. The great majority of our people have only a smattering of education, and once you say that they must pass a severe examination before they can take a public office, you penalize them and exclude them from all competition.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition saw this objection, and he put the matter very fairly as a big problem. It would be a considerable undertaking to enact such a measure and, as I have said, the matter was discussed by Sir William Whiteway and Sir Robert Bond, when they were in power, as the records of this Chamber will show. All were agreed that the suggested change would be a good one, but that when it came to be worked out as a practical measure the difficulties would immediately crop up.

The hon. member for Bonavista, Mr.

Coaker, referred to the question of compulsory education. This is another question that is bristling with difficulties; in fact he saw the difficulties himself because he proposes to exclude from his scheme settlements with a population of less than a thousand people. This proposal of the hon. gentleman in itself is the best argument that could be advanced to show the difficulties that are to be faced in dealing with this question, for if you exclude from the operation of any measure for compulsory education every settlement with a population of less than a thousand people, you will exclude hundreds of settlements, as out of the thirteen hundred places in the Island very few have that population. The hon. member contends that it is only to the large towns that such a system could be applied. As a matter of fact, it is not a question of the size of the settlement at all. If you make it penal for a man in Bonavista, where there are five thousand people, to keep his children away from school, why not do so in the case of a man at Petty Hr., where there are only eight hundred people? The great question as a matter of fact is the nearness of the school and not the size of the settlement. If there are only five families in a settlement and they are near a school, the children should be compelled to go, if we are to carry out such a measure at all.

It is useless to pass a law without also imposing a penalty, and if you bring in a law compelling a man to send his children to school, you will have to punish him for not doing so either by sending him to gaol or fining him. You will not do this, because the country will not stand it. How are you going to carry it out? The law will be like many others on the Statute book, merely made to be broken, the cigarette law for example. I should like to see every child attending school for we spend thousands of dollars every year for education, and the reports of the Superintendents show that a large number of children do not go to school. It is desirable that they should go, but you will not compel them to go by passing a law that merely imposes a penalty. If you do fine a man he will not pay it unless there is the alternative of going to gaol, and certainly you are not going to fill your gaols.

You must look at the matter fairly and be convinced that you can carry the law out before putting it on the Statute Book.

MR. COAKER.—It is carried out successfully in other countries.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I do not agree with my hon. friend, for I feel sure that if he looks up the matter he will find that the system of compulsory education has not been a success in any country. A very large percentage of children go to school in this country without any compulsory law, and the best method to adopt with those who do not go is moral suasion. Bring it home to the parents that they are doing an injustice to their children by not sending them to school, and you will find that in most cases they will see that their children are educated.

It must be remembered also that we have many local difficulties to contend with. In the first place we are a very scattered country, and anybody who has travelled over the country knows that there are hundreds of places with no schools and many other places where the children live miles away from a school. Then we have our long winter months when it is often impossible for children to go to school owing to the inclemency of the weather. Then, there are the claims of the parents, for especially among the poorer people the children often help to keep up the home and support the parents.

I mention these points to my hon. friend in order to show him that it is not an easy matter to carry compulsory education into effect and also to show him that the matter has been under consideration before. It is easy to say that we should have such a system, but it would be a very difficult matter to carry it into effect.

As to the question of free education or the doing away with the fees I may say that the payment of fees is more observed in the breach than in the observance If hon. members will look at the returns for last year, as shown in the reports of the Inspectors, they will find that the amount paid is very small. I admit, of course, that this does not lessen the weight of the argument that all the children should enter school on the same basis and that one should not be paying while the other is receiving free education.

In looking at the returns you will find considerable disparity in the different denominations with regard to school fees. One denomination paid ten thousand dollars and until the Government can increase the grant to that denomination by ten thousand dollars it would be unfair to take that amount from them. The three large denominations paid between them about thirty thousand dollars, if I remember rightly and they would be handicapped very considerably if fees were done away with and this amount lost to them. I agree with my hon. friends opposite that it is not fair for one to pay while the other escapes and I agree with the principle that every child should enter the school room on the same basis. The matter is one that has received the consideration of the Government but until it is possible to make such a large grant to the different denominations as will be sufficient to offset what they would lose in fees it will not be good policy to take any steps in the matter.

There were two or three minor matters mentioned during the debate to which I would like to refer. My hon. friend made a statement concerning a payment to Jacob Manuel out of the surplus trust fund for public work at Cottell's Island. That is not correct for the place concerned was Cotrel's Cove. I now table the statement and I am having the other amounts referred to by him looked up. He may feel certain that any amounts charged in the public accounts are paid only after strict examination and that there is a voucher for every dollar. It may be that some expenditures cover up amounts that are not strictly correct but in any service and particularly in the public service it is impossible to get dollar for dollar. I am confident, however, that my hon. friend will find there is no wrong doing as far as the Government is concerned.

In relation to the amount paid to the "Earl of Devon", I wish to say that that steamer was chartered at the lowest rate that could be obtained, namely $100.00 a day. The steamer left here in October to distribute the ballot boxes around St. Barbe District or a coastline of six hundred miles. Every ballot box had to be distributed by her.

She was the only steamer that could be obtained and the mere accident that Hon. R. K. Bishop was the agent or part owner had nothing whatever to do with it. The rather long time that was spent by the steamer in the work was not due to Mr. Bishop or the Government but was due to circumstances that were unavoidable and the steamer could not get back an hour earlier. When the account was given to me I made a personal examination, although the matter was not in my department. I thought that the bill was rather large and I thought it was one that should be examined closely. I therefore sent for the Returning Officer, Mr. Squires, of Woody Point, who was on board. He is a man of

high character and this was his first year as returning officer, that position having become vacant owing to the death of Magistrate Duder. I went over the work of the steamer day after day and I was convinced after my consultation with Mr. Squires that the steamer could not have reached here an hour earlier. My hon. friend must know the nature of the coast.

Then my hon. friend referred to the cost of the Tuberculosis Campaign. It is quite true that the Government has purchased a site for a sanatorium from Mr. R. White, Lighthouse Inspector, for $3,000. It was the only available site and the best and the cheapest in the district; it was on the line of railway and not far from St. John's. A place was needed where an abundant water supply could be obtained. I maintain that, if the hon. gentleman will apply the price per acre of land here to the price we paid for this farm, he will find that the price was reasonable. The Reid Nfld. Co. intended erecting a $50,000 building; but plans have now been specially designed and it will require nearly $100,000 to erect the sanatorium. You cannot erect a $100,000 building on a site that is unsuitable; a wooded site with agreeable surroundings, good water and convenient of approach, is necessary.

My hon. friend, the member for Bonavista, referred to Dr. Rendell's salary. We allow him the same as we allowed Dr. Keegan. I shall soon table his report and I think his work and his report will commend themselves to the Committee.

The erection of sanatoria over the Island will be commenced next year and by the end of the year they will be in working order. Much delay was caused by the plans having to be altered to suit existing conditions.

As regards the disparity in the salaries paid to public officials and especially in the lighthouse department, the present system has grown up during many years and it is impossible to readjust it offhand, though attempts have been made to remedy this matter. In every case, there is some special circumstance which justifies the disparity in the salaries. You take the case of a lighthouse keeper at St. Mary's and then at Catalina and you want to know why there is a difference. You will find if you look into the matter that there is some explanation; in one case he may do all the work himself, in another case he may have to employ help. One is open all the year the other only for eight months. There is always some special reason or explanation. It is not fair to deal with these disparities as if they were made by the present Government. These differences have existed for 30 or 40 years in the Civil Service List and gradually an honest attempt has been made to settle them along reasonable and fair lines.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, just a few words in reference to the remarks of the Prime Minister in relation to the question I raised as to the desirability of having competitive tests for entering and for promotion in the Civil Service. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier is noted for one thing and that is that he can make a mountain out of a mole hill, when it will advance a case of his. I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that I can agree with all he said with regard to the difficulties in the way of adopting such a system of competitive tests for entering the Civil Service. When we are dealing with this question, it is scarcely fair to refer to the Civil Service Examinations in England. We don't want the same here as in England. In all the provinces of the Dominion of Canada, a competitive entrance examination system is in vogue and we could have a system here which would suit the existing condi-

tions. Why do you take the case of the Indian Civil Service examinations —they are the most difficult in England? Here the conditions are different; we want no such severe examinations. One great benefit to be derived from such a system is that you will have competent and reliable officials in the various Departments. I believe that under the present system the boy in the outports does not get the chance he ought to get. He should enter on an equality with the St. John's boy and should be encouraged to make use of his education. A competitive examination system would go a long way towards reaching a solution of the difficulties of compulsory education, and would open up new opportunities for a great many capable and deserving young men.

The questions of Free and Compulsory Education have been discussed before and there is no doubt that they are surrounded by many difficulties. I believe that if we had such a system it would be impossible to carry it out. At first, I must admit, I was carried away with the idea, but now I am beginning to see the difficulties in carrying it out. If we have a law saying that the parent must send the child to school, we must enforce it by penalties. Such penalties would be either imprisonment or fines. Now, if we imprisoned the father for not sending the child to school, we would be removing the bread winner of the family and heavily punishing the innocent children. If we imposed a fine upon the father, it would be taking from him money that very often he could ill afford. The only method is by moral suasion and by appealing to the parent's conscience.

The question of free education is one entirely of money. I believe that, if the Government could see its way clear to removing the difficulties in the way of granting free education, it would be a very good thing. These three questions, Mr. Chairman, are big and important questions, which require much thought and careful handling.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word or two. As regards Compulsory Education, we hear of nothing but the difficulties in the way. Even Mr. Kent backs up the arguments of the Premier. This talk about doing so and so amounts to nothing. Actions speak louder than words and we are becoming impatient for you to do something. You have only to put the machinery of the law into force and send the man to jail, if he does not send his child to school. The people, in the majority of cases, want this law put into force. If such a law were enforced, every child would have a chance.

With regard to the "Earl of Devon," I say that the sum of $5,500 was too much for that service. They should not take 55 days to do 12 days work. I state that the "Devon" could have made the rounds from Bonne Bay to LaScie in 12 days. I do not want to run down the man in charge, but I do not agree with the bill that was charged. You should make an enquiry into the matter. I know a little about the coast and I know that you could have got the "Sagona" or some other vessel for $100 a day.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is entirely astray; it is not a question of 15 or 20 days. It would have been absurd to suppose that 55 days were taken to accomplish a 12 day's service. I may point out that the boat had to leave here in order to get to Bonne Bay on Nomination Day and distribute the ballot boxes. She took 10 days to distribute them and then she had to collect all of them. Between Nomination Day and Polling Day she had to be there. She left in October and no risks could then be taken. It was not a question of the "Sagona" or the "Fogota." These boats could not be

obtained for the service. They have their regular work. She took 10 days from St. John's before she got to Bonne Bay. The hon. member insinuated that there was something wrong; that the Captain delivering the boxes purposely delayed. Now, I am only stating the actual facts which I have discovered after examination. She took 10 days to go and then there was 10 days before polling day. That is 20 days right away. We did not have a declaration of the polls until about 15 or 16 days after the declaration in other districts. The declaration took place on Nov. 24th.

I went into this matter very carefully and I asked Mr. Squires for a written statement of every day's work. They took 10 days to go there and reached Bonne Bay on the 20th of October. Then they had to distribute the ballot boxes along 700 miles of coast. Afterwards, they had to collect them, and the poll was not declared until the 24th of October. He took 7 or 8 days to get home; at the very best and with favorable weather he would take 5 or 6 days. That, Sir, is the explanation of the delay.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were on motion, deferred.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER tabled the Report of the Agricultural Board, 1913.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS tabled the Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for 1913.

MR. HALFYARD gave notice of question.

MR ABBOTT gave notice of question.

MR. WINSOR gave notice of question.

MR. KENT gave notice of question.

On motion the House then adjourned till to-morrow at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

THURSDAY, Feby. 5th.

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY laid on the table of the House the Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy for the year ending Dec. 31, 1913. Also the Report of the Superintendent of the Penitentiary for the same year. Also the Report of the Superintendent of the Asylum for the Insane for the same year.

PETITIONS.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Farmers Arm asking for a sum of money to build a post office at that place. It is the centre for the change of mails from Twillingate and Herring Neck and they bring the winter mails from Lewisporte there. They point out that a post office and a small place where the mailmen might shelter would be a great convenience. They also ask for a small sum of money to build a bridge across to Shoe Arm. At present in order to get to the main land the people have to cross the gut in a boat or in the winter they have to wait for the freezing of the ice. The bridge was started some time ago but has not been finished. They also ask for telephone communication to Moreton's Hr. I trust that this petition will receive the attention which it deserves.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of New Chelsea. They ask for a sum of money to build a road about three miles from that place to a pond. This road would lead to the place where the people cut their timber for boat building and other par-

ticular purposes. It is very necessary that they should have this road and I hope the Government will give the matter their attention.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

QUESTIONS.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs for particulars of payment made out of the Finance Department, during the years 1912 and 1913, of a sum of $3,250 to the Hon. the Prime Minister for services, and for copy of warrant, Minutes of Council, and all vouchers connected therewith.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS tabled the information asked for.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House a statement of the amount paid for stationery for House of Assembly and Legislative Council from January 1st, 1913, up to the present time, and if any bills are outstanding on this Account.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER tabled the information.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement of the amount of coals supplied for Fever Hospital for the year 1912-13, and the price per ton.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House copies of returns for amounts allocated by his department to the following persons: Capt. George Hann, Wesleyville, May 12th, 1912; Capt. Dan Green, Newtown, May 29th, 1912; John Spurrel, Badger Quay, June 1st, 1912; Capt. A. Barbour, Newtown, October 10th, 1913.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of returns for the sum of $100 allocated by his department to Thomas Carew, of Broad Cove, in the District of Bonavista, in the year 1910.

Owing to the absence of the Minister these questions were ordered to stand until later in the sitting.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the cost of the recent election in St. John's East.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled the information asked for.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

The Chairman from the Committee of the whole on Supply reported a Resolution which was read a first time as follows:

Roads, Bridges and Ferries, $189,679.00.

The said Resolution being read a second time it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolution was agreed to.

PATENTS BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend Chapter 109 of the Consolidated Statutes respecting Patents."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of the Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the adoption of this amendment to Chapter 109 of the Consolidated Statutes. When moving the second reading of this Bill I pointed out that it was a mere amendment in connection with the procedure or practice of filing documents in connection with the taking out of patents. As the law is at present the original assignment has to be filed. Now it is proposed that a true and correct copy duly certified as such under the seal of a Notary Public, and an affidavit setting forth the date of the patent abroad, that the article to be patented has not been in public or common use in this Colony and

that he is assignee for good consideration, will be sufficient. When the matter was before the House the learned Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Kent, pointed out the desirability of certain other amendments being made in the Patent law—in fact, perhaps going so far as to have it consolidated, and in addition, the amendment of it by the introduction of clauses that already have a place on the Imperial Statutes and also in some of the British possessions; but he referred particularly to the section—I think he quoted from the Imperial Act—bringing the patent into operation in this Colony by manufacture. It has in the past been customary to put an advertisement in the press to bring the patent into operation. I had the section of the Imperial Act looked up,

(Rt. Hon. Prime Minister quoted the section.)

Now, of course, if we were to adopt that section it might mean that a great many parties might be debarred from making application by reason of the fact that they would not feel that they were able under any circumstances to come in here and manufacture, and they might not be able either to give any of the reasons which, under this section which I have read, would justify them in holding their patent and yet not manufacturing. If anyone will read the list of patents that are issued in the Colony, he will notice that many of them are of such a complicated character that they are very difficult to manufacture. For instance, numerous patents have been taken out by the Marconi people in connection with wireless telegraphy, and there are many others of that class which you could hardly term articles of commerce, and it might, as I say, be difficult for the party holding the patent to justify to the Governor in Council that they were not in a position to manufacture in the Colony. In that way, I think, difficulties would arise. I only mention this to show that this is a matter which would require a great deal of care and consideration before it could be submitted to the House. This amendment does not seriously amend the patent law. As I have said, it is merely an amendment affecting the practice. When we proceed with the consolidation this is one of the matters which might be dealt with, but it will require a great deal of thought and consideration before the principles that are contained in the English patent law and the patent laws of other countries could be safely adopted by us. Of course, in a country like Great Britain, it would pay the parties in the case of nearly every patent which is taken out (if it were ever likely to be universally used) to manufacture there, because if it will be used anywhere it will probably be used there. For these reasons I would suggest to my hon. and learned friend that it might be well to postpone the consideration of that section until the matter can be carefully thought out.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, I recognize the difficulties in the way of dealing with a matter of this kind at the present stage. The reason I brought the matter up when this bill was before the House was because of the uncertainty of defining the rights of patent owners under the present law. The law at present simply makes the brief declaration that persons who obtain a patent in this country must bring it into operation within two years of the date of the granting of the patent. Now, those who have had to advise people both here in St. John's and abroad as to what they had to do to protect their rights under this clause found themselves in a very uncertain situation. It is impossible to safely advise as to just what constitutes bringing a patent into operation in this country. Most of the members of the Committee will remember

when the Marconi system was first brought here, and I think experimented with in this building for the purpose of protecting the patent rights, the matter was considerably discussed amongst lawyers,as to whether the rights were protected or not. Many thought not, and as a matter of fact it is very questionable whether the mere experimenting with the system constituted bringing it into operation. Thirteen or fourteen years ago I went into the matter as thoroughly as I could, and looked up all the authorities I could find—English and Canadian and some American—on the question of bringing a patent into operation. As a result I drafted the notice which is now used. I discussed it with several members of the profession, such men as Mr. Furlong and others, and they thought that under the Act it was the safest course to follow. Since then that notice has been acted upon, but there has always been a doubt about it. Of course, I agree with the Prime Minister that at this stage an amendment of this kind cannot be dealt with. There are many things to be considered in connection with the changing of the patent law, but I hope that a Patent Act adapted to our conditions will be framed before the consolidation. There are many things in the English Act and in the Canadian Act that cannot apply here. There are many patents that could be brought into operation in England that could not be brought into operation here. Our efforts ought be directed, I should think, towards bringing in as many patents as can possibly be used in connection with the business and development of this country, but at the same time not to frighten people away from acquiring patent rights by having an unsatisfactory and imperfect law. I would make one suggestion in connection with this amendment in reference to the person before whom the affidavit should be taken. In all other cases affidavits may be taken before a Judge of a Superior Court of Record or British Consul. There may be no Notary Public in a place while there may be a British Consul or Agent there.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well, then, the Section would read in this way, after the words "Notary Public":—"Judge of a Court of Record, Mayor or Chief Magistrate of any city or town, Consul, Vice Consul or Consular Agent."

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the bill with some amendment.

On motion, the report was received and adopted, and the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

ALIENS BILL.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend 6 Edward VII., Cap. 3, entitled The Aliens Act, 1906."

On motion, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of the Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I have already explained the object of this Bill. There is a limitation in the Act at present; it defines an immigrant ship as a ship bringing twenty steerage passengers. The Department contends that it is desirable that there should be no limitation, and that the expression "Immigrant Ship" shall mean any ship bringing any alien steerage passengers—any number from one upwards.

The Speaker resumed the chair.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

On motion, the report was received and adopted, and the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

INSPECTION OF FOODS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Inspection of Foods in St. John's."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I stated when the second reading of this Bill was being considered that its principle involved the inspection of foods in St. John's. Section One and sub-Sections One and Two are the same as in our Consolidated Statutes. Sub Section 3 of Number 1 was taken from the Manitoba Act. Nearly all the sections from 3 to 8 are taken from the Ontario and Manitoba Acts. This Bill has been very carefully prepared by Dr. Brehm, the efficient Health Officer. He had almost a similar Bill prepared last session but it was not presented to this House in time to give it that consideration which it merited. Since that time he has given further consideration and made some changes in it, keeping in view that it should not be too stringent; and I think that much good will result from the carrying out of its provisions. A day or two ago I read an extract from a newspaper showing how seriously they regard the inspection of foods in the city of New York. For the information of the House I will read those extracts.

Typhoid and Milk Supply.

"Halifax is not the only place where typhoid has broken out. In the suburbs of Boston there have been serious outbreaks. At Montreal there have been this year 215 or more cases. Now there is an epidemic of the fever in certain districts in New York, which has been traced to impure milk supply. Notwithstanding that this city claims the nearest to perfection in pure milk by a system of classification. Still the endeavours of the health authorities have not been able to totally defeat the negligence and carelessness of that type of farmer who wiil not get into the procession of progress but becomes a lonely figure on the sidelines.

"After milk reaches New York the authorities take more care of it than is dreamed of in most cities. The whole basis of the system is classification. There are three divisions: Grade A for infants and children includes certfied or guaranteed milk, inspected milk (raw), and selected milk (pasteurized); grade B for adults includes selected milk (raw) and pasteurized, grade C, for cooking and manufacturing purposes only. The same rules apply to cream. Not only is all milk tested for bacteria, but the cows at the source are regularly tested for tuberculosis. Milk must be delivered to the consumer within 36 hours of the time at which it was drawn and buyers can always tell how old milk is as it must be labelled. The percentage of bacteria count of all raw and pasteurized milk is given, but while interesting the subject is too complicated to be given in detail."

We thus see what a great amount of care and attention is given to these matters and particularly to the milk supply. The authorities say there is no greater disseminator of disease than milk and it is of the utmost importance that it should be well looked after. During the past few years Dr. Brehm and Inspector O'Brien have visited all farms from which milk is supplied. These visits have been made regularly and the milk supply has been subject to rules and regulations made by the health authorities with the result that these matters have been brought to a high standard from the point of view of the Public Health. Not only has the supply of milk been attended to but also the slaughter houses were

visited, and owing to the willing disposition of the butchers to fall into line, the slaughter houses are now in a clean and healthy condition.

Some people may think that some sections of this Bill are too stringent but I am of the opinion that we are adopting the right course by endeavouring to have everything brought up to date in this connection. We are following the precedents of modern and up to date legislation.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to make one or two remarks in relation to this Bill. I am afraid that some difficulty will occur in carrying out the provisions of the Act. Under the present law the Health Officer or Inspector might inspect any food mentioned there which was exposed for sale or being prepared for sale.

This Bill goes further by including many more articles and as the duties appertaining to the Inspection will be much greater than heretofore a larger staff of officials will be necessary. We all know that Dr. Brehm and Inspector O'Brien have as much work as they can efficiently do. Both men are most competent. Dr. Brehm had the best training possible for the work and the same can be said of Inspector O'Brien.

It would improve this Bill were its provisions extended somewhat. I think bakeries and candy factories should be visited and the Inspector for such places should be one with a good scientific knowledge of the different ingredients used. This applies especially to things such as candy. The Inpector of necessity requires a knowledge of dyes and other ingredients, and did he not possess a knowledge of the chemistry of this department his work would be useless.

There is no question whatever as to the value and necessity of this Bill but it is just as well to allow the present law to remain as it is unless the proper machinery is provided for the carrying out of this contemplated legislation.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks of the hon. member Mr. Kent, when he says that some difficulty will be experienced in carrying out this Act, for in order to provide the proper machinery for its enforcement it is necessary to place in the estimates the sum of twenty thousand dollars. Inspectors with special knowledge of different foods will have to be appointed. One Inspector would deal with milk, another with poultry and meats, and another with molasses and all those foods which are manufactured. Who is now going to be the judge of these different things. Is it Dr. Brehm. He may know all about scarletina and diphtheria, but does he know whether butterine at 14 cts. a pound is as good as it ought to be? Would he know whether molasses was pure or 'doctored' with lime? I can assure the Committee that the pork imported into this country is not as good as it ought to be and last year fully twenty per cent. was returned as being unfit for food. I am told that in the city of New York that that quality of pork could not be sold; and that any fresh beef and pork that remains unsold up there for any length of time is salted and sent as salt meat to this country and other places. As regards milk, no doubt some of the farmers around St. John's in the scarcity of the winter months found it not inconvenient surreptitiously to mix a small percentage of water before its delivery to the purchasers. Anyway last year the milk in most cases did not contain one per cent. of fat. An inspection ought to be taken into the manufacturing of jams, a new industry lately started. A certain amount of fruit ought to be compulsory. We ought to be sure it was not all gelatine we were buying. To carry out this Act and cover the additional ar-

ticles I have mentioned we shall need to provide for a much larger staff than we have at present.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words relative to an assertion made by the hon. member, Mr. Coaker a few moments ago. While I do not wish to take exception to any of the suggestions offered by members of the Opposition tending to the amelioration of the Bill now under discussion, I would like to point out that it is not the general custom of the farmers in St. John's when there is a slight scarcity of milk during the winter months to increase their supply by adding a little water. I do not suggest that it may have been a little habit of the hon. member while pursuing that avocation some years ago, but I am most sure that this custom does not prevail in St. John's. The milk I think will be found to contain more than one per cent. of fat. I am sure my statement meets the approval of the hon. member Mr. Dwyer and I do not consider it would be fair on my part to let pass this favourable opportunity of pointing out that Mr. Coaker slightly erred in his assertion. No doubt he gave a somewhat exaggerated description of the existing circumstance.

MR. DWYER.—Mr. Chairman, there would be no demand for an article were the supply not good. No milk supplier would water his milk because he would very soon lose his trade.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I think we can safely proceed and I think the objections of the hon. member for Bonavista have been completely answered. The leader of the Opposition Mr. Kent referred to the necessity of increasing the staff of inspectors should this Bill become law. I submit that we can carry out the provisions of this Bill in the regular way by the regular officials and if it be found necessary hereafter to increase the staff it could be done as needed without incurring a great deal of expense.

It is not a very difficult matter to inspect milk. It might have been long ago but it is a very easy matter indeed with the instruments that are now used for that purpose.

Now in the same way in relation to meat and poultry and fish and general articles like flour the very same objection was made when the first Inspection Act was brought in—Where were we going to get the Inspectors? No one ever thought that hidden away in an unassuming uniform in the police force we would be able to find such a competent man as Inspector O'Brien for the work in which he is engaged. Now we are most of us familiar with the work that he has done in the way of inspecting slaughter houses and drains and we know the way the milk is looked after in St. John's; and I have no doubt that later on we will be able to get an Inspector to inspect the Oleo and butter and meat. We have had a good deal of inspection of meat here in St. John's and for all I know in the Outports. We have had many convictions in the Courts in cases where bad meat was being sold and it was seized and the vender prosecuted. Now we have a Meat Inspector already. We voted his salary here in this Committee or if we have not done so already we have been doing so for years and will do so before the Committee rises so that meat inspection is already provided for. The gentleman who looks after it may not be a specialist but in a general way I think he is well able to inspect meat.

I was surprised by the statement of the hon. member for Bonavista when he said I think, that twenty per cent of the beef and pork purchased by him last year had to be returned. That is a very large quantity. I do not

doubt his statement for a moment, and it is certainly a strong argument in favor of inspection and in favour of taking up this whole question. In every country in the world the inspection of foods is being dealt with, and I think we are not at all too soon In endeavouring to deal with the question. Of course we had to have Legislation first. We could not appoint the officers and look for the legisation afterwards, and I think that as the Act is worked out by the present staff we wil be able to more correctly understand the class of inspectors that will be required.

It has been a grievance for a great many years that we have had no Inspector in connection with the liquors sold in this country or at least sold in this town. It is alleged by persons who drink liquor that there are quite a number of qualities offered for sale and that some of those are injurious to the public health. I should like to have proofs from the hon. member for Bonavista as to the statement he made in connection with the milk sold here in town. He may be able to prove this assertion though I doubt it but if the statements made by him are correct it indicates a condition of things that ought to be seriously investigated. 1 have never known a case where a farmer deliberately watered milk for the purposes of sale. It may be that milk may be watered and the blame not attached to the person who originally sold it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.— Mr. Chairman I would like to say a word in reference to the Bill now before the Committee. I wish to assure the mover of my hearty support and I do not think that in carrying out the provisions of this Bill we will have anything like the expenditures spoken of by the hon. member for Bonavista. Much good work has aready been done in this city as regards the inspection of milk farms and stables, etc., and that is the best demonstration of what can be done by a little further expenditure. We can remember and look back but a very few years ago when we could go into the country and visit the farm and barns and stables of our friends who were in the farming business and we can remember that their condition was not by any means as good as it is to-day. Anyone who has had an opportunity of visiting the suburban parts of St. John's East and West must have been struck with the great improvement made in this direction. You can go into a farmyard now and see the kettles all properly cleansed and hung out and everything cleanly in every possible way,the same condition can be observed in the stables where the cows are kept and it is hardly necessary now for the Inspector to go around at all because the people have been awakened to a realization of their duty and the farmer has awakened to the position stated by my friend Mr. Dwyer that unless he conducts his business right and gets the reputation of having good clean milk he is not going to do any business. Up to very recently the people of this town had not awakened to the importance of health affairs. I am sure the work that has been performed by Dr. Brehm and Inspector O'Brien will receive the commendation of every man; they have both been indefatigable in the discharge of their duty. Sergt. O'Brien has done his duty in such a manner as to the carrying out of the provisions of the Act that he has convinced the farmers that he is their best friend and as long as they obey the law he has no desire to interfere with them in their vocation. It is a well known fact that now every farmer is delighted to bring people out and show him his premises and show him how everything around is clean and how conditions have been improved over previous years. But I think Mr. Chair-

man, that a great deal more can be done in other directions. We have improved greatly in our way of carrying on business the last three or four years. Everyone remembers the way in which our meat was carried back and forth from the slaughter houses to the butcher's stall. It was a common thing to see meat carried through the streets in carts without any covering and exposed to every kind of dust and dirt. That condition of things is changed. To-day, they carry it in closed carts and everything possible is done to protect it. With regard to the butcher's shops the meat is now kept inside whereas before now we could all remember the hooks that hung outside with meat hanging on them covered with dust and flies; it was a common sight to see a boy with a flail killing those flies and afterwards that meat was brought in and sold. We have to look back to appreciate what has been done for the benefit of the health of the people. I think the inspection of factories will have a similar effect. I believe to-day that a great majority of those who have factories in town for the manufacture of supplies are keeping their places in a fairly decent and clean condition, but the very fact of an inspector coming around to inspect will have a moral effect on them, and they will realize that any improvements they make are for their own benefit as well as for the benefit of the general public. Anyone who has travelled abroad and visited factories of any note will agree when I say that cleanliness is the first and foremost consideration in these factories. I remember visiting a factory in Niagara where shredded wheat is prepared. Every employee in that factory when he comes in in the morning has first to take a bath and change all his clothes and every one of the hundreds of employees is clothed in white from head to foot. They dine in the factory, they have their cooking schools there and they have recreation rooms and everything that makes life pleasant and the article manufactured there is all done by machinery and not touched by the human hand from the time it goes into the factory until it is put up in packages. All this shows how these people appreciate the importance of cleanliness and sanitary conditions. I think that under a system of inspection our factories will show a marked improvement and will depart from the present condition of indifference. There is no intention at present of being dirty and any faults that may exist arise from indifference and from the fact that the necessity of these improvements has not been brought home to our people. I have no knowledge of the factories where our butterine is made but I have been given to understand that the utmost cleanliness prevails and that the manufacturers are most particular in every detail as regards cleanliness. It is quite possible as has been said that one batch may be indifferent and another fairly good. I think that this is the case in all kinds of manufactories. It is very difficult where conditions vary and where conditions of temperature play such an important part to turn out an article uniform in quality. I do not know much about this article but I believe that that is quite possible. The same thing can be said about our bakeries and our candy factories and I am sure that any persons who may have been inclined to be indifferent in the past will realize after they have had a visit or two from a man like Inspector O'Brien that it is in their own interest as well as in the interest of the public to carry out the provisions of this Act.

It is absurd to say that a vote for $20,000 will be necessary to carry out this Act. We may require some vote as we go along but the first step is to get legislation and then it will be required to be worked out. I see the

importance of inspecting the beef and pork that comes down from Canada and the United States. It is a matter that affects the whole country but we must remember this fact that inspection has already taken place and we are led to believe that the inspection in the United States to-day is much more stringent than it ever was. We all remember the great Chicago packing scandals which were exposed by Upton Sinclair and how the whole world was shocked with the conditions of things brought to light at that time. People up there did not give due attention to cleanliness and sanitary conditions and enormous losses were sustained at that time but to-day as we are led to believe the whole system has been revolutionized and all meats are thoroughly inspected; nevertheless with all that inspection my hon. friend has pointed out that twenty per cent. of the pork and beef that he bought last year had to be rejected by him as unfit for human consumption. I think that matter ought to be taken up by the Government and the attention of the Government of the United States called to it. If that is the case somebody is certainly doing wrong and violating the conditions of the Pure Food Laws of the United States and I am sure that the people who sent that pork and beef here are no small people and can be located and traced. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the passage of the Bill will mean that a great deal of benefit will result and I am sure that in carrying out its provisions we will not be called upon to pay such a large amount as has been suggested by the member for Bonavista.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, just one word with reference to this matter. I think we all agree with the Hon. Colonial Secretary that one of the objects that we hope to obtain by the Act is this, that it will be educative in effect and that where people do not appreciate conditions that are injurious the difference will be pointed out to them and they will amend what is wrong. That is of course one of the prime objects hoped to be obtained by this Act. Now if we put this Act into force without sufficient machinery to carry it out we will not accomplish any good. We will only lead to unnecessary friction. Take the city of St. John's and take the number of shops and stores and other places that will come under the surveillance of the inspectors under this Act. They are almost innumerable. If any member will go through the streets of St. John's and see the number of shops that will come under this Act he will see the immense amount of work that there will fall upon any officer. Take Water Street, Duckworth Street, Gower Street and New Gower St. and see the number of stores and shops and places of depository that will come under the surveillance of the officer appointed under this Act. The officers that we have at present have all their time taken up in carrying out the act as it stands at the present time. They have done good work and if we throw too much work upon them we may be undoing the work that they have already accomplished.

I think the question referred to by the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, with reference to imported beef and pork and other articles of that kind is one of a most serious and important character. I do not think that we ought to take any chances or risks with articles which are so much consumed by our people as pork and beef that is imported from abroad. If you take up our Customs returns you will see the amount of these articles imported into this country. I think this is a matter of very far reaching effect and I think if there is any hesitation or doubt as to whether the inspector who will be appointed

under this Act will have the right to inspect such food as this imported pork and beef and molasses and other articles of that kind we ought to remove it before the House goes out of Committee. I think it is quite possible under the Act as it stands at the present time that they have such power. He has power to inspect meat which would probably cover in its broadest extent such articles as beef and pork. He has also got the power to inspect flesh, either one or other of these terms may cover this but if there is any doubt and I think there is a doubt, we ought to put in one or two words there adding salt beef and pork as has been referred to by the hon. member for Bonavista. The work of Inspector O'Brien and Dr. Brehm as I have said before has been done thoroughly.

Reference has been made to the milk supply in St. John's. I personally know most of the farmers who are carrying on business around St. John's and I do not think that any of them would knowingly adulterate milk in any way by water or any other means. The milk supply that is at present sent into the city of St. John's is I think as pure as can be obtained in any of the cities of the provinces or any place else. Adulterating milk or any other article of common use is not as easy as one would think. These things are spoken of by people usually as a matter of suspicion. I think Sir it will be found that the milk supply of the city of St. John's would contain probably as high a percentage of fat and would be as free from adulteration as any milk supplied any of the Provinces of the Dominion. Of course we must remember in connection with this that the cattle that supply the milk are not perhaps of as high a grade as the cattle in some of the larger and better provided farming centres. That of course would make a great deal of difference as regards the percentage of fat in the milk, but I think that taking conditions all round you will find that our supply is fairly good.

To the general principle of the Act I do not think anybody could take exception. As I have said before the present machinery is inadequate to carry out the Act and if the Government hopes to get results from it it ought to improve the machinery and will have to add quite a number of officials if it is intended to deal with the various candy factories, butterine factories, aerated waters factories and other factories operating here. The men who are to deal with these will certainly have to have some special training and special knowledge to officially inspect them otherwise the inspector would probably be dealing with matters of which he knew nothing and a man who is carrying on his business properly might find himself before the Court under a charge under this Act not because of any defect in the manner of carrying on his business but because the officer in charge did not understand the work for which he was appointed and the business or factory owned by that man might receive great injury or loss. No charge ought to be made unless it had substantial foundation. If a charge be once made even though it is dismissed it very often leaves behind it a great deal of harm and perhaps results in a serious injury to a man's business.

Therefore, I think, that great care would have to be exercised in selecting the officers to enforce the provisions of this Act and if we are going to get the results that we hope for from this Act we ought to put it in operation as soon as possible after it is enacted, otherwise it will be like many other Acts that at present encumber the Statutes and which are not in force and are in everybody's way when looking up our Statute Law. I think that proper machinery ought to be adopted

and this Act put into force as soon as possible.

MR. COAKER—Mr.. Chairman, I would like to say just a word or two on this matter. I had nothing to do with the word 'butter' being put in the Bill, for it was there already. What I contend is that if you are to have a man engaged inspecting butter he will have to give all his time to it. It is no good to have a man in that position unless he is there all the time for, if he is not there, how will you know if good butter is made during his absence? It is hard to get the uniform article and very often in trade you have a tub of butter returned to you as being no good, and you go to one of the companies and get a new one in its place. I do not desire to make any insinuation against the manufacturers but it is our duty to point these things out in this House, and I contend that we should have an Inspector of Butter, who should give his whole time to it.

The hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, took objection to what I said concerning the milk supply of the city. I said nothing whatever as to the quality of the milk which the farmers sell, but what do hon. members know about the milk after it is sold by the farmers? The farmers take good care to sell good milk, for if they do not do so they lose their customers. The rt. hon Prime Minister and others who buy their milk direct from the farmer are very sure of obtaining it good. What I was referring to is shop-keepers who bought milk from the farmers and retailed it, for there is nothing done to see that they keep the milk pure and sell it just as they have received it.

I have never sold milk, for I never had a chance to do so. I made all I could into butter, and the rest I gave to the calves. However, while I never sold any milk, I know something about the milk business, for I gave it a lot of consideration during my stay in Canada. Every gallon of milk there is inspected and has to go through a process. The farmers often bring milk to a butter factory, where it passes through a process of inspection, and unless it is up to a certain grade of fat, the factory will not take it. If it is necessary to have such an inspection in Canada it is necessary for us to have the same as long as we have made up our minds to go into the matter.

I grant that the Government will have a lot of work to do to carry it into effect. If they put down a standard quality, say three per cent. of fat, which is the usual standard, I cannot see why the law cannot be carried into effect. Some farmers can have their milk analyzed at their farms; others at a place which they pass every day; others give their milk to public institutions, and their milk can be examined there. We do not know what kind of milk some of these institutions are receiving. We take it for granted that it is all right, but we should place the matter beyond any possible doubt. That is what we are here to do, and what we should do as effectively as possible. We should give a man power to go into places and shops, where milk is sold, and carry away samples and have it analyzed. If he can only inspect it without analysis, the inspection is not of much use, as anybody who knows anything about milk knows.

I have nothing to say against the milk sold by farmers, but I cannot see why any hon. member cannot come in here and ask for proper reforms to be made, without being accused of making a slur on those in the business. Have your milk inspected not only when it is sold by the far-

mer, but when it is sold in the shops, and then you will be able to correct any mistakes that may be made. By doing so you will be able to protect the farmer and also safeguard the health of the people.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words concerning the Bill now before us. I think it is a step in the right direction, and it should be passed. However, I think that salt beef and pork should be included, for these are largely used by our people. In passing this measure we are merely following in the steps of other countries, and as a matter of fact, the Bill should have been introduced here before.

When I was in New York and Cambridge, I had the pleasure of inspecting the slaughter houses there, and I found that they had an inspector for every department. I do not know if there will be much extra expense involved in carrying the law into effect here, but after the Bill is passed it will be time enough to go into details. The passing of the Bill will be a good thing, if we leave politics out of it. The inspectors should be men of practical experience who know the business. I trust the Bill will be taken up in this spirit, for, if so, it will be a step in the right direction and it should pass.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on the Bill now before the House. I agree with it, for I consider it a good measure, and I would also like to see pork and beef included. I have had some experience in these articles of food, and I have found that whenever I ordered a certain brand, I always obtained what I ordered. Sometimes when the order was made through a broker, I would not obtain the quality that I desired, and I am led to believe that it is only by ordering direct from Armour or Swift or some other packer that you can be sure of obtaining the proper article. That is my experience, extending over thirty years. I have not been a very large buyer; I usually obtained a carload at a time, but I have had experience enough to make me sure of the statement which I have made.

I have also been through the stockyards and packing houses of Swift and Armour, and I must say that I saw nothing there but cleanliness in every department.

With regard to molasses, if you order from the West Indies, Barbadoes or Porto Rico, you are fairly sure to obtain good molasses. I never once failed in this respect. However the cheaper grades cannot be depended upon. While I do not object to inspection of all pork, beef and molasses that come here, I think that special attention ought to be given to small lots that are imported through Boston and New York.

The members of the Opposition seem to be very suspicious of those on this side of the House and they accuse us of being rogues and robbers.

MR. KENT—That is absolutely incorrect.

MR. MOULTON—I have seen it in the papers of the Opposition.

MR. KENT—We cannot be responsible for the papers, but no such statement has been made from this side.

MR. MOULTON—We have been termed rogues and robbers in the 'Advocate.'

MR. COAKER—You made the charge that we accused you in this House.

MR. MOULTON—What I said was not meant as an insult to my hon. friends. I merely say that they are always suspicious of us and all their speeches would lead people to imagine that we did many improper actions.

MR. COAKER—That is very insulting to the members of this side and it is not correct.

MR. MOULTON—The papers of both sides said many unfair things. My hon. friend Mr. Halfyard, spoke of the low tone of the papers during the election campaign.If we sit here and hear insinuations from the other side, you cannct blame us for resenting them. We hear nothing but insinuations from hon. gentlemen opposite, but it should be remembered that because we are on this side it does not follow that all we have to do is to receive money. We are here to help the Government to do what is right. When the Government does what is right, I support it, and not because of anything I may receive. I have not made money, but lost it, through being in politics.

This measure is a good one and I shall support it.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I am not going to allow my hon. friend or anybody else to say that we accused members opposite of being rogues and robbers, when we did not do so. What he has said is uncalled for and insulting to the members on this side of the House. I am quite sure that no party that has ever sat in this House has conducted the debates any fairer than we have. I know that I have been very moderate in view of the way in which I have been assailed. I was attacked in a most bitter and uncalled way a day or two ago by a member of the Executive and now we have been attacked very bitterly and unfairly by an hon. member who I thought was possessed of a little bit of common sense.

I never attacked the hon. member in any way, nor did anybody else on this side of the House. I do not know that he ever got a grab out of the Government, and I really thought he was an honourable man in every way. Now he comes and makes an attack on us, that is unjustifiable, and unfair to every member of the Opposition.

Who talked about the 'Advocate.' It has written what it has written, and it has done its duty. It was the only Opposition paper that was read during the recent campaign, while the whole country was flooded with tons of 'Heralds' and 'News.' I do not think any hon. gentleman should bring the 'Advocate' into the debates.

I know the hon. member for Burgeo is a decent sort of man, and I am surprised that he should come here and make this unfair attack on us. It is true that we have criticized the Government, but we have done so fairly, and we have not made any personal attacks whatever. The Government must expect to be attacked because what else are we here for? You cannot expect fair criticism from the other side of the House. I never said that every member opposite is a rogue and a robber, nor would any member on this side make such a statement. If you wish to accuse us of having said what was improper, make a definite charge so that we shall be in a position to defend ourselves.

I have made statements concerning the 'Earl of Devon,' and I have pointed out certain reports that are made concerning the hospital. These are matters of importance that the people want to know about, and for that reason I have asked for information concerning them. This is the place for us to find out particulars of these matters, unless you wish us to stay here with our mouths shut and our ears closed.

No member of the Government should make the insinuations that have been made here this afternoon. If what the Government does is not

right, we shall continue to criticize them, but I am very sorry that the hon. member should accuse us of making personal attacks, when we have not done so on one single occasion since the House was opened.

MR. MOULTON—What I said was not meant as an insult to members opposite, for what I said was that they are always suspicious of us. I agree that they may not mean in their hearts that we are rogues and robbers, but what they accuse us of doing would lead people to believe that we are. That being the case, we are certainly bound to resent it.

MR. KENT—I do not think that the hon. member for Burgeo has stated fairly the attitude of the Opposition towards the Government during the session of the House. No member opposite who takes into consideration the attitude of the Opposition can deny that we have conducted the debates in a straight, honest and manly way. Our criticsms have always been directed at the policy of the Government, and not at any individual member. I have been here every day, and I have not heard any personal accusations or insinuations thrown across the House. When we last sat here there were more accusations made than there have been during all the sittings of this session.

Whether the hon. member is looking at the reverse side of the picture or not, it is not for me to say, but I can assure him that the Opposition is here to do its duty. We differ in politics from members opposite, but we do so honestly. We have our opinions and certainly any person who is intimate with the debates held in this House since Responsible Government was granted us will admit that the debates this session have been conducted by us as gentlemanly and as courteously as ever before in the history of our Legislature.

I am rather afraid that the sting of some criticisms that were made in the heat of the recent political campaign is still felt by my hon. friend. We must not take too seriously what was said or written when political feeling was running very high for both sides will admit that they made mistakes in their utterances. What was said in a political campaign has absolutely no bearing on what has been said from this side of the House. It is very unfair, therefore, for the hon. gentleman to accuse us of calling hon. members opposite rogues and robbers, for, as I have said, I have been here during every sitting and I have not heard a word spoken that could be construed in that way.

I have known the hon. member for many years and have always found him one of the most courteous of men. For that reason what he says has all the more weight, and it is with much regret that I have listened to the words he has used against the members of the Opposition.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, in his remarks the hon. member for Burgeo referred to me as having spoken of newspapers, but I must remind the House that it was in the course of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister's speech that the first mention of the 'Advocate' was made. I merely replied to his argument that the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, was responsible for a certain matter that was written in it, and I said that it was ridiculous to blame my hon. friend for that article for he had nothing to do with it. It was the Prime Minister who first brought the news papers into the House and anybody who reads the debates will know that this is correct for it must have been taken down by the reporters.

However, I cannot see why the matter should be brought in here at the present time at all for it cer-

tainly has nothing whatever to do with the Bill now before us.

I am in accord with the principle of this Bill and I agree with other hon. gentleman who have said that it should have been brought in long ago. I am especially pleased to know that we shall have inspection of meat and other articles of food, and I am also strongly in favour of pork and salt beef being included. I trust that every section of the Bill will be closely considered for the matter to which it relates is one of much importance to the people.

However, I think we are all stomach and no head for, while we do not look forward to any difficulty in carrying out this Bill to improve our food, we are told that it will be impossible to have compulsory education, which will tend to improve the minds of coming generations, because of the obstacles in the way. Therefore, compulsory education is brushed aside and we take up a measure that promises to build us up physically. While I am in favor of any measure that will improve our bodies I do not think that we should give our attention to our bodies altogether and forget the mental side.

To return to the subject of the newspapers, we state that we think it unfair to misrepresent a statement in the papers. The publication of such misrepresented articles should be prohibited. What has caused the greatest amount of dissatisfaction is the statement which originated in the 'Daily News,' and was afterwards copied by the 'Herald.' It was founded on a letter published in the 'Advocate' during the absence of Mr. Coaker. I was responsible—if anyone—for this letter. I was discussing the educational question. I said among other things that undenominational schools must come. That sentence was cut out and kept for election time, and the cry was raised that we advocated Godless schools. This was done to poison the minds of the electorate in every newspaper in the Colony. Because we refer to that thing, we are said to be suspicious We have a right to be suspicious.

The fishermen would ever look upon the merchants are rogues if the F. P. U. did not mend matters. They are getting a little knowledge of merchants, and of fishermen. Don't think that we are fools altogether, because we are new to the business. We will throw back anything we don't like. Patriotism is the last refuge of scoundrels. Don't think that we will swallow any insults, because we are green horns. We are not educated in the intricacies of party politics as well as are the old hands. We cannot close our eyes to what is going on in the country. Take the Civil Service for instance. We do not find the officials appointed according to their abilities; on the contrary they are appointed because of their political pull, because of their influence with the persons in authority. This question brings to my mind something that the Premier said the other day with reference to a competitive system. He referred to our lack of education, and said that there were Universities in England one thousand years before Newfoundland was discovered. I think he did not mean that. We could have a competitive examination for the Civil Service organized on similiar lines to those of the C.H.E. I think there would be hundreds of applicants from the boys of the outports. Those who have put in a number of years should be rewarded for their long and faithful service.

The only thing that the boys of the outports have to look forward to is to get a smattering of education,

and then come to St. John's and enter as Pupil Teachers. There is no chance of entering the Civil Service.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the 'Advocate' in all its writings did not cause so much bitter feeling and prejudice as that utterance with regard to Godless schools that was enlarged upon in every possible way. The cry of Socialism was also raised. These catch cries were kept up by the 'Herald' for all its worth. I am only defending our position in connection with the 'Advocate.' I had nothing to do with the editorials except in this case, and that was because Mr. Coaker was away.

MR. KENNEDY, (St. John's West). —Mr. Chairman,I have something to say with regard to this Inspection of Foods Bill, and the statement made by a member that $2,000 would be required to carry out this system. I chanced to be a member of the City Council when that matter was brought in, and when Dr. Brehm and Inspector O'Brien were appointed. We knew the conditions and the need of things in St. John's with regard to the handling of milk and other things. You have but to take a walk around and you will see the great improvement in things. Greater care is now taken in the handling of goods. I believe Sir, that this Bill will be of great benefit and I give it my support. I am surprised that the member for Bonavista lost control of himself with regard to my friend, Mr. Moulton. I would like to inform the hon. member that we have heard some serious insinuations coming from the members of the Opposition. We have heard about the shortage in the coal supplies to the light houses; some gentlemen said that they get 180 pounds instead of 224 pounds. We also heard about someone watering the milk. I don't think that this is the case. I think Sir, it is very unjust to make charges like these without giving any proofs that they are true. I don't think it is fair for any man to say that he heard such and such a thing in the streets about a man. We all know that both papers went a little too far during the time of the Elections, your papers as well as ours. My hon. friend, Mr. Halfyard, has hinted that a certain passage which appeared in the 'Herald' was not copied correctly from the 'Advocate.' If that is so, it will be taken back.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That was copied exactly from your paper.

MR. COAKER—It was not.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will produce the paper.

MR. KENNEDY—It was strange that you did not bring an action for libel against the paper, if these things did not appear in the 'Advocate.' I hope now that the members on the Opposition side will be a little more careful in their remarks and not make unfounded charges against members of the Government.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I have heard some things in connection with this Bill that are worthy of commendation. I think that good work is being done by the Inspectors. There were many things that my attention was drawn to in connection with the amendment, in particular number 5. It is well known that when we go up Water Street or any other street we find a number of articles exposed for sale in the windows. In the Summer the doors are always open, and dust is pitching on the things that are exposed. Some firms on Water Street are trying to deal with this matter, and are endeavoring to keep out the flies and the dust of the streets, by having windows closed in at the back. I think that the small shopkeepers should be compelled to do the same

thing. We see such articles as sugar lying uncovered and any amount of flies are pitching about on them. Often these goods are exposed for a whole week or more before sale. When the flies are about, such articles should be removed from the windows. I think it would be necessary to have another clause to govern windows as well as doors; we should protect the foods that are exposed in these windows, if we want to safeguard the health of the city. I trust that the Premier will take notice of this matter and have it remedied.

DR. LLOYD.—I notice in this Act the words used are "fresh fish." In the original Act the words is simply "fish." I think it desirable to leave out the word "fresh." It can at least do no harm.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I think that a good suggestion. Further, I have no objection to the insertion of "pork and salt beef" after the word "meat," as suggested by the hon. member, Mr. Coaker. I do not think it necessary but it will however, put the matter beyond question. I would further suggest the addition of the word "Oleo" after butter and of "molasses" after the word "milk."

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. .Chairman, I would like to suggest the addition of the words "sugar again" after the word milk. It is well recognized that medical offcers qualifying for inspectorships of food must show efficiency in detection of the adulteration of these articles and in analysing them.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman I think that a very good suggestion.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this bill I would like to point out that if an inspector went into a grocery store and saw an article there whose condition would bring the owner under the penalties of this Act and a dispute arose between the owner and the inspector, the question of identification is very likely to come up for the purpose of proof. The owner of the store ought to have some right to seal up the sample of the article taken for the purpose of identification in the same way as was done under the License Act passed here some years ago. If a policeman goes into a beer shop and thinks that some of the beer sold there is being sold contrary to the act, means are provided whereby the owner can place his seal or some other mark on the sample for identification. In the present case with the imperfect machinery in operation it would be well for the owner to have some such protection.

MR. GRIMES.—As to the protection from dust, I think some clause should be inserted in regard to some protection from dust in the windows.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, does it occur to the hon. member that the same thing would apply in the case of shelves. No absolute protection can be invented. We can only protect ourselves to a certain extent. It would be practically impossible to pass an act that would be faultless and also it would be impossible to carry out a detailed act.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman there is no use in going into minutiae. The object of the Act is to see to the proper protection of food stuffs from dirt and dust. We cannot impose strict structural conditions in stores without making the Act oppressive.

With regard to the publication of the rules and regulations in the Gazette I think it would be a good idea if these rules and regulations were to be laid on the table of the House within a certain time of its opening so that we could deal with them in case they were oppressive.

I might also say that I think this Act should not come into force before

a fixed date. As will be noticed by perusal of the Act in many instances structural changes will have to be made and to bring the Act into immediate operation might be oppressive on those who have factories and stores.

Another matter that I wish to refer to is the appointment of officers. I notice in the first section that the medical health officer and all other officers are appointed by the Governor in Council. I submit that no officer should be appointed by the Governor in Council to carry out this Act until he has got a certificate from the Medical Health Officer. It would be unfair to the business community of St. John's to allow incompetent men to carry out such a delicate mission. And if the Medical Health Officer is the man I know he is,a man who thoroughly understands his business he is not going to give a certificate to incompetent men. So that a certificate from Dr. Brehm should be a sine qua non to the obtaining of the certificate.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—In relation Mr. Chairman to the amendments proposed by the hon. member I think they all make for the improvement of the Act. As regards the rules and regulations these of course will have to be made from time to time and I daresay it would be good to have a copy laid on the table of the House so that members may be able to discuss them and suggest amendments.

I think also that the suggestion he made that structural alterations may be necessary in factories and stores is quite correct and it would be advisable to insert a clause bringing the Act into force six months hence.

As to the appointment of inspectors I am quite prepared to accept his suggestions that they be appointed only on the certificate of the Chief Medical Officer. I also consider his suggestion as to taking samples a good one.

The sections will have to be carefully prepared and I shall have time to draft them to-night and have them ready by to-morrow. Meanwhile I move that the Committee rise and report having made some progress and ask leave to sit again to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

It is ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

It is ordered that the remaining Orders of the Day stand deferred.

MR. COAKER gave notice of question.

MR. STONE gave notice of question.

MR. JENNINGS gave notice of question.

MR. TARGETT gave notice of question.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS tabled the returns asked for by Mr. Stone re the expenditure of special grants at New Perlican and also the returns asked for by Mr. Stone regarding British Harbor.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER gave notice of motion for Monday next.

It is ordered that when the House rise it do adjourn until to-morrow at three of the clock.

The House adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY Feb. 6th, 1914.

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

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS tabled the following statements:

Statement of Customs Revenue collected in the Colony during the year ended 30th June, 1913.

Statement of the Imports and Exports of the Colony for the year ended 30th June 1913.

A Comparative Statement of goods, wares and merchandise, imported into the Colony during the years ended 30th June, 1912, and 30th June 1913, showing the increase and decrease for the year 1912-13.

A comparative statement of Revenue received at each of the Outports for the years 1911-12 and 1912-13.

A comparative statement of Light dues showing collection at each outport for the years 1911-12 and 1912-13.

A return of the Bank Fishery for the year 1913.

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

A statement showing the movements of Shipping during the year ended 30th June, 1913.

An abstract of Shipping for the year ended 31st December, 1913.

Also the answer to question asked by Mr. Clift on Tuesday, February 3rd.

QUESTIONS.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing amount paid on account of Squid Tickle and St. Chad's to Point Bonavista forest fires, which occurred in the spring of 1912, and to whom paid, as no account for much of the expenditure appears in the usual grants for "Forest Fires."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, that statement will be tabled next sitting.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Minister of Justice to lay upon the table of the House a statement of $7,197.05 as expenses in Commercial Cable Company versus the Government.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table that statement.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the number receiving the Old Age Pension in the District of Trinity to date.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, that statement is being copied. Will have it to-morrow.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement showing all moneys, both ordinary and special, expended on main line road, account of Carbonear District, from July 1st, 1913 to date, together with the names of those by whom said money was expended.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, that statement is in course of preparation.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay upon the table of the House a statement, in detail, giving the number of Agricultural Societies established in the District of Bonavista up to the end of 1913; also, amount of live stock and seeds of different kinds distributed, and cash grants allocated, for the last fiscal year, with account of distribution and expenditure.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I hope to have that statement furnished at next sitting.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House copies of returns of all monies allocated by his department on account of Public Wharf, Hant's Harbor, from 1909 up to date and to whom such monies were sent.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, that statement will be furnished at next sitting.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table

of the House the names of all widows and orphans in Hant's Harbor who received amounts as Poor Relief in the years 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913, and what amount was given to each.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker in reply to the hon. member I may say that this information is being prepared. I may have it this afternoon; if not on Monday.

PATENT BILL.

Third reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend Chapter 109 of the Consolidated Statutes respecting Patents."

On motion this bill was read a third time.

On motion this Bill passed and was ordered to be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking their concurrence therein.

ALIENS BILL.

Third reading of Bill "An Act to Amend 6, Edward VII., Cap. 3, entitled The Alien's Act, 1906."

On motion the Bill was read a third time.

On motion the Bill passed and was ordered to be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking their concurrence therein.

ADVERTISEMENTS BILL.

On motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Exhibition of Advertisements."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman since the second reading of this Bill I have inserted a section giving the Municipal Council power to make rules for regulating, restricting and preventing the exhibition of advertisements within a radius of five miles of St. John's and the Governor in Council may make similar rules for all places outside those limits.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments.

The Bill was then read a third time and ordered to be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking their concurrence in the same.

DENTAL BILL.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill further to amend the Newfoundland Dental Act."

RT HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have already pointed out the object of this Bill and I now lay on the table of the House the correspondence dealing with the request for the amendment. The amendment asked for is merely verbal and is as follows:

(1)—Section 1 of the Act 3, George V, Chapter 3, entitled "An Act to amend the Newfoundland Dental Act" is hereby amended by substituting in lieu of the words "(d) possesses a diploma entitling him to examination with a view to admission to practise as a Dentist by the General Medical Council of Great Britain," the words "(d) possesses a diploma entitling him to registration as a Dentist by the General Medical Council of the United Kingdom."

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

On motion the Bill was read a third time and ordered to be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking their concurrence therein.

PROTECTION OF ANIMALS BILL.

On motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the law for Protection of Animals."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I explained the principle of this Bill on its second reading. Since then I have received a communication from the Secretary of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals which I will read to the Committee.

(Rt. Hon. Prime Minister then read a letter from the Hon. Secretary of the Society for Protection of Animals forwarding a letter sent to the So-

ciety by the Truckmen's Protective Union. The Union requested that boys under 18 be not allowed to drive horses for hire in the city of St. John's, on the grounds that it was dangerous to the public and interferred with the employment of competent men. The Society endorsed the request on the additional ground that lads were inclined to carelessness and cruelty in driving horses, and submitted a draft section accordingly.)

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— This is the suggested section:

It shall be unlawful for any person under the full age of eighteen years to drive or use for payment, hire or reward, whether direct or indirect, any carriage, cart, truck, express waggon, sleigh, slide, catamaran or other horse-drawn vehicle plying for hire or for any commercial purpose within the limits of the city of St. John's; and any person under eighteen contravening the provisions of this section or any person paying, hiring, employing or rewarding such person, shall upon consideration thereof forfeit and pay for every offence a sum not exceeding ten dollars. Provided that this section shall not apply to farmers fishermen or other persons resident outside and not habitually employed inside the said city limits and entering the same temporarily for some bona fide purpose connected with their avocations."

I submit that to the Committee for their consideration. I think it is hardly germane to the Act and would be more appropriate in the regulations of the Municipal Council in relation to the issuing of licenses. However, if the Committee see no objection to the principle it might be placed in the Bill later.

There is another matter I should like to inform the Committee on in relation to this Act. It will be remembered that one section relates to the using of small dogs. I have received the following communcation from the Society with relation to the weight of dogs.

St. Bernard—160 to 210 lbs.
Mastiff—160 to 200 lbs.
Newfoundland—110 to 150 lbs.
Labrador Retriever—70 to 100 lbs.
Pointer—45 to 60 lbs.
Eskimo—70 lbs.
Bloodhound—80 to 110 lbs.
Irish Wolfhound—Up to 148 lbs.
Deerhound—80 to 110 lbs.
Collie—40 to 65 lbs.
Greyhound—55 to 65 lbs.
Bull Dog—45 to 50 lbs.
Bull Terrier—40 lbs.
Boston Terrier—23 to 30 lbs.
Fox Terrier—20 lbs.
Dachshund—20 lbs.
Irish Terrier—22 to 24 lbs.
Scotch Terrier—15 to 30 lbs.

That would exclude all smaller dogs from being harnessed up.

I may say a word in explanation of the provisions of this Bill. Section 1, Sub sections (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) are taken from the Imperial Act of 1911, Cap. 27. A few additional words are inserted in subsection A from our own present law, Con. Statutes 1892, Chapter 69 and the United States Statutes and subsections have been added, (f) as to docking and (g) as to conniving at offences of cruelty. Docking is not legal in England under the Act. The section as to connivance comes from Australia.

Section 2—This follows the Imperial Act; the word Court is altered to Stipendiary Magistrate; and it is modified to local conditions.

Section 4—This section is from the Imperial Act verbatim and is closely similar to the present Newfoundland law.

Section 5—That is Section 9 of the Imperial Act slightly modified and permits the using of small dogs for small weights or for the use of children and ordinary dogs for general use. The only question there is whether

the Committee approve the thirty pound limit; whether that is not excluding too many. It will permit the use of large dogs and exclude only the very small ones. I do not think that will work injury to anyone.

Section 6—That Section is practically from the Imperial Act and also from the Newfoundland Act 5, Edward VII. Cap. 15 and there are several precedents in the United States legislation.

Section 7—Subsection 1 of Section 7 is from the Imperial Act, Section 12 and is practically a verbatim copy of our own law, Section 5, Cap. 69. Subsection 2 is the same as our present law.

MR. F. J. MORRIS.—With reference to Section 7, although it has already passed I would like to ask the Committee if they do not think if it is not giving a Constable too much authority altogether in authorizing him to apprehend and arrest any person whom he has reason to believe is guilty of an offence under this Act or on information which he has received from anybody else. I think that that is almost too much power to give to a policeman. If he sees cruelty going on he might be allowed to do this but if he does not he may exercise his own belief and without any warrant or any authority but his own belief he may make the arrest. Well if somebody comes to him with a story which may or may not be correct he has power to make the arrest. I do not think that he should be given an authority of that kind. I think a deposition should be made if the policeman does not see the offence committed himself and if a third party makes the move in the matter he should make the deposition state the case and have a warrant or some other proceedings issued. I think that it is too much authority to give a policeman the power to arrest on a mere suspicion under this Act. He need not justify his belief either.

MR. KENT.—I agree with the hon. member for Placentia and I think it would be a mistake to give such unlimited authority to the police in the matter of making arrests. I think it might be altered to cover offences of a kind that are more serious and where he actually sees the cruelty committed he might be given the power to arrest but to give him the power to arrest merely because he has reason to believe or in other words that he has a suspicion, is going too far. There may be no offence at all and this procedure is contrary to the whole spirit of our law to give authority to arrest unless on a sworn deposition. It is done in certain cases where the offence committed is of a more serious character. But these are the most serious crimes against society as a whole. I think it this power under the Act were limited to cases where the constable actually saw the cruelty committed it would be improved.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—As I pointed out this is the law as copied from the Imperial Act dealing with the matter, and after all that is a safe guide for us,and in addition to that it has been the present law of this country for a number of years; 1892, Section 5, Chapter 69, Cons. Statues, is as follows:

"When, and so often as any of the offences aganst the provisions of this chapter shall happen it shall and may be lawful for any constable, upon his own view thereof, or upon the complaint and information of any other person who shall declare his or her place of abode to the said constable, without further authority or warrant to arrest such offender and provide for his appearance before a Justice of the Peace, to be dealt with by such Justice under the authority of this chapter."

The working of that Act has not caused any inconvenience. At any rate the class of persons whom this Act affects are not likely to advertise what they are going to do. It is very hard for constables to be everywhere and, therefore, when information is given by a responsible person, the constable will act upon it.

MR. F. J. MORRIS.—Mr. Chairman, I submit that this section gives the constable too much authority. In the former Act he dealt with cases that came under his own view but under the present section he has power to arrest merely on the information of another party. He may arrest me tomorrow merely because he has an idea or a suspicion that I have been cruel to an animal and perhaps merely because he has a spleen or a personal grudge against me. I do not suggest that such motives operate on the minds of policemen in the discharge of their duty but we are here to protect the public against any possible contingency. It is too much authority to give a policeman when he can lock up a man on suspicion for the accused has no opportunity of defending himself until he appears before the Magistrate the next morning, after having spent the night in a cell. This is against all the principles of justice.

It is an entirely different case if the matter comes under his personal notice or if he goes to the magistrate and has a warrant issued.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, I think that the point taken by my learned friend, Mr. Morris, is well founded except that under the present law a constable has the power without information or complaint being laid in the legal sense to take the steps which this section permits him to take. This section is really an improvement on the present law as far as the question of leniency is concerned because it provides concerning those offences only which are punishable by imprisonment without the option of a fine. No matter how the constable obtains his information he cannot arrest without a warrant unless the case is a very serious breach of the law.

If we are to have a Bill for the purpose of preventing cruelty to animals we must take care that there is some scope allowed by the Act whereby those who are guilty of downright cruelty can be dealt with immedintely and on the spot. Under the present section if an act of cruelty is done when the constable is not present the matter will be reported to him and he will go and stop the cruelty. This after all is the real object of the Act.

Furthermore as far as this section is concerned any man who suffers injustice has his remedy for if he is treated wrongfully, he has a right of action for malicious prosecution or wrongful arrest. I cannot see that the section is a departure from the present law although it might appear to be so.

I would go so far as to say that it is an improvement on the present law as far as cases of cruelty of a pronounced kind are concerned for the constable has the power to arrest the guilty party and that is the only way in which cases of this kind can be dealt with effectively. For these reasons I would suggest that my learned friend will consider that the position taken by the framers of the Act is a wise one.

MR. KENT.—I should like to say just a word concerning this section. I think the present law is much better than that outlined in the Bill. Of course every offence is punishable without the option of a fine at the discretion of the Magistrate no matter how serious or slight the cruelty may be. If a party gives a policeman his name and address then let him

act on such information as he may receive. After all, we want to prevent cruelty as much as possible. At the same time I do not think we ought to outrage any of the fundamental principles of justice by giving a policeman practically unlimited authority to arrest. It would be unwise to do so. If the policeman on his own view or on the evidence of any person, who will back him up, arrests a man he has some authority behind him for doing so.

A policeman may act impulsively if he is informed of cruelty but under the present law the party making the information has to enter a complaint. If a person suffers wrong he will have his remedy. As the law is at present with respect to this matter it is better than the law suggested in the section under discussion.

MR. HIGGINS.—As I read the section it means that the constable must either see the cruelty himself or he must be informed of it by some other person. The effect of this is that to all intents and purposes the present Act is re-enacted.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, I would have no objection to the present law being re-enacted but the proposed section is not altogether on the same lines as the present law. Under the new section a person informing the constable has not to give his name and address or make a complaint, as it is usually understood. He merely informs the constable who acts in a bona fide manner and makes the arrest. The person against whom the complaint is made to the constable may suffer wrong through this and in the meantime the man who made the complaint may not be able to be found.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I am quite satisfied to make any amendment that the Committee may desire to have made.

MR. KENT moved as an amendment: That the wording of Section 5 of the Consolidated Statutes, 1892, Cap. 69, be substituted for the section now under discussion.

The amendment was carried.

MR. KENT.—As to the proposed section with reference to boys under 18, it is quite possible that there may be some differences of opinion as to whether the age is too high. It is very hard to tell by appearance the age of a boy between 16 and 20. As the Section here stands, it is not the apparent age, but the actual age of the boy driving the conveyance. But I am not discussing the question now, because I think that the proper place for that provision is in the Municipal Act. We are informed that it is very likely that we will have an Amending Act. I saw by the papers that the City Council proposed to have some changes made in the Act, and perhaps it would be better to deal with the matter then.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition in that respect. I think it is a matter that wants some consideration. There are many shopkeepers who have adopted the system of delivering their parcels in carts drawn by ponies. The nature of their business does not permit them to pay a very large wage to a man. I think that a boy who is competent is well able to take charge of a pony and a small delivery waggon. I think that the care of a horse and wagon should be in the hands of some responsible and reliable person We have often seen youths driving recklessly to the danger of the lives of the citizens This is often due to their being the sons of cabmen and through their being made use of regardless of their ages I think that a law prohibiting this would be welcome to the citizens. I repeat that I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that this is more a Municipal matter than a

Government one, and as there is every likelihood of an Act to amend the Municipal Act being introduced before long I think it had better be left till then.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr. Chairman, I think that such a measure should come under the powers of the Municipal Council. At present no person can drive for hire without a license. That license might be accompanied by certain restrictions as to the age of the driver and the work of the horse, etc. I think it would be much better if it came as a Municipal section, because then the party applying for a license would need to give particulars of the work in which the horse is to be engaged.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, as the leader of the Opposition has said after all it is only a matter of the age of the drivers of the horses. Since the Municipal Council get the revenue from the licenses I think they are the people to deal with the question.

DR. LLOYD.—I might say that I concur with the views that have been expressed with regard to this matter.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I agree with what has been said in reation to this matter and I think that the proper place for it is in the Municipal Act.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the Bill with some amendments.

The Report was received and adopted and the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

INSPECTION OF FOODS BILL

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the inspection of Foods in St. John's."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—There are two or three amendments which are worthy of consideration. The first is in relation to the tabling of the Rules and Regulations made under Stction 9; I propose an amendment to the effect that a copy of all such rules and regulations should be laid before the Legislature in the first week of the next session after they are made. Then there is a new Section dealing with the qualifications of officers to be appointed under the Act. Providing that no person shall be appointed until certified as competent by the Medical Health Officer. A new Section, Number 12, has been introduced in order to give sufficient notice of the coming into force of this Act, providing that this Act shall come into force on a date to be fixed by a proclamation of the Governor in Council. It will give six months notice or so. There is another amendment proposed to which I have given a good deal of thought, and I think it would be very desirable to bring in an amendment that would govern the whole Act. That was in relation to the taking of samples of the goods that the officer proposed to seize. That would come in after Section 1 and would provide for the marking of the sample taken by the person from whom it was taken, or the retention by him of a portion of the sample. But it seems to me that in a good many cases, such as for instance, fresh meat or similar articles, which deteriorate very rapidly, such a system would be of little use.

If the inspector had to divide the sample with the person from whom it was taken it would be difficult to do it in those cases because as a rule a complete change takes place from the it is removed until the time the

analysis takes place. It would be of no value. If a portion of salt meat was taken to-day and put away it would perhaps be the same in 10 days; but during the same interval a portion of fresh meat would greatly deteriorate and would be of no value as evidence because it might have completely changed. I am afraid it would be very difficult to frame a section that would meet in any way the point raised by my friend. I have no objection if it can be done; but there is such a very great difference between taking a sample of an article like spirits which does not deteriorate as regards the percentage of alcohol and bodies which can easily deteriorate for certain reason and under certain con ditions. Take for instance a portion of salmon. Such an article might be alright to-day but in 48 or 60 hours might have become an entirely different article.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman I agree with a portion of what the Prime Minister has said in reference to this Act. It is not possible to make it govern the whole of the articles mentioned in Clause 1. What I would suggest is to consult the English Adulteration of Foods Act, where it is the custom in regard to quite a number of goods to take samples, divide them into 3 parts and seal them up—something after the practice of the Licensing Act. What we would suggest then is that we defer consideration until the next meeting of the House and consider in the neantime what is done in similar Food Acts in other countries. There are many articles of which samples might be taken, for instance ordinary bread, flour and a number of other articles that are not subject to rapid deterioration.

Under the English Licensing Act, the officer must divide the sample of liquor into 3 parts and have them sealed up. He must then give the seller one portion and keep one himself for comparison. The third portion he must submit to the analyst. There is no difficulty in carrying out that section, but the difficulty would be in applying such a section to a food like fish or fresh meat, especially in warm weather when deterioration might take place before the matter was adjudicated upon.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I have no objections to the suggestions of the hon. member. Our object is to make the Bill as perfect and as popular as possible. I shall ask the committee to rise and report progress, and in the meantime I shall have an opportunity to look up the English Act.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the Prime Minister that when I drew attention to this matter I specially mentioned those articles. I think it is absurd to apply this method of taking samples and sealing them up to such things as fresh fish and fresh meat; but such articles as flour and bread could be quite easily brought under this method. I think that probably the best course is to consult the English Adulteration of Foods Act. My recollection is that it is the same as our Licensing Act.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, in discussing this matter yesterday, some remarks were made in connection with the "Advocate." The Premier stated that he would lay upon the table of the House a paper in connection with the statement made yesterday.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I have that paper here. The discussion arose in relation to a statement that was published in the Herald last August. It was brought up by Mr. Halfyard. The hon. member has the quotation and it would be more correct to read from that. His point was that the quotation was not the same as had been published in the "Advocate." My point was that the

wording was practically the same. The wording in the Herald was:

"From your earnings Bishops, "Priests and Ministers derive their in- "come. You are five to one yet you "have always permitted the one to do "with you as it liked. Take the pow- "er that lies dormant in you and shake "off these rascals as you would a dog "found worrying sheep, etc.

These are the words published by the "Herald" and he claimed that that was not the correct copy of what had originally been written in the "Advocate". Now I have the original paper and I think it will be found that they are practically the same. The words are taken from the "Fishermen's Advocate" of Feb. 5th, 1910. This is the whole article. I will read the whole of it. The hon member would I feel sure like to hear it all: ,

"This country has been maintained always by you. You pay the salaries of the hosts of employees at St. John's and in the outports. From your earnings, Bishops, Priests, Ministers, Doctros, Lawyers, Politicians, Bookkeeperss, Storekeepers, Clerks, tradesmen of all description derive their incomes. You are five to one, yet you have always permitted the one to do with you as it would. Out of the 50,000 voters in the Colony, you number 40,000. Why then do you permit the 10,000 to handle you as though you were something or nothing. Be men, you have been fools long enough. Take the power lying dormant in you and shake these rascals who now control you as you would a dog if discovered killing sheep."

It will be found that the whole quotation is taken verbatim. The hon. member shakes his head but I put it to the Committee whether the words are not the same as quoted here. As a matter of fact in a large type article in the "Advocate" of Aug. 30, 1913 both articles are put side by side and they are a significant comparison. The Editor puts in the "Herald's" article as if it were a misquotation and then side by side with it he puts the correct article. The only point in which a difference lies is in the fact that the "Herald" did not quote the whole article. This is merely a quotation from an article and a correct quotation. That is what the hon. member asked for and I produced it. The quotation is correct.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Prime Minister was not manly enough to say that the "Herald" had quoted something from the "Advocate" and had left out important parts of the quotation that would have impressed the reader. But he actually gets on his feet and justifies what the paper said when any fair and reasonable man who compares the two articles knows that what the "Herald" said was false and untrue. That article was written on a very stormy night in Twillingate and little did I think at that time that it would become the subject of discussion in the House of Assembly. I am very pleased with that little article. I am proud of it. If it was sent broadcast through the country there is not one man but would say it was fair and just. It speaks well for my friend, the member for Placentia. I had followed his speeches up to that time and I knew he was a fair and reasonable man. I hope he will now back me up and see I get fair play. I am sorry that Capt. W. C. Winsor is not here because he would agree with me. But I suppose I am to blame for his absence. The quotation from the "Herald" says that the "Advocate" had published these words:

"From your earnings, bishops, priests and ministers derive their income. You are five to one, yet you have always permitted the one to do with you as it liked. Take the power lying dormant in you and shake off those rascals as you would a dog

found killing sheep. They are all

your enemies."

What was really said was as follows:

"This country has been maintained always by you. You pay the salaries of the host of employees at St. John's and in the outports. From your earnings, bishops, priests, ministers doctors, lawyers, politicians, bookkeepers, clerks, tradesmen of all descriptions derive their incomes. You are five to one, yet you have always permitted the one to do with you as it would. Out of 50,000 voters in the Colony you number 40,000. Why then do you permit the 10,000 to handle you as though you were something or nothing? Be men, you have been fools long enough. Take the power lying dormant in you and shake off these rascals who now control you as you would a dog if discovered killing a sheep."

Now who will deny all this? No one. It is not because reference is made to bishops and clergy that I meant them to be shaken off like dogs killing sheep. I am a member of the Church of England. I have a bishop. I do not say that he is entirely dependent for his income upon the people of this country. He gets a great deal from foreign societies. But he does get a great deal from local sources and the Catholic bishops are I think entirely dependent upon the people of this country for their income. The article then goes on to say:

"Out of fifty thousand voters in the Colony you number 40,000. Why then do you permit the 10,000 to handle you as if you were something or nothing?"

That is all left out. He did not trouble to put that in. He left it out and simply took here and there what would injure me. He makes out that I believe that bishops, priests and ministers should be shot or killed as you would a dog after sheep. No such thing was intended and nothing of the kind was said. I do not care what was said in those articles. There is no one who has more respect for clergymen than I have and no man with more respect for religion. I am a most religious man. I have been President of the F.P.U. for five years and if the Archangel Gabriel were to come down and examine every action of mine during that period he would certainly say: "You have certainly done well Coaker. Your services have been well performed. Keep on." There is not a single act of mine during the last five years which I would be ashamed for any man to see. It is not that I think anyone cannot say the same but I say it in justification for myself. I am a most religious man. As the Hon. Colonial Secretary knows, I received my religious instruction at St. Mary's Church with him under the instruction of the late Rev. Archdeacon Botwood and I can certainly say that from that day to this I have never been under a better influence than his. As a boy I was associated with him. For years I was prominent at St. Mary's with him. That certainly shows that I was religiously brought up in the principles of the Church of England.

I ask why these words were left out. I want to impress upon the public that I had no object such as to lay hands on the clegy. The "Herald" wanted to say I did. That I was an anarchist. An article was published in the "Daily News" that I was an anarchist. I was going for the clergy. I ask anyone to point to a word in the article and show that it is a reflection on the clergy. Everyone of them gets his salary from the fishermen. No one could live in the country were it not for them. We would have no Harmsworth, no Reid, nothing at all were it not for the fishermen.

The rascals who controlled the fishermen are the men who were in this Assembly. These are the men who

were to be shaken off as you would a dog killing sheep. The object of the "Herald" was to make out that Coaker was a bad fellow. Coaker is an anarchist. Coaker wants to do away with the clergy.

The man in the "Daily News" is even worse than the man in the "Herald" because the Herald does put in a few words. That is how I was represented. Now the members of this House and those that attend its sittings know that I am a decent kind of fellow but those who do not know me would be led to believe that I am the greatest rascal that ever walked in shoe leather. I want to set myself right in this matter and I hope that in future no more misquotation of this kind will be permitted. If you want to quote from the "Advocate" do it honestly. Let the people judge the true words. Then they will know right from wrong and make ther own deductions. I hope the Prime Minister will see that when the Hon. Mr. McGrath quotes from the "Advocate" that he will do it properly. The 'Advocate' is getting better. That poor little 8 x 10 little four-page thing is going to be issued tomorrow in twenty pages. It will be the delight of 20.000 fishermen who would not do without the "Advocate" even if they had to miss their meals. When the mail comes in you see all the people rushing to the post office to get the "Advocate" to get the news. And no wonder. Has it not done good work. Is it not the greatest paper in the country. Send it north, south, east and west and you will hear nothing but praise of it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman just one word in reply. I have no fault to find with the hon. member in defending the position of the "Advocate" but I am not prepared to accept the statement as to his great work although I admit that he has done good work. We differ as to its magnitude. "Let him boast who takes his armor off." I suggest this as a headline to the hon. member. I do not admit that the hon. member has done what he claims to have done nor do I admit that the "Advocate" has accomplished the wonders that he claims for it. Under the circumstances I think the hon. member has accomplished very little. Let me tell him what he has accomplished. Now take the districts up north. In these districts there are 32000 voters. And in these union districts 15,000 voters voted for the members of the union party. There were Union candidates placed in the Districts of St. Barbe Fogo, Twillingate, Bonavista, Trinity, Carbonear, Harbor Grace, Port de Grave and Bay de Verde.

MR. COAKER.—Not in Carbonear.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The hon. gentleman says there was no Union candidate in Carbonear. Well, does he know who nominated the candidate there?

MR. COAKER.—I don't know.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well, the hon. member ought to know. I submit there was a Union candidate in Carbonear. But the point I want o make is this: In the districts which I have named there were 15,000 votes registered for the Union and Liberal candidates. It is indifferent to my argument whether these votes were Union or Liberal; what I want to point out is that out of the 32,000 registered voters in these districts, only 15,000 voted for these candidates.

MR. COAKER.—How many were away?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—My hon. friend does not pay any compliment to his intelligence when he asks a question like that. Out of the 32,000 voters in those districts he was only able to secure 15,000. But that is not all. What I want to point out is this: That nearly half of that 15,000, certainly one-third, represents

the Liberal vote. My hon. friend must admit that if Sir Robert Bond had stood as a Liberal in the district of Twillingate he would have got a certain number of votes.

MR. COAKER.—Yes.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—How many?

MR. COAKER.—1500.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well, then, let us say 1500 from the 3,400 he received. Say a third. That brings his 15,000 down to 10,000. Now, where are the other 8,000 that we have heard so much about. In other words, it comes down to this, that in these districts there are 32,000 votes altogether. Out of that number my hon. friend has been able to get 10,000 —not one-third. If the Liberal Party had not gone in with my hon. friend —if Sir Robert Bond had led a Liberal Party to the country and had put Liberal candidates down in the district of Twillingate, how many votes would my hon. friend have received there?

MR. COAKER.—Enough to elect us.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well, that is your opinion. But you have admitted that Sir Robert Bond would at least have got a third of the vote. Do you allow that the Liberal member for St. Barbe would have got a third of the vote there? And that the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, would have got a third of the vote down there?

MR. COAKER.—He would not have gone there at all.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well now, I think he would have gone.

DR. LLOYD.—I would not have gone.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That would have shown the hon. member's good sense. But some other Liberal member would have gone there. My point is that if it had been a three-cornered fight in Trinity district the 2,000 Liberals that were there in 1908 would not have been entirely wiped out. And the same is true of Harbor Grace. Will anyone contend that if a Liberal team had gone there headed by Captain Dawe, one of the best type of representatives we have ever had in this House, they would not have got some support? The same is true of the other districts, and it amounts to this: That out of the 32,-000 voters in the Union districts, represented now by the hon. members on the other side of the House, not one-third voted for Union candidates. Why, take Bay de Verde. That was one of the strongest districts for Unionism.

MR. COAKER.—One of the weakest.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It was one of the districts which my hon. friend relied on most, and we divided with him there. He got a man and we got a man. Then he put up three men in Harbor Grace. Dr. Mosdell went over with an imprimatur as editor of the "Fishermen's Advocate," and was snowed under with his two colleagues. The same thing occurred at Carbonear, where our candidate had to fight Liberalism, Unionism and every other ism, and we won there. Then, what has the 'Advocate" accomplished? To hear my hon. friend talk one would imagine that everything alive north of St. John's was in favor of the "Advocate" and in favour of him and his Union. Now I don't agree with that, and I think that when the public reflects on the figures which I have put before the Committee they will see things in a very different light. I have got to tell the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, through you, that four years from now it will be very dfferent in a great many of these districts and some of those who went to the polls at the last election as Union followers and supported Union candidates will act very differently.

MR. COAKER.—Not at all.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The hon. member knows of some already;

and if he doesn't I do, and if he likes I will give him their names.

MR. COAKER.—You might give me the names of some who have been expelled from the Union.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Expelled for what?

MR. COAKER.—Because they did not vote for Union candidates.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Exactly. I could have no better evidence than that British subjects and Newfoundlanders have been expelled from the Union because they voted in a particular way. "I thank thee Jew, for teaching me that word." I want no better proof, no better evidence to sustain my contention that many of those who followed the hon. member to the polls on last polling day will not follow him four years from now.

The point I want to establish here is in relation to the proportion of those 32,000 voters north who supported his Party at the last election. He admits that one-third of the vote in Twillingate would have gone Liberal if Sir Robert Bond had led a Liberal team; but I am not prepared to admit that only one-third would have followed Sir Robert Bond. It would be a sorry day for Newfoundland or for any other country if after thirty-five years of good service he could not have gone down to his district and got more than one-third of the votes down there; because although I and others may have differed from him upon matters of principle no one has ever questioned the industry of the man or the good work that he put in during 35 years. What is true of Twillingate is also true of Bonavista. On polling day in Bonavista town and all over that district there were three classes of people: Those who supported the Government pure and simple; those who supported the Union; and those who were Liberals and voted for the Union Party because that Party and the Liberals were together. Why, there were thousands of men in this country who voted for the hon. member because Sir Robert Bond was leading him; and the reason why Sir Robert Bond was asked to lead him was to add the influence and weight of the Liberal Party. The hon. member has accomplished, according to his own statement, wonders, and the "Advocate," we are told, is coming out tomorrow in an entirely new garb. Well, I have no objection to its coming out, and the longer it comes out, and the oftener it comes out, and the more there is in it, the better it will be for the Government.

Now, the hon. member regretted that I was not manly enough to admit the discrepancy between the quotation in the "Herald" and the original article in the "Advocate." He is claiming here that every editor or person connected with a paper who quotes from an article must quote the whole article.

MR. COAKER.—I didn't say any such thing. I said he should have quoted the whole sentence.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The fact is that the hon. member regrets now having written this article.

Now, as to the religious character of the hon. member while he may think it necessary to tell us to-night all about himself—give us a sort of Apologia Pro Vita Sua—personally, I require no proof in that direction, as I have always regarded him as an exemplary man. I am sorry to have to admit that I would hesitate to subject myself to the severe scrutiny which he has offered, namely, that the Angel Gabriel might come down and go over his actions for the last five years. I leave it to himself to say as to whether, if there was anything objectionable in the articles of the "Herald" or the "Daily News," there has not been a great deal of aggravaton on the other side. I have not

quoted anything that has been said by the "Evening Telegram" or the "Advocate," although at times I have seen some extraordinarily peculiar articles in both these papers regarding myself and others; but I don't give those things very much attention; the only thing I am afraid of is that they will stop writing about me.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Chairman, as this matter has been brought up again—it was on here last evening—I would like to say a few words in explanation. Yesterday afternoon, in speaking, I charged the Opposition with being suspicious and with throwing insinuations across the floors of the House, and I went on to say that the "Advocate" had termed us rogues, robbers, grafters and everything that was bad. Now, by the Opposition I did not mean the front row, the Liberals.

I have nothing to say with regard to the Union. I think it is quite right for the fishermen to band themselves together to look out for their rights; but I do not think it right for the Union to condemn all those who are not members of it and to say that they are robbers and rogues. Now, if the "underdogs," as they are called, were depending upon the Union for supplies in the spring of the year to enable them to prosecute the fishery, they would not get them; that is what I understand, that the Union Trading Co. would not give supplies. As I have said, I have no fault to find with it as a Union, but I do protest against its being used as a political machine by the fishermen of this country to try and control the Government. As far as I can see, according to the "Advocate," the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, wants to set himself up as a dictator to the whole of this country. Now, there have been some very hard things said in that paper. One of the headlines in the issue which I have here says: "Hard Row in the House Last Evening." The row was that I stated that members of the Opposition were suspicious and were throwing insinuations across the floors of the House. There was nothing very dreadful or wonderful in that. I cannot say that I am such an exemplary character as Mr. Coaker says he is. This article says: "Mr. Moulton was seen to read a note passed him five minutes before he rose to speak. Probably the offensive words had not been spoken if that note had not been written." Sir Edward Morris passed me that note, and it had no reference whatever to the matter before the chair. It referred to the bill which is to be brought before the House on the 16th. Mr. Coaker professes to be a good man who would not do anything wrong. Now, I dare say the hon. member remembers last year my coming to his office. While coming in from Burgeo I looked at the "Advocate" and in it I saw an article referring to where the moneys go and in it I was quoted as having received $1,000 (it did not say what for) and contracts enough to satisfy me. As I did not have very much to do then and would be glad of some of those contracts as up to that time I had not received any, I went and saw Mr. Coaker and spoke to him about the matter. He said: "I did not intend to say anything about it." I had received $1,000 for my sessional pay, $200 a year for five years' service, but that article did not mention anything about sessional pay. It made out that I had got $1,000 for something and contracts enough to satisfy me. He promised at the time to make it all right, but two months afterwards the same thing was published again. Now, that is not bad for a religious man such as he claims to be. I do not claim to be a religious man, but I would not do such a thing as that. This is my tenth session in the House, and there is not a man here, or in

the city, or in the country, that can say I ever insulted him on the floors of this House; and further, I do not intend to take any personal insult from any man, either on the floors of this House or outside it. Every member of Mr. Coaker's party, with one exception, have made statements here to the effect that we were doing something wrong, and that we are banded together by a golden chain. Well. I do not want to blow my own trumpet, but I want to say that I have never received anything from the Government. As far as I am personally concerned, politics has practically ruined me. I consider that I am out today nearly 150,000 dollars through politics That is what I have got out of it, and I think that any man that has anything else to do that goes into politics is a fool. It is all right for a man who has plenty of money and nothing else to do, or for a man who goes into politics to make a living out of it, but those are the only men who should go into politics.

I just wanted to explain that this article which I have read is untrue, and I do not think it is right to publish such things. I ask the House here now if I ever did anything disgraceful here, or created any "row" here yesterday afternoon.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I would rise to make one or two remarks. Mr. Moulton, in referring to the Opposition throwing reflections, excepted the front row and Mr. Stone from the back. I just want to speak with regard to myself. I have not, since I stood on the floors of this House, in any way that I know of, made any remark that has been a reflection on the personal character of any member of the Government. I had no intention of doing so, and any remarks that I made were directly concerned with their policy, and I do not think it is fair for the hon. member to pick out one and try and put blame on the others for something which they did not do. I made no reflection on the personal honesty or integrity of any member of the Government.

MR. COAKER—With regard to the statements of Mr. Moulton, the hon. member for Burgeo. He stated yesterday evening that the Opposition side were making out that the members on the other side of the House were nothing but rogues and robbers. I objected to it, and I thought that we fixed up the matter fully then. I excused him, and said that I thought it was unfair, and that certainly he was not justified in what he said but that in all probability he did not mean to use such strong language when he got up to speak. Now, he comes out and reiterates the statement, and adds further insult to it by saying that it is only members on the back row of this side of the House who are stating such things. I am very much afraid that if this sort of thing goes on there is going to be music on the floors of this House. We on this side of the House are not going to tolerate any such statements by any member of the Government. We are going to do our duty. We are not going to stop our mouths and ears; we will say what we think is right and proper and those who do not like it can dislike it. The hon. member did come into my office last year and make some complaint in reference to an article that appeared in the "Advocate." I told him that I had nothing to do with it; that I did not write the article, and did not see it until after the paper came out; but I did not say that I was going to do anything else. He said he had not got any contracts for fertilizers that were given out, and with which Mr. Moulton or some one by the name of Moul-

ton was connected. He said that he had nothing to do with the public chest. What was he doing up in Fortune Bay the other day? Was he up there for the good of his health? Are there any arbitrations on in connection with the Fortune Bay railway? He may not have got anything in the past, but he as well as the rest are beginning to find out that there is something in politics after all.

The Premier has said that out of 32,000 voters in the northern districts we only got 15.000. This is another case of putting a misconstruction on what has happened. It may be true that there are 32,000 voters in those districts, but do you imagine that all the men are home to vote at an election. Why there are only about two-thirds of the total number of votes polled. We would have got four or five hundred more votes in Bonavista if all our young men were home. Our majority would have been four or five hundred more if those men who were employed on the railway, and at Bell Island, and Grand Falls, and everywhere else were home to vote. The Premier states that one-third of the voters of Bonavista would have gone against us if there had been Liberals in the field. Well, let him test it. Two Departments have now been vacant for three or four months—since we defeated Mr. Blandford and Mr. Morison—and have no representatives on that side of the House, and he is not prepared to open any district in the country to fill those vacancies. Send them back to Bonavista, and see what we will do to them. Then he says that they divided the district of Bay de Verde with us. Why, it was the Liberals of Bay de Verde that defeated our man by going back on the Union candidate. The people there were too grand. They were not going to vote for a fisherman, but they would vote for a merchant. And do you know how you won Bay de Verde? There were fifteen hundred electors in that district working on public works up to a day or two before the election. You may win a district if you put two thirds of the electors on the public works, but send your men down there as Mr. Hickman, the hon. member for Bay de Verde, went down there, on their merits, and see how many you will get. As for Harbor Grace, we did not claim to have Harbour Grace. The Council at Bay Roberts asked Dr. Mosdell to be one of the candidates, as the Bay Roberts end had the right of naming one of the candidates; but we did not interfere in that district in any way. It was a Liberal fight, pure and simple. We did not have any correspondence with any one man in Harbour Grace or Carbonear with regard to the election.

The Premier is delighted because I admitted the truth. Somehow or another it is a refreshing thing to get anyone here to admit the truth. I admitted that men have been expelled from the Union because they did not vote for Union candidates. Do you know that the Fishermen's Union has a Constitution, and one of the conditions contained in that constitution is that every man who is a member of the Union is supposed to vote for those whom the Union have selected as candidates; and the great majority of them did that voluntarily. The Constitution was there, and every member of the Union knew that we had power to select candidates and form a political party whenever the people choose to do so. It was not I, or the Supreme Council, but the various districts that decided to have Union candidates, and the members of the Union were supposed to stand by them; and those who did not do that, because they were false to their declaration, because they

were heelers, were expelled. Those men went into our Councils because they wanted to know what was going on in there, so that they might inform our opponents as to what took place. These men have been expelled from the Union. They were chaff, and the men who were the wheat, who did their duty, would not sit side by side with them and expelled them from their councils. British subjects, said the Premier. A British subject is free, and these men were free. We did not ask them to join, but when they came in they came in under certain conditions and with certain obligations, and when they did not live up to them they were expelled. As to the effect it will have, there is a seat now vacant in Twillingate. Open up that district, send a man down there, and use all the power and influence which you on that side of the House can command, and see how you will come out. Send a man down to Bonavista. If you would like to have Mr. Blandford back as head of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, or if you would like to have Mr. Morison back as head of the Department of Justice. I will resign my seat and give you a chance to see how many men down in that district won't vote for us. You cannot expect us to come here and be perfection in everything connected with Parliamentary usage. We are new to our duties and may make some slips occasionally, but there has been nothing wrong in anything that has been said from this side of the House.

The hon. member for St. John's,East Mr. Higgins, said that I had been a farmer myself, and had perhaps put water in my milk, and knew what the farmers were doing. Go around town and ask whether my statements are justified or not. Dozens of men have come to me and complimented me on having the courage to get up and refer to this matter, and there are thousands of people in St. John's today who fully agree with what I have said. Of course Coaker is a villain, and all that; but your opinions won't make any difference to me. I am here to do my duty and I will do it.

It being now half past six of the clock, the Chairman of Committees left the Chair until eight of the clock.

The Chairman of Committees resumed the Chair of Committee at 8 o'clock.

MR. COAKER—The Premier made the remark that certain men have left the Fishermen's Union. I have no hesitation whatever in stating that for every name he gives me I can give him ten of those who have since joined. Why only to-day I received 52 applications from Petty Harbor. Although I have many times been asked to go there and inaugurate a Union, I told them to go to Kelligrews, where a man will go from our headquarters here on Monday nights to enroll them. The Premier did not state, I notice, how men were driven like sheep to the booth where it could be seen how they voted—this in the face of the fact that every man is entitled to vote as he pleases -although certain slurs were cast upon the Union because some men afterwards found undesirable, were dismissed. Nor did we hear anything about the 315 men who last year between May and December received increases in their salaries, men who previously made no attempt to hide their public denouncement of the Government, and who afterwards became strong Government supporters. We know the 48 thousand dollars they received was a mere flea-bite, but it well sufficed to purchase their support. Things like these are the factors which tend to the unpopularity of a Government. In Coaker the people have a complete and assured trust.

No man ever did as much for this country as I did. If all I could say was that I had taken the money that the fishermen had secreted in their old boots, in their old stockings, perhaps buried or hidden, and put that into trade, I would rest assured that no man ever did such a thing before in the history of this Colony. They get ten per cent. returns today for their money. What man ever did that. I give them food, and clothes cheaper than they get elsewhere. Thanks to me they have built halls and stores, all over the Island, and they know it is not misplaced confidence. They know their trust is in the hands of a capable man who has accomplished a thing, the like of which was never seen before. In twelve months time we shall be on the other side of this House. Everyone knows what I did to give the fishermen cheap coal. It is all very well to talk of bad debts—twenty cents for bad debts. Bad debts are not from the fishermen, they come from the man with kid gloves and a cane on Water Street. When dealings are with the laboring classes, bad debts need no consideration. But the poor man pays the extra twenty cents for the negligence of the rich. We know Mr. Moulton lost $150,000 some time ago buying fish. Where did he get the money from? Business and hard work of course. Of course, when the fishermen want to buy things they buy them from the merchant, who has to make a certain amount of profit. Four years ago I was down on the French Shore two weeks stranded, waiting day after day to see the steamer come in. There were no telegraphs, no means of outside communication. And when the steamer was to call we received a message saying it had passed us, and gone to Battle Harbor. What did it matter about the French Shore people? I would be pleased to see the credit system done away entirely, and the rope removed from the necks of those who are dependent on that system for supplies. To show how I am regarded by the people I may say that 750 subscriptions were handed me by the women and children for the purpose of purchasing a motor boat. These people were only too pleased to honor the leader of the F.P.U.

Then the other day we had slurs cast across the House because the fishermen presented me with a watch. But how long would it be before the people would take the trouble of importing a gold watch and presenting it to any member on that side, because of the good he had done for them. It is no reflection on the fishermen that they came forward and appreciated my work the way they did. They thought they were doing right and they knew what they were doing even though some members of this House think they were wrong.

Then we were told the other night that we were armchair politicians. If there is any man in the country that has worked and toiled for the position he occupies today it is I. I have had no hours to spend in armchairs, and I never will. But because I objected to the amount handed to the 'Earl of Devon' we were told that she had met bad weather and stormy nights, and that it was easy enough for us to sit here in our armchairs and criticize these payments. But I have been on the decks of schooners on stormy nights, when the crews have had to go on deck and battle for their lives. I am no armchair politician whoever else is; and I am able to go down to St. Barbe as master of a steamer, and bring her around in less than fifty-five days.

Now all this trouble has come out of the remarks of the honorable member for Burgeo, Mr. Moulton; and I

am very sorry that he used the words that he did. If he had not done so, things would have gone on as they were going, and we would not have had this little blow that we have now. But it is not going to end here. The men on this side of the House, sitting on the back row have been deliberately insulted this afternoon, and they are not going to put up with it; and members opposite cannot cast insults across the House, and try and keep the Liberals from the Unionists and do it with impunity.

"The 'Advocate' is a bad paper!" But it belongs to the fishermen, and every cent paid for its plant came out of the pockets of the poor man. No politicians or contractors have any interest in it. It is to protect the interest of the fishermen, and has a circulation of ten thousand. Has any other paper in this Colony that circulation, or has any other paper ever published in the Colony ever had such a circulation? We are told it is not popular, and the people do not want it. We know that certain people do not want it, and we do not want them; but there are men who do want it and will have it in spite of what the Premier or anybody else says. The first issue, February 1910, has been laid on the table and you can see that it is only a very small sheet, not much bigger than this sheet I hold in my hand; and yet today it is the most influential paper in the country, with twice the circulation of any other paper, and still we are told that it is no good, and I am fooling the people. Four years ago the Editor of that little sheet was down at Coakerville, or as the 'Plaindealer' often said, "down rearing gulls on Dunnage Island." and to day he sits in this House a Leader of a party, head of a Union of 20,000 members, and if you want to know the exact number of members it is 21,060.

We have that body of men behind us and a large corporation to import our own goods and we can sell them cheaper than anybody else and yet the shareholders can get ten per cent. At first we were assailed on every hand and all sorts of stories were sent around the country against us, but the fishermen did not believe these stories, and we got their support and it gives me great satisfaction to be here tonight in the House with as strong a following as any party ever had for its first opportunity. The wonder is I am here at all. When I started out I was told that I would never succeed, that the fishermen were ingrates and that they had gone back on every man, and they said look at Sir William Whiteway, and look at this man and that, and that the fishermen would leave me in the lurch, and that I could never get them to work together, but in spite of this we went on with our work and even those who are opposed to us tonight will admit that we have accomplished something. Those who were opposed to us, the merchants and others said that Coaker was a fool, and was not going to do anything but make a fool of himself. They took it easy and said it was only a matter of six months and after that no more would be heard from him. That is where they made the mistake in taking it so easy in the beginning. Now, if the Rt. Hon. the Premier or if the Leader of the Opposition had started this these people would have been frightened at once, they would have said: "These are smart men and if we do not look out they will have charge of us in a few months. But they let me go on because I was a fool and now they have found out the difference when it is too late. Now I do not wish to delay the House further, but I hope for the balance of the session that we will not have the unpleasant duty of getting up and

defending ourselves as we have had to do this afternoon. We do not want to be continuously fighting, but when insults and slurs are cast across the House the men on this side must get up and defend themselves or the people who sent us here will think that we are unable to defend ourselves or are afraid to do our duty.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, I rise to join in the spirit of the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down, that we should know one another and understand one another better; and it is not my intention to unduly delay the Committee. There is just a word that I want to say—and I say it in the spirit suggested by my hon. friend, so that when we all understand one another better these little things which arise from time to time, and cause temporary trouble, should be swept away. The hon. member this afternoon was particularly forceful in suggesting that I had insinuated strongly certain statements and ideas to him. He stated that I had suggested, had even said, that he was accusing farmers around St. John's of watering their milk. Well, despite the fact that I have got to follow a religious man, and despite the fact that I now find myself in a very sacred atmosphere created by him. I feel that I should take the risk of saying a word or two. Of course I recognize that the hon. member has informed us of the many qualities of virtue which he possesses to such a degree that the Angel Gabriel would at any time, upon a demand for a certificate of character, greet him with the words, "Well done thou good and faithful servant." I recognize also that those of us who follow the legal profession are usually not placed in that very select class to which the hon. member has appointed himself, it is this which makes it rather awkward for me to follow him this evening. I must candidly say, however, right at the outset, that I fear if the worthy Angel referred to were called upon to pass upon the hon. member's conduct on this occasion instead of the words, "Well done" he would say: "Thou hast not done so well my friend. Thou hast not told all the truth with regard to these poor farmers, and thou hast not quite lived up to thy reputation for seeing all things correctly. Nor hast thou spoken truly in suggesting a misrepresentation of thy remarks." These are the words, Mr. Chairman, that I fear would be used towards the hon. member in particular, so far as his conduct this evening is concerned, because I have in no way misrepresented any of his remarks or credited him with having said anything which hon. members present here did not also hear. My few words of correction this afternoon were caused entirely by the hon. member's own statement. He stated distinctly that "one half of the milk on sale in St. John's did not contain one per cent of fat." Surely no other construction could be put on that expression, than that it was being adulterated with water. That at least is the construction which ordinarily would be placed upon such a statement, but if there were any doubt in the minds of any of us as to what the hon. member meant he removed it himself, when he stated that "water was cheap', and that "a little adulteration of milk was thought no harm by farmers.' It is because of this and in view of the hon. member's own statement to the effect that he had himself kept a cow that I suggested that he was judging other people with a somewhat prejudiced mind, and he thought that this practice prevailed amongst our farmers, because he had discovered long ago that his own cow required shingling.

MR. COAKER—I did not say the farmers watered their milk. I said the milk that was on sale in St. John's was adulterated.

MR. HIGGINS—Well, then, I accept that position. My friend can sit on either horn of the dilemma, and he will find both equally sharp. If he did not mean the farmers he meant the shopkeepers, and anything I said in the way of endorsing the honesty of the farmers of St.John's East, would equally apply to those who run small stores here where milk is sold. There are very many of these in the city, and I have no hesitation in saying here that there is not the slightest foundation in fact for the suggestion that the people who run these stores are so dishonest as to water milk before offering it for sale. However, in this whole matter, Mr. Chairman, the very best evidence that I have not being doing an injustice to the hon. member for Bonavista is contained in the fact that my distinguished colleague in St. John's East, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Kent, took exactly the same stand on the matter as I did; so much so indeed, and I shall be pardoned for mentioning newspapers—that one of the organs particularly supporting the party represented by the members in the back row suggested in its issue of today, that Mr. Kent and myself took our stand upon this question purely for the purpose of catching votes. Well, however, much anything I said might be so judged, I hardly think it is necessary for my friend Mr. Kent, to resort to this method of getting votes. He has got votes and numbers of them for very many years in St. John's East, and I do not think he got them by any methods such as these. Now, I have no intention of labouring this matter further, and I only refer to it because, as I remarked before, I think it is a little too serious a matter to have sweeping statements made like this by a responsible Leader of a party in this House, and to allow them to go unchallenged, particularly by those of us who might be said to more particularly represent the people who are slandered. It is hardly fair that because the hon. member meets people about the street, these "little birds" to which he has referred so often, who sing stories into his ear, that he should immediately come up in this House and make a broad charge of this nature, without reflection and without ascertaining whether there was any foundation for it. I feel that he now recognizes that in this case, although he might think he knows the people of St. John's, he has unconsciously done them an injustice and I feel sure that it is an injustice that he will not now repeat.

Now, a good deal, Mr .Chairman, has been said during this debate, and since the session opened, about members on the Opposition side having their remarks misrepresented by those who sit to the left of the Speaker, and particular complaints have been made of the manner in which some members have been abused through the newspapers. I am not very much concerned with this discussion, but, I think, I might fairly say that all the misconstruction and all the abuse has not been centred on one side of the House so far as newspapers are concerned. I have had my little share of cause for complaint in that respect, because on the Saturday following the declaration of the Poll in the East End one of the newspapers supporting the Fishermen's Union Party saw fit to publish a lengthy and most abusive criticism with respect to my campaign, which was entirely unwarranted. I was accused in the vilest possible manner of unfair tactics. I was dubbed with that good old title that

has done so much service in these kinds of attacks "a sectarian fire bug" and the country generally, was informed that I was going to be made swallow my unfair language and disgraceful tactics at the hands of Union members in the House when the Legislature met. Well, I have patiently waited so far for this swallowing operation to be begun, but it has never materialized. I have no doubt that the hon. Leader of the Union Party and his friends have since discovered that all that appeared in that paper concerning me was not gospel, and that I was not quite as black as I was painted. I have never referred to the article, because I think newspaper comments of this nature written in the stress of political excitement are not to be regarded seriously, and that when we meet here we should have other things to occupy our attention besides reviving these old troubles. I might only say now, lest there be any lingering doubt in the minds of some of my friends opposite that there is not the slightest foundation for any of the horrible charges that were levelled at me, and that those who made them are free to search where they will in my district for a confirmation or otherwise of this statement. I had no occasion, even if I were so inclined, to adopt any of the tactics that were suggested in the article that I referred to, and if I did attempt any such methods I should hardly be occupying a seat in this House today. The electors of St. John's East, are somewhat too intelligent to be won over by any such methods as these, and I trust that, whilst I am not as religious a man as my hon. friend opposite, I have still managed to preserve enough self respect to fight an election without indulging in any such conduct.

The hon. the Leader of the Fishermen's Protective Union took a somewhat different view of my election this afternoon by announcing that civil servants had been granted promotions and advances in salaries, and that he had no doubt a number of these were in St. John's East and so helped me along the road. Well I have only to say to him what whilst I trust any civil servants in my district got whatever advances they wished, I fear that the number of them on the list to which he referred would not be many, and that he would have to seek for some further cause to explain the great change which took place in that district. St. John's East Mr. Chairman gave a seat to the present Government for reasons different from those that have been suggested. The district recognised that the present Government had done more for it during the past four years than any previous administration in double that period; and this fact, coupled with the general progressive policy of the Government ,is the explanation of the turnover which occurred there. So far as the part played by the civil servant's advance in salary is concerned I only regret that I was not in a position to be a party to securing these advances if any were obtained by my constituents. I trust however, that during the next four years I may in some small way see that those who deserve it get what is their due in this respect. Now if the hon. member for Bonavista is still doubtful about how my district was won I am prepared to give him an opportunity to find out. Following his own oft repeated challenge as to resigning his seat, I would say that I am prepared to resign my seat and face him in the East End to-morrow. And I say this in no spirit of boast, but only to show him how incorrectly he interprets the sentiment of that district.

Now a great deal has been said to the effect that members on this side of the House are opposed to the Fishermen's Protective Union, and in particular it has been said that we in St. John's are against it. Why, Sir, nothing could be further from the truth, and I would here invite the hon. member for Bonavista to come down to the East End and start his Union.

MR. COAKER—I have been asked to go there.

MR. HIGGINS—And I hope you will go.

MR. COAKER—I do not intend to go.

MR. HIGGINS—Well you ought,the people down there are very kind. They would treat you well. With all due deference to your men North, you will find as good a class of fishermen down that shore as there is in any part of the country.

MR. COAKER—I am not going down there.

MR. HIGGINS—Would the hon. member like me to tell him the reason why? He might have his own ideas, but I likewise have mine as to why he would not go. But Mr. Chairman, why should he not go? If there is good in the Fishermen's Union—and I have no doubt there is—why should not the fishermen of St.John's East get the benefit of it as well as those North. Why should all the advantages that follow from a properly organised and conducted Union be confined to one section of the country? Are not the fishermen of St. John's East as much deserving of consideration as those in any other section of the country? Do they not equally do their part in carrying on the industries of the country? And if privileges are to be sought by fishermen why should not those who work on the waters of St. John's East be joined with their more favored brethren of the north? Now this is the explanation of what is called "Opposition to the Fishermen's Union." We do not object to the Union; we do not object to any course that might be taken for the benefit of the fishermen who constitute it; but we do object to this Union being confined to one section of the country. We do object to the proposition that the only fishermen to be considered are those North. The men North are undoubtedly good men. They play a large part in the fisheries of the Colony, but, Mr. Chairman, they are no better than their brothers who fish to the South, to the West and to the East, and if this Union is really intended to be a benefit to the fishermen of the country why not extend its operations all over the Island? Why should we have hon. members come in and take seats in this Legislature and daily protest that they stand for a certain section of the country. Are they not reasonable enough to see that we have at least some interest in our fishermen, and that all we ask is that they be given an equal showing with those to the North of St. John's. Surely that is not an unreasonable position. That cannot be taken to be an opposition to the Fishermen's Protective Union.

My hon. friend from Bonavista got up in his seat the other day and talked about having brought coal and sold it in St. John's for $6.80 a ton. Well, I congratulate him upon it, and I only hope that he will continue the good work. I trust he will bring it back to the good old price of $4.80 per ton before he stops, because it is naturally my desire that those in St. John's should get the benefit of cheap coal. The great evil of to-day, and the thing which we hear on all sides, is the high price of coal, and any attempt made to combat this evil should very

properly have the support of every member of this House and particularly those who represent the city. My hon. friend went on and asked, however, a few days ago, when I was not present in the House, where I was that I did not get together some few people and bring down a cargo of coal and sell it at a low rate? I was not here at the time to make the answer to the hon. gentleman that I should have liked; but if the hon member has no objection I will give him my answer now, and it is this, that I did not bring down a cargo of coal because I did not have the fishermen's money to experiment with.

MR. COAKER—They would not give it to you.

MR. HIGGINS—That may be true. Being a lawyer I was probably at a disadvantage in the matter of the opinion the people might have of me to hold money, but I should have done my best for them and I only hope that their greater trust in the hon. member himself will not be misplaced. The hon. member himself bore testimony to the fact a few days ago that people had changed their opinions of him. He told us that at first he himself was not regarded very seriously and that people were doubtful of his capabilities, that he was not generally accepted as a great man, and that many had thought he was but a fool. And he said we might find out later that he was not quite as big a fool as people thought him.

MR. HALFYARD—No, what he said was that there was a class who thought him a fool but who were now finding out their mistake.

MR. HIGGINS—Then I misunderstood the hon. member. I do not wish to misquote any statement that was made, and so will not say more.

However, the hon. member seems to rest under the misapprehension that he alone is working in the interests of the fishermen and working classes of the Island. I am a member of this party and, with all respect to the hon. member, I think I can claim for that Party that it has done a very great deal for the fishermen. My friend Mr. Grimes the honourable member for Port de Grave, referred to the Old Age Pension. Well is not that something? Is it not a scheme that was never carried out before? The other Governments came in here year after year and advocated it, but no party ever had the courage to face the problem until the Morris Government took power. We all saw the Estimates that have been tabled here this year and the past few years. In every case you see increased grants for public services in which the fishermen are interested. Then why has the hon. member undertaken to say that all ideas of good for fishermen emanate from the other side of the House, and that the Government have been unable to initiate anything.

One would think from some of the comments made that the F.P.U. party were alone interested in the fishery and the fishermen. Is not every man in the island, no matter what his avocation, interested in the fisheries? Do they not mean everything to everyone?

And when we come in and take our seats in this chamber do we not all represent the fishermen as well as all other people of the Colony? Why should we have this sectional theory propounded? Do we not all come in to honestly try and do something for all the industries of our common country, no matter on what side of the house we may sit. We do not come to try and obtain the plaudits of any particular class by saying nice things about them. I rejoice in the work of my honourable friends opposite. I am glad to hear from them that their Union is progressing. May it progress

further. But will the honourable members please bear in mind that on their entrance into this House they and I cease to represent any particular class. We all have a common object, namely, the betterment of all classes. And in trying to attain that object let us forget all about newspaper attacks and other pre-election memories. We all have our complaints on that score, but this is not the place to be dwelling on them. Let us try and do something, now that we have, I trust, reached the common ground of understanding to which the learned member for Bonavista has referred.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Chairman. It is not my intention to say more than a few words. I was evidently one of these referred to yesterday by Mr. Moulton, when he said that with the exception of Mr. Stone all the members of the back row had been insulting to the members on the other side If I have insulted any man in this House I would be glad to know what I said. If I have done so, I wish to take it back. If I have ever done so it has been through my ignorance of the rules and regulations. I do not expect that I know them all yet, but I do not think that I have ever insulted any man on the floors of this House. We are new to this kind of thing and are likely sometimes to say the wrong thing, but if I have insulted anyone, I want to say I am sorry. I thought when I was coming here that I would have to turn my tongue over, but it appears now that I am pretty well as good as most men. We are here for the most part as fishermen, and not used to public speaking. But I could not think that we have any of us insulted any member of this House. Mr. Moulton's references to us were, I think, most insulting. But I do not wish to delay the House on this point any longer.

My hon. friend Mr. Higgins made reference to Old Age Pensions. Five or six cases of the working of this scheme came under my own notice and this is what has happened. An old man and woman before this scheme came into operation were receiving pauper relief. They each got $5.00 a quarter. That is to say, $40,00. Then they got the pension. But when they went to get the poor relief, they found that it was stopped So now they are getting $50.00, where before they were getting $40.00. That is the only additional advantage. That is the position in four cases out of five.

Mr. Moulton said that we were a suspicious lot. Well, Sir, after looking over the accounts that we have before us, is it a wonder that we are a bit suspicious. And if all the fishermen in the Island were to go over the accounts they would begin to get a bit suspicious. If we are suspicious it is the Government that is to blame. It strikes me from what I have seen that for a great many years these fishermen have been like lambs led to the slaughter.

My hon. friend, Mr. Higgins, said that he was in hearty accord with the Union. "God speed the Union" he said. He was glad to see the Union and the good it was doing. He said it was all right for the fishermen to have a Union, but it had no right to go into politics. That is all very well but we have found that we can do a great deal by going into politics and we are going to stay in. And we are not going to sit down here and be insulted. I have never taken an insult from any man. And I do not intend to sit here and be insulted by any man on any side of the House. If I see my duty before me, I will do it, and I will not be deterred by anything that may be said.

With regard to what has been said in the newspapers, I may say that Mr.

Coaker is not to blame for all that. At a Convention that the Union held Mr. Coaker asked us how we thought the paper was being run. If we thought that it was being run wrong we had only to say so, and he would change it. But we all agreed that it was being run on the proper lines. The fishermen of the country want it run that way.

My chief object in rising was to say that I was sorry if I had insulted anyone, and I repeat now that if I have done so, I take it back. I have never intended to insult any member of this House.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few remarks. There is one thing that I can say, and that is that I have never insulted any man in my life. I have never before known a man to accuse me of that. I was very sorry indeed today when the hon. member said that we were insulting, and suspicious. When I am going to make a remark I always think well before I make it. I know what I am going to say before I say it.

Mr. Moulton thought it was unjust to say anything against the Government. I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that he did not think it unjust to fling insults across the House. I don't know whether he was aware of it; but I know that I am aware that we have received several insults from the Government side. I thought the House of Assembly was something better than I have found it. I did not know what I was going to do; I was very nervous before I left home. I have met plenty of men of all classes, but I never got such insults until I came here. Insults have been thrown across the floors of the House such as calling us cullage. I admit we are illiterate; but, if we had been born with a silver spoon in our mouths, we would have been better educated, and would have known how to conduct ourselves. The trouble has been, Mr. Chairman, that a great many of us had to earn the money, before we could be educated. If we had had the chances and the opportunities probably we would not have been subjected to such remarks. I don't want to be bad friends with any man, I don't want to say anything against any man; what I said to a man, I was always satisfied to have that man say the same about me. We are here assembled as the representatives of the people. I don't remember seeing one of the Government members before, except Mr. Devereux. It is my impression that all of us here,from the Premier right down to the last man in this building, are liable to make mistakes. Though the Premier has been here for thirty years, he is just as liable to err as anyone. All the greatest men that ever lived have made mistakes. Now, I wish to make a few remarks with regard to the spending of money. I believe that a great deal of money was misspent with regard to the Agricultural grants. When I was looking over the Estimates the other day, I saw the payments made to the Post Offices. I thought they were very low. One man got $36. Was not that a grand salary? It is a shame to give a man with such a responsible situation as a postmaster such a low salary as $36. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Government can afford to give more than that. Often there is a money order office and a telephone connected with the post office, and consequently the postmaster has a great deal of work to perform. He has to render an account of every cent to the postmaster General and, if there is a cent out in his account, that account is sent back to him. I think Mr. Chairman, that such a position should be better paid. After the Elections of 1909, many men were thrown out of their positions. I know of one man

in Hant's Harbor who lost his job after the Elections, because he voted against the Government. Was not that most unjust? I must now return to the question of expenditure. In 1909 in Bay de Verde District, there was a Magistrate, an honest and learned man who could well do his work, and we find that he was pensioned, and did not do a stroke of work for the last 5 years. The man who got his place is a personal friend of mine, and the man who lost his job is also a personal friend of mine, and I have great respect for him. I think, however, that that action of the Government was very unfair.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few remarks in answer to a kind of bouquet that was thrown to the Opposition members, as I believe it is up to us to throw it back. The subject of discussion before the House adjourned was the daily papers, such as the 'Herald' etc. As we are about to pass a law dealing with the inspection of foods, I think it would be wise to pass a law for the inspection of papers, and the prevention of certain kinds of articles in them. I speak, because the Union and the President, Mr. Coaker, have been attacked in these papers. As a member of the F.P.U., and as a representative of the District of Trinity, I may say that we are here by the people's consent and that we are determined to do our duties as their representatives. The Premier hinted that we had received less votes than the Government, but I venture to say that we received more votes, although less members were returned for the Opposition than for the Government. The Premier was also wrong when he stated that Bay de Verde was one of the strongest Union settlements; we say that it was one of our weakest districts. We will not sit quietly in our seats and listen to the Government members at tacking the F. P. U. It was also stated by the Prime Minister that Sir Robert Bond was the means of giving us a great deal of support, because the Liberal party supporters gave us their votes. Though I believe we would have lost some votes, yet I think we would still have been here with a majority of votes. The Northern districts returned their men, and I trust that they will have reason to feel proud of them, and that the Government will aid them in their efforts for the welfare of the country. We don't believe in the present Government, because we don't believe in the policy that is being carried out. The hon. members on the Government side will not agree with me, because they want to back up the Premier.

Did he not say that the five branches would not cost more than $6,000,000 and now we know that they will cost about ten or twelve millions? Was not that misleading? We are all liable to make mistakes. Did not the Premier make a mistake when he said that if he came back he would so improve matters that two blades of grass would grow where only one grew before? Did he not make a mistake when he said he would cover the Southside Hills with sheep? There are many things that the Government has promised to perform that it has not yet carried out. Take the question of coal. Is not coal more expensive today than it ever was? I hold here in my hand a statement as to the cost of coal supplied to the Government. I see the coal supplied to the lighthouse at Catalina cost $15 a ton for anthracite and $9 for soft coal. It is about time that we began to look into these things and cut down such enormous expenditures. We would then be able to carry out a real Old Age Pension policy and pay a few more old men. In my election campaign I came across many cases of old gentlemen who had

applied for a pension and had not been able to get it. If we cut down these expenses for such things as coal, we would be able to pay all deserving cases a proper pension, and thus reward old men worn out in the service of the country.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer to one or two statements made here during the debate, and in particular to one statement made by the member for Burgeo, Mr. Moulton. The hon. member stated that all the members in the back row with the exception of Mr. Stone, had insulted members on the other side of the House. I would like to ask the hon. member if he can say that I insulted any member of this House.

MR. MOULTON—I did not say that you had insulted anyone.

MR. ABBOTT—I do not think that anyone can say that I ever insulted anyone on the floors of this House. The hon. member for St. John's East then said that the F.P.U. was all right, but that it should not have anything to do with politics. I do not see why. The F. P. U. represents four fifths of the electorate of the country, and that it should have its members in Parliament is only reasonable. When the F.P.U. decided to put men in the field at its Convention, people laughed. When the F.P.U. decided to make a change in the affairs of the Colony they were scoffed at. But the majority must rule in the end. In past governments promises have been made before the election, only to be forgotten when the Government has been returned. The people have been fooled. But the majority has decided to rule. The F.P.U. in their work are only following in the footsteps of other parts of the world. They have a Labor Party in Australia The Liberals and the Tories combined against it, but when the fight came the Labor Party emerged triumphant. Every country has its labor party. In England they have one growing in power day by day. But labor has never been represented in the Government of Newfoundland. Today the workingman is ready to rule. Education has spread knowledge throughout the world.And the workingman sees no reason for selecting another class to rule. The working man must rule himself. New Zealand is perhaps the most advanced country in this respect. It has passed popular legislation, legislation for the masses. It collects its revenue from the rich and men of poor means are not called upon to contribute to any great extent to the upkeep of the Civil Service. It is only by Union that the masses can hope for proper treatment, and by placing the F.P.U. on the floors of this Assembly they are taking the proper steps to have their voice heard in legislation and to make our politics honest and clean.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, the turn that this debate has taken seems to be not so much on the question of pure food as of pure politics. And to my mind I think it is a very good thing that we have had this debate, because it has shown up the iniquitous practice that has heretofore prevailed, of conducting elections purely and simply on the principle of discrediting the other side. It has been the history of our politics that the only means used in elections are those which will create in the minds of the people a want of confidence in the opposite party, and this is done by any trick that comes to hand. And I suppose it will go on until the end of time, so long as we have the Premier taking up the valuable time of the Committee of this House in trying to excuse an editor who makes untrue statements on the eve of an election. I was very much surprised that the Prime Minister should have taken up

this matter as he has done and used all his energy and ability to exonerate the 'Evening Herald' from manufacturing this article out of the 'Advocate,' dropping words here and there in such a way as to poison the minds of the electorate. It is a recognized fact and one patent to every man in the country that the editor of the 'Herald' misrepresented that article in the 'Advocate' and to have the Prime Minister here excusing that paper from all blame in the matter is something that cannot be understood outside of the realms of party politics. It is nothing more than the expediency of party politics. We all know, and the Premier knows, that the person who put together that article to further the interests of his party, a few years ago used every word in the English language to vilify him, to make him out the greatest scoundrel in the country, and yet we have the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister this afternoon trying to uphold the man who wrote so vilely about him a few years ago, instead of holding him up to contempt. Party politics is responsible for a lot when it upholds such men, and puts them in places of emolument and trust under the Government. It was sufficiently proved to this House that when Mr. Coaker wrote that article he never intended that bishops, priests, and clergymen should be killed as you would dogs killing a sheep. He was referring to the politicians who are ruling the country and he used very strong language towards them.

I wonder if the Premier heard what Sir Robert Bond said about him when he left the party? Ask the people of Twillingate what he said. Personally I have nothing against the Government, but politically we have everything.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I would like to hear what Sir Robert Bond said in Twillingate. It will be the first time he ever said anything against me. I would like you to state it.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not think you would like it. You might not take it well.

With regard to the election I may say that as far as Fogo is concerned I need say very little. It was won before I went there. In Fogo we had Liberals and Tories working against us, but we know the result.

The 'Advocate' has done a great deal of good and it is going to do more. They elected men to the Legislature to frame laws for the people, and I hope this debate will put an end to the unfair and degrading system by which elections have been run in the past.

As regards Mr. Moulton, he seems to be a target for debate this evening. He found fault with us for being suspicious, and for saying that the Government party was bound together with a chain of gold. Take every member of the Government party with scarcely an exception, and you will find that it is true. Mr. Goodison, supports the Government. But he gets pay as an arbitrator. Hon. Mr. Emerson has received about $3,000. Hon. Mr. Gibbs, some four or five thousand Captain Winsor, $837. Hon. Mr. Bennett, no doubt, has had a picking. Mr. Howley, $3,000. The Premier, we do not know what he has got, but he cannot live on air. Hon. Mr. Cashin is paid for his work. Hon. Mr. Crosbie has had a few contracts. Is not all this a chain of gold? Mr. Devereaux and Mr. Downey are Agricultural Commissioners. And so on. Go to the 'Daily News' and the 'Herald.' We still have the chain of gold. Mr. Moulton seems to be the only one outside of it. He has lost $150,000. I do not know whether he is getting anything from the Government, but

I have heard rumors of something down in Fortune Bay.

Then we have an expenditure of $130,000 on executive responsibility in Election year. We are told it was for public imprevements. In my district I saw no recent public improvement. What was the result. In 1910 the vote stood Earle 861, Fitzgerald 841, in 1913 Halfayard 1337, and Fitzgerald 594. And this in view of the fact that Mr. Earle was fighting against me and bringing every influence he could find to bear against me. Politics bring strange bed-fellows. The election showed the strength of the Union spirit throughout the district. I went there a total stranger as a Union candidate for the Assembly, and I was returned.

Can you point to one industry brought into being by the present Government. The Government did nothing more than their predecessors except borrow money. Where are the new markets for fish? The Agricultural policy has been condemned by many as a failure, and the forty thousand dollars expended was simply wasted and now I see we are going to grant another twenty thousand dollars, the most of which I presume will go towards the paying of Commissioners. A great deal of credit was taken by the Government on account of the Old Age Pensions, but I would point out that in many cases pensions were given to old men and allowances taken away from the old women.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one or two remarks in reply. In the first place the hon. member, Mr. Halfyard, stated that in cases where Old Age Pensions had been issued the widows allowances had been taken away. I am not aware of any one case where this thing had happened, and I would like the hon. member to name such a case, if any, came under his notice. The Old Age Pensions have been five years in force, and the Government is not aware of one case, such as is referred to by the hon. member. Some poor commissioner in some isolated part of the Island may have done so, but if the hon. member can supply me with one case, I will be very glad to have inquiries made. We had a good deal of debate before and after the recess, and I am afraid we wandered considerably away from the real question before the Chair, but no doubt a great deal of good will result from the discussion. It will be remembered that on yesterday afternoon the matter in relation to the newspapers was not brought up by me but by the hon. member for Fogo. I was under the impression that the article in question had been copied by the 'Herald' newspaper from the 'Fisherman's Advocate.' The hon. member for Fogo stated that this article had been doctored and I undertook to point out that in my judgment and opinion the article had not been doctored, but was a truthful and correct copy of the attack made in the 'Advocate.' This was questioned by the hon. member, Mr. Coaker, who was editor for that paper at the time the statement was made. I undertook to prove that the article was not doctored, and the hon. member Mr. Coaker, challenged me to produce the papers. I accepted that challenge and brought the paper before this House. In the face of this, I am charged with having brought on this discussion. I regard the time taken up with this discussion as being well spent. Although the matter has not been germane to the subject before the Chair, I would point out that hon. members have been accustomed to deal, when the House is in Committee, with every conceivable subject, and their action in this respect is quite pardonable. The hon. member for Fogo

may not regard the charge about the 'doctoring'—as he called it—of this article as a serious one, but I take a different view, for, if his statement is correct, a very grave charge has been made against the Government. The hon. member for Fogo may be of the opinion that it had been doctored, but surely he will concede me the right of differing from him. If he has the right to an opinion so have I. I do not believe there was any doctoring, and I consider the copied article was correct in every respect. I have no retainer to defend the editor of the 'Herald'; that gentleman is well able to defend himself. I would be quite willing to go into Court and submit to the consideration of a jury upon this matter, and I have no hesitation whatever in saying that the interpretation they would place upon it would coincide with my own. I do not expect to convince the hon. members opposite and it is less likely that they will convince me. We agree to differ. I cannot agree with the interpretation placed upon this matter by hon. members opposite, nor do I expect them to concur in my interpretation of it. This being the case it simply comes down to a question of the pot calling the kettle "smut." The hon. member for Fogo had referred to some article which had appeared in the 'Herald' some years ago against me. Of course, there are things which appear in our newspapers which ought not to appear. During the last two or three years I was an easy target for the attacks of newspapers, but I was not thinskinned enough to mind them or to pay any attention to them. All is fair in love and political warfare, and we sometimes are obliged to receive as well as to give blows. If the hon member for Fogo is serious in the matter of producing objectionable articles in the 'Herald' I can undertake to produce the 'Advocate' containing articles equally as bad against me. Let him produce before this Committee the worst article, and the most objectionable that has appeared in the 'Herald' during the political campaign, and I will undertake to match it in the 'Advocate.'

Fault has been found with me for endeavoring to under-estimate the work done by the Union and by its President. Whose fault is that? There was nothing offensively said by me or any member of this House against the Fisherman's Union. I do not provoke trouble and anything I said here this afternoon concerning the work of the Union was entirely in answer to statements made by the President of the Union. What are the facts? The President was talking about the work, he had done in the North, and the result of the work accomplished by the Union, and I took issue with him. I told him he was over-estimating the work which he had accomplished, when everything was taken into consideration, such as the inducements held out and the hopes generally created in the minds of the Union men; and the consideration of many people for the large sums of money which had been poured by them into the Union. In addition to this the hon. member said that 10,000 copies of his paper were in circulation, whereas we did not have half that number, so it is not unreasonable to assume that the President of the Union might have done much better under the circumstances. Contrast our position. We went five years ago to the country under a very heavy fire, for everything that it was possible to say against me and my party was said by the Opposition newspapers. We do not profess to be absolutely perfect like the hon. member for Bonavista, and I would remind that gentleman that this Government does not differ from any other Government. They all commenced

to die from the moment of their birth. We are bound as time goes on to make some enemies and to dissatisfy some people, in the same manner as those who had preceded us, as a ruling body. We had practically accomplished a miracle because in the elections of 1908 and 1909 we had opposed to us an established party with newspapers under their control: then in 1913 we fought the last General Election with all our sins of commission and omission to answer for, which were daily served up to the public by the press of the other side. Those who read the newspapers during the past five years are well aware how we were bitterly and constantly attacked night and day by our opponents, and not only had we to combat this hostility but were obliged to fight a combination of Liberalism and Unionism. Hon. members opposite were under the impression that this Government was opposed to the Union and its principles. Such is not the case. I have never said one word either in this House or outside, in relation to the principles of the Union. What I do say is that I claim the right to criticise their work, and that of the President. For I do not think that gentleman has accomplished anything like the amount of good he claims and time will prove that I am right. The hon. member for Bonavista stated that he wished the credit system was entirely done away with. I have heard that subject discussed before but let us seriously consider what that means. Last year we sent ten million dollars worth of fish out of the country, and in order that that amount of fish may be taken from the water it was necessary to give out five million dollars worth of supplies. If this large amount of money had not been given out on credit many a fisherman's family would have gone hungry. I have no hesitation in saying that as long as Newfoundland remains a fishing country, it will be impossible to carry on this fishing business without some sort of credit system. As long as forty years ago I remember seeing four or five hundred men working on Duder's premies. Where is that large business today, a business at that time of gigantic proportions, whose vessels sailed over every sea? Go over to Harbor Grace and look upon the untenanted and unoccupied stores and mercantile premises, and the people will tell you that such houses as Ridley's, Donnelly's, Munn's, went under owing to the failure of the fishery. Take the case of the late Charles Dawe, who was one of our largest merchants, and one of the best men in the country for our fishermen, and we find that on several occasions his business had been reduced to the brink of bankruptcy, but was saved by the mere accident of the price of fish going up in the foreign markets. The history of this country shows that nine out of ten of our mercantile houses went under in times of general depression and weaknesses of markets. Yet thousands of men were never refused a barrel of flour, or a bag of bread by these business concerns. In 1909-10 we witnessed two bad fisheries and the majority of our people coming from the Labrador and other places, had not sufficient codfish for their own use, and were not these men helped by their suppliers? What is the use of talking about Union stores which are run on a strictly cash basis? If I were to go to Bonavista tomorrow and pay off the indebtedness of every man and then supply them free, and not charge them a cent and they afterwards catch no fish. they would be no better off than before at the end of the year; but the supplier would have to meet the Bill. If ten millions worth of fishery pro-

ducts are exported from this Country one half of this amount goes to the people in the way of fishery supplies. I wish it to be clearly understood that no man in this country is more inclined to help the fishermen than I am, and the President of the Fisherman's Union knows that. My heart is as warm to the fishermen as that hon. member's, notwithstanding the boasting and self-laudation of that gentleman. If Unionism means the improvement of the condition of our fishermen I shall be the first to run up my flag for it, and if there was less boasting by the President of that body the probabalities are that the people would have more confidence in him. "Brag is a good dog, but hold fast is a better one." I never made any reference to the Union from a commercial point of view, I was simply dealing with its political aspect. The point I wanted to make is that in districts from St. Barbe to Brigus out of thirty-two thousand voters only fifteen thousand voted for the combination of Union and Liberal candidates, and out of that number fully one third were Liberal votes. The President of the Union sits here tonight representing only ten thousand votes out of the fifteen thousand cast, for all the hon. members on the other side of the House. This is all the hon. member accomplished after five years work nowithstanding all his bragging and boasting. The hon. member said that he intended forming a Union at Petty Harbor. I can inform the hon. member that if he goes to that flourishing settlement he will be properly received there, and even those who do see eye to eye with him will extend to him the usual hospitality. Whether he is in the Union or out of the Union he may rest assured that every facility will be given him to carry out his work. It makes no difference to me whether the hon. gentleman starts a Union in every street in the district of St. John's for as far as I am concerned I do not wish to remain in my present position five minutes longer than the people want me. If the hon. member, Mr. Coaker believes that he polled a majority of the votes in the last election he is welcome to derive all the consolation he can from it; but in that matter he is under the spell of an hallucination. I would remind the hon. member that there are thousands of fishermen not in the F.P.U., and there are other classes of persons not eligible to join his Union, who are entitled to a say in the conduct of the business of the country. The Union has no doubt gained a good deal of political standing, but its power can be exaggerated. We carried every District from St. John's to St. Barbe and had it not been for the Union, we would have been elected by a very large majority. We won in the western districts, but in Trinity, Bonavista and Fogo we were defeated by a combination of Liberals and Unionists. I find no fault whatever in these men for having voted as they did, but it must not be forgotten that the majorities given to our opponents was not a pronouncemnt on the work which we had performed during the past five years. Had the aspect of Unionism not entered into the question and this election turned upon the policy of this Goverament and its acts during the past five years, we would have been returned by sweeping majorities.

It has been said that a very large part of those who supported us were holding Government jobs. All you have to do is to take the list and look over the names of the lighthouse keepers, and you will find that the most of them are men who did not vote. Increases in salaries were made

during the whole year , and not merely during the month before the elections. Every time that this House meets, we hear something about the increases that have been made. These increases were only given to worthy and deserving officials. I don't think that members on the other side of the House who understand the position will say that it is fair to the country that this statement should go abroad, that the increases were made only for political purposes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that good will come of this debate, and that both sides will get to understand each other better. There has been a little ill-feeling shown, and insinuations made from both sides of the House; but I don't suppose it was the intention of either party to say anything really injurious to the other. In the heat of debate members are all liable to make statements and insinuations which they do not really mean.

A great deal has been said about the hon. member for Burgeo; but I think you will agree with me that he is the last person in the world who would say anything offensive or uncalled for to anyone. He is a man of very high ideals, and of high standards of character. I hope now that we have heard the last of this little unpleasantness and that the work of the Committee will be entered into in a friendly spirit by all the hon-members of the House.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, in his opening remarks and in his closing ones, the Prime Minister hoped that good would come of this debate. It has been said that all is fair in love and war; but I don't think this side of the House will accept that principle. I don't think that anyone of the Government members would think that it is fair for any member to slander him. I do not consider that it is right for the newspapers to slander persons as they do. A statement of this kind coming from one who holds such a high position in the community, cannot but give the people a bad impression of the morals of the members.

The Premier said that we could not do without the credit system. The bottom dropped out of the country in 1894 at the time of the crash and this was mainly due to the credit system, and it is that system that the Premier recommends to the country today.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—I did not recommend it. I said that you could not get along without it.

MR. GRIMES—Saying that we cannot do without it, is encouraging the continuance of that system. Thousands of people all over the country have suffered from this system but the Fishermen's Union is doing its best to do away with it.

The Premier also stated that he has a heart that is warm for the fishermen. Well, we ask him to show that by his works. Why is it today that he does not find an additional number of Old Age Pensions? We find an addition made to the Governor's salary today of $2,500, and that he has got $1,500 extra for expenses. That amount would furnish eight additional pensions, but instead of giving those pensions we have given the Governor an increase that could have been done without.

Again, Sir, what is his attitude towards free and compulsory education? He seemed to say the other day he did not think it workable, because conditions in this country were not the same as in other countries. Now, that is no argument, because that argument was made use of when this country first looked for Responsible Government. At that time we were told that conditions in this country

were not the same as in England and that Responsible Government should not be adopted in this country. The same thing was said about the Ballot Act when it was first mentioned in this country. It was said that our people were illiterate and would not be able to use the ballot. Well, we have these things and they have been most beneficial to the country, and I am sure the same would apply to compulsory education, if we gave it a trial.

Now, the statement has been made two or three times from the other side of the House, that the arguments put up by the Opposition from time to time have only been for the purpose of criticizing the Government. I do not think that is a fair way of putting the Opposition before the people. As they have pointed out they are here to criticize certain things, but they have also suggested certain reforms to the Government. If the suggestion put forward by Mr. Kent, with reference to competitive examinations for entrance to the Civil Service were adopted, it would give everyone an equal chance of getting into the service, and one would not have to depend on pull or political influence with the Government in power. We have suggested refoms of this kind, and I do not think it ought be said that our only purpose has been to oppose and criticize the Government.

Now with reference to compulsory education, I think that even now we are late in the day in adopting it. We should have had it long ago. In the countries that have adopted it it has done more than anything else to advance these countries. Anyone who is familiar with our people must see the need of this system. In my campaign in Port de Grave District, I was told that many little children were kept from school because their parents could not afford to pay the fees required to send them to school. The Government should do something to supplement the fees paid by these people and give a vote for free education .

Now, the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, in the course of his speech hoped that something would be done to smooth over the little ruffles we have had here during the course of the debate. Now, none wishes that more then members on this side of the House; but at the same time we do not intend to allow to go unchallenged any unfair way of conducting business or any unfair criticisms. He stated it was a disgrace to have these things occurring in this House. Well, is not the Government more to blame than the Opposition? Is it not a recognized fact that their campaign last fall was conducted on low lines, and nothing could be more conducive towards demoralizing the people of this country than the press during the last campaign. We of the Opposition are sitting here to day representing a certain section of the people, and if the Government will assist us and we the Government, much can be done within the next four years to bring about these needed reforms, and we only hope and trust that if this controversy tonight has done nothing more than bring a reform about in the Press of the country, during political campaigns, it will have done some good. I hope the Premier will not allow that maxim to be followed in future, that "all is fair in love and war."

I hope the time is coming when some rules for conducting campaigns will be recognized by every member of this House, and by every man engaged in politics in this country.

The Committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Committee asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY laid upon the table of the House Report of the Council of Higher Education for 1913, and also financial statement.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg leave to table information in answer to a question asked by Mr. Stone.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I beg to lay upon the table of the House information asked for by Mr. Targett from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, re money allocated for Public Wharf at Hant's Harbor. I may say that to facilitate the answering of that question I had to get the original papers from the Department. I am tabling the whole fyle.

MR. GRIMES gave Notice of Question.

MR. HALFYARD gave Notice of Question.

MR. KENT gave Notice of Question.

MR. STONE gave Notice of Question.

MR. TARGETT gave Notice of Question.

The House then adjourned until Monday next at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

MONDAY, Feb. 9th, 1914.

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

PETITIONS.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Codroy Valley asking that an alteration be effected in the present law relating to the exportation of live foxes, and also another petition from the residents of Middle Barachoix asking for a grant to enable them to construct a necessary agricultural road in that place. Both these petitions are very important and I hope they will receive the consideration they respectively merit at the hands of the different departments to which they relate. I ask that they be referred to those departments.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bareneed in the District of Port de Grave on the subject of a public wharf and a well at the Dock. The petitioners ask for a sum of money to extend the public wharf so that they may be enabled to get their schooners to the wharf for loading and unloading. At the present time they are obliged to land or put aboard in boats at considerable risk and inconvenience such freight as may arrive there. Such a large resident population as that of Bareneed composed for the most part of the fishing classes paying into the revenue of the country a quota of taxes equal to any other section of the country, should be entitled to fair consideration at the hands of the Government, more especially as they have been the recipients of but few favours hitherto. In reference to the petition for a well it is an absolute necessity as the people are obliged to go a long distance for their water. In the winter months great hardship and inconvenience is entailed. In the summer time the women of that place have much of the carrying to do. This ought not to be allowed by a Government with so large a revenue as the present one. I trust the Government will see their way clear to grant the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. JENNINGS.—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Moreton's Harbour on the subject of a public wharf. The wharf in question was partly built by the Government during the years 1904-1908, and it will take now about $800 to complete it. The site of the wharf had been chosen by a majority of the inhabitants. Petitions have frequently been presented

to this House on this subject but up to the present nothing has been done, probably owing to the fact that a small minority has opposed its completion on its present site. The majority of the inhabitants are very desirous that this work should be completed as great inconvenience is being experienced in the landing of freight and passengers. Already something like one thousand dollars has been spent on this public work and I trust that it will be speedily completed. I ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from New Chelsea asking for a small sum of money to finish a road to some agricultural lands in that settlement. It seems that some moneys were granted for this work but not sufficient to finish it. A great many are interested in this road, for if finished, much more land would be tilled and much more agriculture products raised. I also beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Long Beach, asking for telephone connection with Northern Bight. This would be a great benefit to the people of that settlement for at present their mails are irregular and they have no telegraph office. I trust that the Government will see its way clear to meet the wishes of the petitioners.

I have also another petition from the inhabitants of Long Beach in the bottom of the South West Arm, in the District of Trinity asking that a telephone connection be given them from Northern Bight. They have no telegraph office and no means of communication except by letter, and the mail is not regular. The petition, which is signed by about twenty-five people, asks that a telephone be installed there.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petitions presented by my colleague.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I also have much pleasure in supporting the petitions.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of King's Cove in the District of Bonavista asking that a freight shed be erected on the public wharf. I find in many of the outports, even important places like Twillingate, where there is a considerable amount of traffic that there is no such thing as a freight shed. Now, Sir, a couple of hundred dollars would put a shed in any of these places. It is true there is a small shed at Twillingate but it is not nearly large enough to accommodate the traffic. In a place like Twillingate there should be a shed that would take a thousand casks of fish. At present the shippers have to pile up their freight near the wharf or put it in lighters to await the steamer. In King's Cove it is the same thing and the petitioners ask for a small sum to erect a shed. I think it is a reasonable request and I think that the Government should erect sheds on the public wharves in the more important places, north as well as south. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition. I also beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Charlottetown, Bonavista, asking for a sum of money to cut a road from Charlottetown to Port Blandford.

They do not ask that a road be built and they only ask for a sum sufficient to have a path cut through the forest.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—What is the distance?

MR. COAKER.—About twelve miles.

I have also a petition from the inhabitants of St. Brendan's asking for a sum of money to construct a road from Shoals Cove and Shalloway Cove to the main line. The petition is signed by Rev. J. Mackey and about thirty five others and I think the Govern-

ment will do well to consider the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Cape Ray asking for the sum of $300 to repair a road from the station to the Cape. I trust that the petition will receive favourable consideration and that the prayer will be granted.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I beg to lay upon the table of the House a statement of the Teachers' Pension Fund for the year ended June 30th, 1913. Also a detailed statement of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board for 1913; also a statement of the Railway Arbitration Awards for 1913.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Groais Islands, in the District of St. Barbe asking that that place be made a regular port of call for the S.S. Prospero. It is not the first time that a similar petition has been presented from that place. That place is a great resort for the fishermen from Bonavista, Saint John's and many other places. There are hundreds of fishermen who fish from Groais Islands and it would be a great convenience to them if the steamer on that route made the place a regular port of call. It is about twelve or thirteen miles from Conche and would not be much out of the way of the steamer. The people there import quite a lot of goods from St. John's, and it is a great hardship to the people to have to send over to Conche for their freight. This place is one of the parts of the district that has not received the benefits conferred on other districts all over the Island. In fact it is an isolated place and it would be only fair to these people if this petition were granted. I would ask that it be referred to the proper department.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition just presented by my hon. friend, Mr. Clapp, from the inhabitants of Groais Islands. This place has no communication with St. John's except by way of Conche. I think there was a small motor boat last year carrying the mails from the Island to the mainland. There is a lot of traffic at Groais Islands and it is largely resorted to by the fishermen of Bonavista Bay and other places. I would say that in the summer thirty or forty schooners go there regularly to fish. There are also a couple of hundred resident fishermen. A great many come there from St. John's to fish in the summer and they need the steamer to take them there in the spring and take them home in the fall. It is often a hardship to get from the mainland to the island, particularly for women as they are often exposed to storms or great risk and already some drownings have occurred in connection with the traffic between the mainland and the Island. It could easily be made a port of call for the Prospero. The distance is only eight or ten miles and there is quite a good harbor with a deep water approach and I do not think any objection would be made by the Company to sending the Prospero there if the Government made the place a port of call.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, it gives me very much pleasure to be able to support the prayer of the petition, as I am acquainted with Groais Islands and I know that a great number of fishermen from Trinity, Bonavista and other places go there in the summer to fish. It would not be more than a few miles out of the way of the Prospero if the Government made this place a port of call and I think it would be greatly appreciated by all concerned.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a largely signed petition from the inhabitants of Grate's Cove,

asking for the sum of $65.00 for a winch at Churchill's Gulch for hauling up boats; and also a petition from the same place for a winch at the south side of Grate's Cove to be used for the same purpose.

I may say that owing to the condition of the coast at Grate's Cove, these winches are badly needed by the fishermen.

I have much pleasure in supporting the petitions and would ask that they be referred to the proper departments.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of New Chelsea for an agricultural road. These people have farms situated about a quarter of a mile from the main line and they find it very difficult to get to them. I would like very much if the Government would grant a small sum of money for this purpose.

It was ordered that these several petitions be received and referred to the proper departments.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Stone, under date February 3rd, I wish to state that for the conveyance of mail between British Harbour and Ireland's Eye, Edward Gardiner was paid $162.16.

I wish to explain to the House, Mr. Speaker, that that amount was paid to Mr. Gardiner in error. The amount should have been $56.40. The matter has been referred to the Deputy Minister of Justice and he has been asked to make a demand on Mr. Gardiner for the amount overpaid.

QUESTIONS.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement showing all monies, both ordinary and special, expended on Marine Works in Carbonear District from June 30th, 1913, to date, together with the names of those by whom said monies were expended.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—That information is being prepared.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works if any money was sent to Change Islands this winter to pay for shovelling snow; if so, what amounts and to whom sent.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—There was no money sent for that purpose.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement, with detailed account, of all monies paid for repairs to Court House at Holyrood for the year 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I shall table the statement this afternoon.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Justice to lay on the table of the House a statement, in detail, of the amount paid Magistrate O'Toole for allowances and expenses over and above his regular stipend, from 1909 to 1913.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Instructions have been sent to have it copied and it will be tabled during this sitting.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secetary to lay on the table of the House a statement of the amount paid for compiling the Outport Telegraphic Despatch ,for the years 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913, and the name of the person or persons to whom the amount has been paid.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to table the information.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works. if, about six years ago, the Government sent material to Victoria Cove, Fogo District, to build a post office? What was done with that material, if sent? Does the Government own or claim any part of the Post Office now at Victoria Cove, Fogo District?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to explain. The Postmaster General had control of all outport post offices. I have asked him for the information, but have not yet received it.

MR. KENT asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister whether any negotiations are, or have been, going on between the Government and any person, or company, in relation to the telephone system of the Colony, or in relation to the telephone system in St. John's; if so to lay upon the table of the House a copy of all letters, documents and papers bearing upon the same.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—There have been no such negotiations.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if any commission has been appoinaed to enquire into the question of compulsory education as outlined by the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister at last year's session of the Legislature, as a result of the various matters brought to the attention of the Government by a deputation in relation to educational grants; if so, that the report of the commission be laid on the table of the House.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—No Commission has been appointed. The Government have the matter still under consideration and hope at the next session of the Legislature to introduce a bill in connection with night schools and continuation schools.

MR. WINSOR asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the amount paid to the northern Labrador mail agent for the years 1912 and 1913 how long engaged and how much per month while thus engaged.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to table the information.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a list of all persons in Bay de Verde District receiving the Old Age Pension, giving the name and place of abode of each and the date on which each pension was first granted.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I beg to table the information and also information asked for by Mr. Targett on February 3rd re the affairs of the Carbonear Water Co.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of committee.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask why the salary of the tidewaiter at Change Islands has been increased from $150. It may be interesting to the House to know that that officer was once Vice-President of the F. P. U. and some of the friends of the Government made tremendous efforts to secure his support. He accepted the position there at $150 and now he is increased to $360.. I might say that there is no more than ten days work a year for the tidewaiter and sub-Collector at Change Islands. Fogo is only three miles away and practically all the Customs work is done there. I have no objection to the appointment, but I do object to taking in a man at $150 and then almost immediately increasing it to $360. Now we consider this too much for the small amount of work this man has to do. He gave up his fishing business and his schooners to accept the position at $150 and now we find this increased. He has nothing to do but interfere in other people's business. The result is that we find protests coming from all parts of the District asking that the position be done away with. A man holding a Government position should have nothing to say in politics unless he is prepared to lose his position. I was in a public position, but I did not value it and did not mind what I said.

and I would not have blamed the Government if they had turned me out. I think this man's conduct is very unfair and I know that this increased vote is going to create a lot of trouble. In Change Islands we have a very strong Council all working in harmony and this man is an eyesore to the people because of his obnoxious ways. Now you are going to have a strong protest from them when they learn of this increase.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, In answer I may say that this man made representations to the Government that the salary he was receiving was not enough to keep body and soul together and he asked for an increase; and in view of what the hon. member has said that he gave up his fishing business and his schooners to do this work, I think the salary is only in keeping with the office.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, just a word in relation to the salaries of the tidewaiters, I would like to point out the discrepancy that exists between the salaries of the tidewaiters in different places. I do not know whether there is any justification for the distinction or not, but there are some where I think it would be very hard to justify the distinction. Take the case of Bell Island. There are four men there at $390 each. That is the standard salary for tidewaiters in large places.

At Botwood there is a tidewaiter who receives a salary of $400; at Hr. Breton there is another who receives a salary of $480 and at Port aux Basques another with a salary of $500. I take it that these are among the largest and most important places mentioned in the list. Why the official at Bell Island receives only $390 and the official at Port aux Basques receives $500 I am at a loss to understand. You will notice that besides the tidewaiters at Port aux Basques and Bell Island you have a sub-collector. At Bell Island the sub-collector receives $700 without any percentage on the duties while at Hr. Breton he receives $400 with ten per cent., which brings the amount up to $800.

There are other instances where sub-collectors receive small salaries but these are increased considerably by the percentages. For example at Bonne Bay the salary is increased to $1,000 on percentages. I would like the Hon. Minister of Finance to explain these distinctions for in a place like Bell Island, where they are working all the time, as those who visit the place must know, the salary should be as large as it is in other places. I know the work must be very great at Port aux Basques, where they have to watch for the two steamers all the year round, but the same conditions exist at Bell Island, for there is continual work there and the men there should be paid like the others in the larger places around the island.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, In reply to my hon. friend I may say that the tidewaiter at Hr. Breton is also Justice of the Peace on the west side of Fortune Bay and when the Magistrate, who is sub-collector, is down the Bay on magisterial work he has to do his work. At Port aux Basques the men have to work all the year round but at Bell Island the port is closed for four or five months each year.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman, I have no experience as to the larger places like Bell Island and Port aux Basques but I know something of the smaller fishing settlements, like Moreton's Harbour and Greenspond. The Customs officials there have many opportunities of increasing their salaries and their duties do not even interfere with their carrying on the fisheries. At Greenspond the sub-Collector had to be present at the coastal wharf on the arrival of the Dundee.

He would attend regularly to the fishery and when the flag went up he would leave his trawl. He received $150 for his services but I think he was able to make his living at the fishery and put this amount aside.

The same applies to Change Islands, where there is a man. He can put in the greater part of his time at the fishery and still do the work of his office. In fact, in all the smaller places the officials can increase their salaries and I do not think that any of them should receive more than $150.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with the vote for the Department of Agriculture and Mines I should like to know how the matter stands with regard to the appointment of the Minister of that Department. We have advanced well into Supply and still this office and the office of Minister of Justice have not been filled. Why these offices have not been filled it is very difficult to say. From the point of view of the public there can be no reason whatever why the office should not be filled. It cannot be for lack of material with which to fill the office for there are many capable gentlemen opposite who would be only too pleased to accept it, gentlemen who would be as qualified for the position as the late Minister or as those who held the office in previous administrations.

I think it is unfair to the House and the country to ask us to go into Supply for this Department until we know how the matter stands as to the appointment of the Minister; we are now four months from the time of the election, when the Minister was defeated, and no attempt of any kind has been made to fill the vacancy. We were informed by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister that the office was vacated on the 2nd January and has remained vacant for five or six weeks.

I submit that we ought to have a Minister of Agriculture in this House when we are dealing with the Supply of that department. I think you will not find a case where Supply of a Department has gone through the Legislature when the Department has not been represented by its official head. We have at the present time no member of the Legislature responsible for the Department. Each Department has its head, who is responsible for the work done by it and for the money voted to it. He also has the supervision of the various works arising out of the Department and, before we go into the Supply of a Department, the Minister ought to be here to explain any matters that may be brought up.

I notice that there is a change in the Estimates for the Department of Agrculture and Mines and even a change of policy is indicated. We had a general explanation by the Hon. Minister of Finance when going into Supply but we have had no further explanation of any kind. The annual vote for the encouragement of agriculture is cut in two. Are we going to cut off the trappings around that vote? These are matters that require an explanation for if we are to believe the report of the commmissioners instead of reducing the vote for agriculture we ought to increase it, that is if the Government believes in its own policy and intends to carry it out.

The report of the Board of Agriculture shows that the difficulty of obtaining the important agricultural products is increasing more and more according as the Canadians and Americans are to a large extent consuming their own products. These are serious matters for the Colony and I think it is due to the country, to the House aud to the Committee that a Minister of Agriculture be here when we are passing the vote of the Department.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I think the hon. leader of the Opposi-

tion will remember that early in the session I dealt to a certain extent with the constitutional questions involved in this matter.

MR. KENT.—I speak of it as a matter of practical inconvenience.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have no objection to my hon. friend calling it by that name but I repeat that the fact that the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines are absent from this House is a constitutional question and it is not a matter for serious comment.

There has been absolutely no inconvenience caused to my hon. friends opposite for every question that has been asked has been answered or will be answered. I am only too glad and the hon. Minister in charge of the Estimates is only too glad to give every information that may be required by my hon. friends. Already the only vote that has been altered in the Estimates for the Department of Agriculture and Mines has been referred to by the Hon. Minister of Finance in introducing the Estimates.

There has been but one change and that is the reduction of the vote for the encouragement of agriculture from $40.000 to $20,000. This has been done to economize and with a view to giving a fair test to the stock distributed over the country. We shall wait for a year or so before having any more exhibitions. We have been having them at the rate of eight or ten a year and now all the people of the different districts have had an exhibition and they have had an object lesson of what the surrounding districts could show. I think these exhibitions have had a very good effect and they have given quite an impetus to farming. We shall rest for a year, therefore, before we give any further exhibitions of agricultural produce.

The same is true of the stock, concerning the quantity of which information has already been given to the House. You will find that there is no district and no important centre to which the Department has not sent improved breeds of cattle, bulls, rams and other animals. We are not likely to agree as to which is the best stock to send, for that is always a matter of difficulty here and elsewhere but the Government takes the position that they have sent to the agricultural societies of the country the very best stock they could procure, having regard to the special local conditions and climate. No bulls, rams or sheep have been purchased without careful enquiry as to whether they would suit our climate and it will not be denied that there are hundreds of improved stock over the island as a result of the Government's policy. We shall wait for a year or two until it may be proper and convenient to change the locality of some of the stock and fill their places with another importation.

There is no other change in the Estimates and the work of the Board is going on along the same lines as heretofore.

Up to the present time the Government has not considered it necessary to fill the office of the Minister but, as I have said, this should cause no inconvenience for my hon. friends can obtain any information that they may require by merely asking for it.

With regard to the importation of agricultural products a few days ago I listened to the hon. gentleman with interest on the same subject. He quoted from the Report of the late Judge Seymour wherein there was shown an increase in the quantity raised in the Colony and then he showed that according to the imports we were importing more. The two things are consistent as I think I can show the committee. In other words I shall show that you can increase your products, your cattle and your produce and your poultry and yet

increase your importation of agricultural products. The reason of this is that our people are living better than they did and consuming more vegetables and they have greater facilities for purchasing and importing them than they did in the past. They are no longer content to live almost entirely on bread and tea. They are earning more money all over the country and besides that a man can now send a barrel of produce to any part of the Colony for thirty cents or all the trains. A Kelligrews man can send a barrel of potatoes to Bay of Islands or any part of the Colony for thirty cents.

Our people are beginning to realize that substantial food is a necessity in a climate like ours and they are demanding it on land and on sea. My hon. friends opposite know a lot about the fisheries and I am sure they will agree with me when I say that those engaged in the fisheries now are much better fed than they used to be. Take a banker, for instance. It used to be a rare thing to see a potato on one of them but now it is a regular item.

Take the sealing fleet and I am sure you find that the men receive four or five times as much vegetable food as they did in former years. I have no doubt that when the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, brings in his sealing bill he will be able to satisfy the House that there has been a large increase taken place in the farm produce allowed the men.

For these reasons there is no point scored when my hon. friend says that we are importing more produce into the country for if we are importing more than we did four years ago it does not follow that our own products have not increased. I go further, however, and I question the correctness of the statement and before the House closes I shall prove conclusively that we are not going behind in our products but that there has been a large increase in every branch. The mere fact of quoting the figures mentioned in Mr. Seymour's Report is not sufficient.

MR. KENT.—They were checked from the Customs Returns.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am speaking of the products raised in our own country. The census is very valuable but it is not always correct and information contained in it is very often misleading. However, if we take the census of the past ten years and compare the annual returns for the past three years with the returns for 1901 to 1911 you will find that the proportion of increase is as great as the returns for 1901-1911 are over 1890-1901. Not alone that but in Judge Seymour's figures he included flour, the import of which has increased greatly during recent years.

The main fact is that our people are living better than they were and whereas the average annual earnings of a family were not more than $300 a year only a few years ago they are now nearly up to $400. But in Nova Scotia they are getting on towards $800 per family, though of course our people are free from many of the expenses they have to pay, such as rent, local taxes, firing, &c. Our people pay no local taxes, and they find their own homes and firing. There is no question but that there has been a considerable increase in our agricultural produce.

I state again that it is not a matter for serious comment that Ministers have not yet been appointed. I shall be very glad to give the hon. member any information in relation to the votes for or the policy of the Department of Agriculture. Our constitutional position is this that, where there is a temporary vacancy as at present, and other members of the Government are in the House prepared to take all the responsibility in re-

lation to the Department, the temporary absence of a Minister is not a matter for serious criticism.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, I beg to take issue with the Leader of the Government on the matter of the absence of the Ministers from the Legislature. It is a very serious matter and it is utterly incomprehensible to me how it is possible for a Minister of the Crown, and especially a leader in a House of Parliament, to stand up and declare that it is not a matter for serious comment, when two heads of Departments who had been defeated at the polls continue to hold office for 14 weeks—for it is fourteen weeks to-day since it was known that these two Minister had been defeated at the polls, though it is not 14 weeks since the offices have been made vacant. It was a matter of comment that they held their offices for a considerable time under very strange circumstances, because it has been customary, when a Minister is defeated either to seek election in the same constituency or occasionally to provide a fresh constituency for him. These two gentlemen were not afforded these facilities. In the first place they did not resign for some two months after the elections, and in the next place, during these two months and for the remainder of the 14 weeks, no facilities have been afforded, for them to go to some other constituency or for anyone else to go. It is now two months since the F.P.U. took action in this matter. The Supreme Council of that organization drew the attention of the Governor to the fact of the vacancies and the fact that no attempt was made to fill them. He was informed that there were two Ministers who had not been sustained at the polls and that the Government had made no move in the matter. The Governor placed on record an opinion differing from that of the Premier. He laid down the position that after all it was a matter of what was a reasonable time for the Government to take some steps. In his opinion six weeks was ample time for the Government to deal with the matter.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That opinion was as to the time within which defeated Ministers should resign and it dealt with nothing else.

DR. LLOYD—It was his opinion on the matter laid before him. The Prime Minister is right in saying that the Governor's statement did not refer directly to the question as to how long such offices should remain vacant, but to the question of the holding of office by Hon. Mr. Bennett for six week before the General Election. But nevertheless that was the general impression given by His Excellency the Governor's letter. This is a matter which seriously concerns this House, and I don't agree with the position taken by the Premier when he says that it is not a matter for serious comment; when after 14 weeks he declares he is not prepared to take this House into his confidence.

It is all very well for the Premier to say that he will take the responsibility. But why is he taking this course? Is it for the convenience or the benefit of this House? I declare that it is merely for the convenience of the party led by the Premier. It is merely a question of political expediency. It has not been convenient for him to open districts, and he does not find it convenient to inform this House of his intentions.

I wish to confine myself to one point and that is the remarkable fact that there is no head to the Department of Agriculture at the present time, and I say that there should be a Head to this Department who should be a member of the Legislature. The Prime Minister has practically said

that he refuses to take the House into his confidence.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman,it may please the hon. member to make that statement; but 1 do not refuse to take the House into my confidence. There is nothing to inform the House about.

MR. COAKER—Say what you are going to do.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I told the hon. member that the matter is under the consideration of the Government. There is at present nothing to announce.

The hon. member is entirely astray in reference to the document published by the Governor. I can say that there is no analogy or connection between the two matters. If he will again read the Governor's letter, he will understand it better, for I have the greatest regard for his views with regard to legal or constitutional matters. The Governor was talking of an entirely different matter; he was talking of how long a man could hold a seat in the Cabinet without going to the country. Mr. Coaker sent a petition to find how long they were going to hold their positions as Cabinet Ministers, and as Department Ministers without seats in the Legislature. The Governor then replied that each case should stand on its own grounds, and he instanced the case of my hon. friend, the Colonial Secretary, who had no seat when he became Colonial Secretary two months before the elections. The Governor pointed out that it was a reasonable time. The hon. member for Bonavista with the object of taking party advantage (for which we do not blame him), pointed out that these men held seats in neither House; but had Departmental Offices, and he thought that they should resign.

But how long they should remain there without finding a seat was a question of time; they should be given a reasonable time. But that had no bearing on the question raised by the leader of the Opposition who raised the question as to whether or not it was constitutional for this House to meet and proceed with the Estimates without filling these offices.

It was proper for him to raise this constitutional question; but the member for Trinity, is talking about an entirely different matter. He will find in that letter nothing on the question of the legality or constitutionality of our being here without Ministers in these offices.

Then my friend went to say that it was incomprehensible to him how the Leader of the Government could put forward such a position. Well, now, I will put it forward again, so that every honorable member can take it down. If any member questions the constitutional position of what I am putting forward, he can obtain the unbiased opinion of some outsider. When ministers are defeated at the polls and when there are temporary vacancies in Parliament in the Departments which they have held, and these vacancies are not filled, it is not a matter for serious comment or criticism if these temporarily exist; provided the Government of which they have been members are prepared to assume the responsibility in relation to their Departments. Now, that is the constitutional position.

My learned friend went on to say that it is usual for a defeated Minister to resign or find another district or go into the other branch of the House. I can cite twenty modern cases where members have held office for months and years after being defeated.

MR. COAKER—Are there any similar cases in this country?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think so. The Solicitor-Generalship was not filled for 8 or 10 years. Of course, you will say it was not an important office; but it was one of the leading Departmental offices. From 1890 to 1898, it was not filled and for 50 years it had been filled. I don't claim here this evening that an office like the Solicitor-Generalship stands on the same plane as these two.

I could, if required, cite other cases..

DR. LLOYD—Where are they?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Well, I don't claim to be an encyclopedia and that I can answer off hand all questions put to me; but I can cite a case today. The Solicitor-Generalship of Canada has not been filled for two years.

MR. COAKER—It was wrong.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Not from a constitutional standpoint. The hon. member has been long enough in public life to know that a Government can do nothing unconstitutional. They could not do it if they tried, and it would be improper if they tried to do it. With regard to the hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Lloyd, I find it very hard to hold any enmity against him. There is something about him that stops all enmity. But he endeavoured to make this House believe that in the matter the Government was hiding something and that we ought to take the House into our confidence. Now, I may tell the hon. member, that the Government is hiding nothing. It has nothing to hide. When this matter ought to be dealt with, it will be dealt with. Meanwhile, we are only too delighted to give every information that we have.

With regard to the cases to which the hon. member has referred, there is nothing unusual and nothing unconstitutional. The hon. member, himself, quoted the case of Gladstone but he agrees with me and with everyone who has followed the trend of constitutional opinion that what happened fifty years ago would hardly be allowed today. But Gladstone held office and was a member of the Cabinet for six months without a seat in Parliament. I did not quote that case, and I am prepared to admit that it was a very strange case, and as I say, it might not be justified nowadays. But here are a few cases just drawn to my attention, some old and some recent cases, all cited by the very highest authority. In 1827 during the Canning administration Lord Frederick Montague was Postmaster-General without a seat in the House. In 1828-29 in Wellington's administration, Vesey Fitzgerald was President of the Board of Trade, and was defeated by O'Connell when he offered himself for re-election, and was without a seat from July 1828 to March 1829.

These are old cases, but they are still cited by authorities. In Earl Grey's administration in 1834 Sir John Campbell was Attorney-General, and from February, 1834, he was without a seat until the following June. In Peel's first administration in 1834, Sir George Murray, Master-General of the Ordnance held office without a seat, until 1835. In Lord Melbourne's second government Lord Palmerston was without a seat, and when the attention of the House was called to the matter, Lord John Russell replied: "I can only say that if the state of things of which the noble Lord complains, had continued for any length of time, there might be very proper question, but as the absence of Lord Palmerston is merely a temporary one, I must decline giving any other answer." That was about 1836. In Peel's second administration in 1845, Caldstone was Colonial Secretary. He was defeated in Decem-

ber 1845, but continued to hold office until the overthrow of the Ministry in June of the following year. If anyone is interested in this particular instance he will find it commented on in Morley's "Life of Gladstone." He held office for more than six months without a seat. A later case is that in Palmerston's second ministry. In 1862 Mr. O'Hagan was appointed Attorney-General for Ireland, but no seat was found for him until May 1863. In 1866 Mr. Patton was appointed Lord Advocate for Scotland, and held office, but no seat was found for him until March 1867, when he was elevated to the Bench. Disraeli in defending the position, said that it might be an inconvenience in the transaction of business of the House, but it was no violation of any constitutional principle. Mr. Patton's successor, Mr. Gordon, was beaten at the Polls and remained out of Parliament until December. In April 1880 Gladstone's second administration was formed and John MacLaren was appointed Lord Advocate for Scotland. He was defeated in two attempts to get a seat, and it was not until Duncan MacLaren resigned the representation of Edinburgh on January 20th following, and after Parliament had met, that John MacLaren obtained a seat.

In Canada there are a number of instances of Ministers being without seats in Parliament. In September, 1842, Robert Baldwin was Attorney-General and was without a seat until January 1843. From August 1845 to Feb. 1846 and from December 1857 to February 1858 William Cayley was a member of the Cabinet without a seat. From May to October 1856 Philip Vankoughnett was Minister of Agriculture, and was in the same position. One of the most recent cases is that of the General Election of October 24th, 1908. Mr. Templeman, the Minister of Inland Revenue in the Laurier Cabinet, was defeated in Victoria, B.C. He continued to hold office without a seat for four months, until Wm. Sloan, M. P., resigned and took a Senatorship to give him a seat. Parliament met on Jan. 20th, and Sloan resigned some time later.

These cases deal precisely with the present situation and show conclusively that the position I have taken up is the correct one.

MR. COAKER—These cases deal with Ministers without seats. What about the case of there being no Minister at all?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—We are now dealing with the second question. I have already dealt with that one. I am now dealing with the question raised by Dr Lloyd and Mr. Kent,as to whether it is a matter for serious comment in Parliament, that Ministers who have been defeated are absent from Parliament. I have dealt with the other point already. I was dealing with the holding of offices by Ministers who have been defeated.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing that is perfectly clear in reference to the Prime Minister, it is that that he has searched the whole realm of Parliamentary history to find cases to suit the present case. And he has failed to do so. He has found a few exceptional cases. But he has not found one case where a Minister has held office for many months without a seat, and he has not found one instance of an office being unfilled by a Minister. Now, what are the cases?

In the first place, the Leader of the Government has attempted to make a distinction between the present case and what was laid before the Governor by the Superme Council of the F. P. U. He said that if I would refresh my memory I would find that the position laid before the

Governor by the F. P. U. was that two defeated Ministers were still holding office. Well, I have refreshed my memory and I find that in the memorial presented to the Government was this position that not alone were two defeated Ministers holding office but that the Government's attention was drawn to the fact that if this condition of affairs continued, the effect would be to leave these offices without ministerial representation in this House. The Government's attention was drawn to the fact that this House would be without its proper Ministerial representation.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I admit that. The point we were discussing was the interpretation of the Government's act.

MR. LLOYD—We were discussing the whole question. I do not intend to be limited by anything the Leader of the Government says. The Government's attention was drawn to the fact that if that state of affairs continued the effect would be to leave this House without the representation of these two offices. That is the correct position. And the probable effect as pointed out by the Supreme Council was correct, for we are to-day without any representation of those offices in this House.

The Leader of the Government cited some instances of ministers who had been defeated at the Polls, holding offices after defeat, even after Parliament had met. What I want to draw attention to in the first place, is the scarcity of these cases. There are a very large number of offices that carry with them seats in the Cabinet. There are in England, some twenty or so. There is another class of office which does not carry with it a seat in the Cabinet. What I want to point out is, that it was a matter for comment when any of these members were absent from their seats and in the next place that in all the instances cited there is not one case of first class importance ever since they have had a democratic Government. The last case of importance was that of Mr. Gladstone, and as pointed out by John Morley a statesman and political writer of the highest standing, that case was not in accordance with the views and constitutional practice of today. I will go further. There is not a single instance of a Cabinet Minister being in connection with the British Government holding his office without a seat, within the last 70 years. All these cases cited, are cases of the minor offices, Lord Advocate for Ireland, Attorney-General for Ireland. These offices are of little importance and it does not matter whether the holders have seats in the House or not. But take any other office of importance and you have not an instance of their being held by a defeated candidate in the last 70 years. With regard to the other cases cited the same thing applies except to the case of Mr. Templeman, who held office for four months after defeat in 1908. That is the only instance of any importance during the past 70 years of a first class office being held by a defeated member. The only instance in the British Colonies, and there is not one in the British House of Commons. And because in Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, set a bad example we are asked to follow it. And this House is faced with the absurd position that nothing unconstitutional is being done, because the members of the Government are prepared to shoulder the responsibility. If the Minister of Finance were defeated and the Premier were prepared to assume the responsibility, would there be no need to fill the office? If the Minister of Public Works were defeated would there be no need

to fill the office? Because if that is so, and if two offices may be left unfilled, why not four? Why not the whole Government? The truth of the matter is this, that it is a matter for serious comment, and a matter which should be called to the attention of this House, that these two offices are not filled. In the first place from October 30th when it was known that that were defeated up to January 2nd, they held office, and nothing was done, and then from January 2nd. when these two gentlemen resigned up to date, nothing has been done, and we are told that we must be satisfied because the Leader of the Government is perfectly open and willing to take the House into his confidence as to anything he knows. But he knows nothing and we have to be content with the assertion that if he had anything to disclose he would disclose it. That is all we know. But the Premier should have something to disclose. He has had ample time to make up his mind and disclose something, and it is the duty of this House to draw attention to the fact that he has had time to make up his mind.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is not a matter for serious comment.

MR. LLOYD—It is a matter for serious comment, and it is very improper for these two offices to be unrepresented in the Legislature. It is a matter to be drawn to the attention of this House, that the Rt. Hon. gentleman does not know and cannot make up his mind what districts to open. And so he proposes to make a football of this House. It seems to me, therefore, that these measures should not be further considered until the Government has made up its mind. If the Estimates were deferred a week that would give the Government time to make up its mind and tell us what they are going to do. This matter is of such importance that I think we should not further consider these estimates until the Government has made up its mind. We have been told that they have considerit. They have been considering it for the past 100 days, and it is surely about time to have come to some conclusion, and we should not consider these Estimates until we hear what that conclusion is.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I must say that as far as we are concerned we feel very disappointed that the Prime Minister has not seen fit to come to some determination to fill these two vacant offices. We have been expecting to have some news that the Government had made up its mind and that it did intend to fill this position. We take the matter seriously because we feel that if it is constitutional to allow this House to go on from day to day without the heads of two Departments, then it would be constitutional to allow it to go on without the heads of four Departments. That is the way in which we regard it. I think the Government should get down to business and decide what they are going to do. We are here day after day and we do not know what is going on in connection with those Departments, and I contend that no one has more right to know what is going on than the members of this side of the House, especially in view of the position in which the parties are at the present time. The Right Hon. Premier has quoted several cases to justify men holding positions without seats. But there is no one holding those positions now. They are vacant, and have been vacant since the 2nd of January. I can understand men being defeated, as Messrs. Morison and Blandford were, and holding their positions for a certain time. The rule is, of course,

that two months is sufficient for the men to hold their seats after being defeated at the polls, but the Premier has quoted cases here today to prove that men have held their positions as long as six months without going back to the polls. But that is a different matter altogether from the one which we are now considering, because there is nobody holding those positions at all. The men who held the positions resigned them, the House has been in session for some time and these Departments are not represented, and I think the Government should make up its mind to fill the positions with acting appointments if not permanent ones. We have been told that the Government have discussed this matter at Party meetings, and that they cannot come to a decision because they are divided on the question as to who should get the positions. It is said, for instance, that Mr. Currie and Mr. LeFeuvre are candidates for the position of Minister of Agriculture & Mines, and that the Government cannot decide between them. Some members support Mr. LeFeuvre and some are for Mr. Currie. Those that support Mr. LeFeuvre take the position that Mr. Currie has no right, being a new member, to get this important position; that Mr. LeFeuvre has been longer in the field and that therefore he is entitled to the position. Probably they are right. If I were on that side I should certainly support the man who has been here longest, and I hope that if the Government do make up their minds to give the position to one of the members for Burin district that they will give it to the man who has been here the longer period. Now, I do hope that it won't be very long before the Premier will be able to announce what the Government intends to do regarding those positions; otherwise he will have a very serious position facing him when the sealers come up from Bonavista Bay. We are going to have a Sealer's meeting.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I hope you will give me an invitation to be present.

MR. COAKER—Nothing could give me more pleasure than to see the Rt. Hon. Premier side by side with me on an F.P.U. platform.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will be delighted. I think I will be able to put the constitutional position to them in such a way that they will understand it.

MR. COAKER—However, the day may come when the Rt. Hon. Premier will be able to take his place with me on an F. P. U. platform, and he will have more sealers to that meeting than he had last year. With regard to the vote for agriculture, I find here a vote of $4,000 for the Fire Patrol committee. Now, I presume that a certain proportion of the Fire Patrol expenses are paid by the companies and other people who have timber claims against the line of railway covered by this fire patrol. I want to inform the Government that the present opinion in connection with the fire patrol is that it is useless. The people who reside in the vicinity covered by the Fire Patrol say that if such a thing as a serious fire took place it would be utterly impossible for the fire warden to do any good. A man travels a section of say four to six miles a day. If he finds that a train in passing has set fire to a place six miles from headquarters, how can he get any assistance? He sees the fire, but there is no water near him, perhaps; he has, may be, a bucket with him, but what is the good of a bucket if the nearest pond is a mile away? He has no way of communicating with headquarters, and the result is that the fire is going to spread unchecked. Now, I have been

making enquiries with a view to discovering the best means of dealing with the matter, and I have come to the conclusion that the best thing to do would be to put a man with Reid's section men. There are generally four men on a section during the summer; they cover about ten miles a day, and if the warden were put with them he would be able to do ten times the work that he can do now. Then in case of a fire he would have the section men right on the spot to help him and he would be in a position to communicate with headquarters very quickly. Down on the Bonavista Branch the people complain that the fire patrol men do no work. They stay at home and attend to their own business instead of doing the work for which they are paid. This is a serious matter. I know that it is not altogether the fault of the Government. The Government expects them to do their duty, but nevertheless if they will make close inquiry amongst the people in the places where those men live they will find out that beyond drawing their salaries they do very little. I have even heard of those wardens clearing land for men who have Government positions, at certain places along the line. It is alright to have a forest patrol; it is alright to try and prevent fires from spreading over the country. We have a valuable amount of forest still left in this country, and we ought to do everything possible to protect that timber; but the Government should see that the work for which they pay is done. I don't think it is right for the Government to be spending a large sum of money to protect the interests of private individuals who own timber limits along the railway line. Of course, the Government owns certain blocks of land here and there but most of it has been given over to private individuals, and I don't think it is right that the people of the country should have to pay for the protection of the property of those individuals. What ought to be done is that the law ought to compel every man who has timber interests along the line to pay for protection in proportion to the amount of land that he owns, and the money thus received should go to the Forest Patrol. Now, every man in the country has to pay a certain proportion of the amount used for this purpose, and I think that something ought to be done in connection with the matter. If a man owns a valuable timber limit, then he ought be prepared to pay for its protection.

Now, I would like to know from the Government what they intend to do with the $20,000 that they are voting for agriculture. Are they simply going to spend it in salaries and in a lot of small minor matters as they have been doing? I suppose they will spend some of it in Commissioners' salaries and some for seed, and a lot of it in other small ways. Now, a considerable amount of good could be done with $20,000. What I would suggest would be, that you put Mr. Devereaux, one of your very best men over there, into the vacant position that you have in the Department of Agriculture, and let Mr. Downey run the other concern. That will help you out, and you will be able to do some good with the extra salary. I should like to know from the Commissioners themselves what they expect to do. They ought to be able to stand up here and tell us exactly what is going to happen to this money. They should be able to tell us just how much they are going to spend for seeds and how much for cattle, and then we will be able to decide whether we are going to get reasonable value for the money or not. Of course, they will have no money to

spend now until July, because last year's grant has been spent, but I should like to know what they are going to do then? I do believe in the encouragement of agriculture; I believe a great deal of good can come from properly directed encouragement. I believe that the Government has acted wisely in cutting off this $20,000 now, because it will give them an opportunity of looking over their books and finding out where leakages have crept in in connection with this expenditure. Next year they may be able to come in and ask for $100,000, and then some material good may come to the people—bonuses for clearing land, if you like. I will tell you what I should like to see, and that is a bonus given for the raising of cattle. I know of nothing better that you could do than give a bonus for this purpose. I don't say that you could afford to give a large bonus per head, but something might be done to encourage the people in this direction. A bonus might also be given for the raising of sheep. If agriculture were dealt with in this way it would encourage young men to take it up. I spent twenty years at farming, but if I had my time over again I would never have gone into it under present conditions. It means an awful uphill fight, and the man who undertakes to make a success of it needs any amount of energy and perseverance. I am satisfied now to remain a farmer because all the hard work has been done, but many a night, when I was hauling stumps out of the forest long after dark, I thought it would never be done and was tempted to throw it all up; so that, as I say, unless a man has lots of energy it is useless for him to go into agriculture in this country. Last year in Green Bay I came across two or three men who had been away. They returned four or five years ago, and started to go into agriculture. They spent the little money they had, found that they had done nothing worth while, and became disheartened. If they only had someone to give them a helping hand then they would have gone ahead and after a few years they would have had a nice little farm. Now, the Premier said in the House this afternoon that all men are beginning to want more to eat than bread and butter. I agree with him and I can tell him that if we have got to go back to the days of tea and bread again we will find that nobody will remain in the country. Our people must be able to live as well here as they can in other countries, or they will not remain here, and what we have to do is to try and make the country such that our working men will be able to live here just as well as they could in the Canadian Northwest or in American cities, and if we don't do that we will never be able to keep our people here. A young man goes away to Canada or the States. He finds that he can earn four or five dollars a day and have lots of enjoyment after his day's work. He writes down to his friends and tells them not to stay in Newfoundland, describes how much better the conditions are at the places where he is, and advises them to go there, and most of these friends go. But, as I said in the House the other day, I believe that the fishermen's lot in this country in the future is going to be better than it has ever been before. Times are going to be better and better, as the years go on. The price of fish is going to be higher. Labrador fish is selling today in the foreign markets for forty shillings a quintal, a higher price than it ever reached before. It is only a few years ago since it was selling for twelve shillings a quintal. Fish is being sold to-day in St. John's for $7.30 and $7.40 a quintal—fish that sold last year for

$6.20. The day for the fisherman is going to come. We will never again go back in Newfoundland, to the days of tea and bread. Our people must have as good as they can get in other countries or they won't remain in Newfoundland, and our duty is to find ways and means to make conditions such that they will be content to stay here.

Now, with regard to climate, the Premier stated that a great deal of attention had been given to climatic conditions in regard to the sheep and cattle that had been imported and distributed thoughout the country. I want to tell him now that a great number of the cattle and sheep that were distributed are dead. I don't believe that ten percent. of the sheep distributed are alive today. I saw last October six sheep sent down to a northern settlement, and when I went there two days afterwards two of the six were dead. A great deal of care is required in handling pure bred sheep and cattle. They must be handled differently from ordinary sheep and cattle and unless proper care and attention is given them they are bound to perish. You must acclimatize these animals, otherwise they will not thrive in Newfoundland.

I don't intend to delay the House any longer, but I would like to say again that I believe a serious position is now placed before the country in connection with these two Departmental positions. I would admire the pluck of the Premier if he would face this thing as it ought to be faced and say: We are going to make two acting appointments and we don't care who likes it or who does not. If you have got the courage to open two districts and appoint two men, go ahead and do it. You can only be defeated. If you open a district where I have any influence, I will certainly do all in my power to defeat your men: but it may be that you will be good before the election comes on and show by your actions that you are determined to do the best you can in the people's interest, and then we might have a different opinion of you. We are not satisfied with things as they are going now, and we are not going to have any of the rights which we believe we possess taken from us. I should be delighted to see the Government take this matter up. Let the estimates for agriculture stand over another week, and in the meantime make up your minds as to what you are going to do. You cannot do better than make two acting appointments just now. If you do that, you will be out of the hole for the present, and God only knows what will happen between now and next fall; you may be over with us then. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to see the Premier and the Minister of Finance over with us.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Chairman, there is just one word that I would like to say in reference to this matter—not that I have anything to offer on the general aspect of the case ,because I have neither the legal nor the constitutional knowledge to deal with the questions which have been raised; but there is one aspect of the case in which I am interested and that is the personal aspect and I would like to satisfy the curiosity of the hon. member for Bonavista as to my position. The hon. member is afflicted with an insatiable curiosity, to gratify which he makes a point of referring here to every rumour that happens to be floating around. Now I want to say so far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned that I have not been approached on the matter; I am not a seeker for the office; I don't want the position; and there is no difference of opinion between my colleague and

myself on the matter whatever. I am not an agricultural expert; know nothing about it in fact. I think this will set at rest the rumors connecting me with the Mines Department.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, there are one or two observations made by the hon. member that I think deserve a reply. I would like to say in relation to the fire patrol, that is a matter in which we are only contributors. The fund is expended by a Committee, and the patrol operates along the line of railway, because that is regarded as the most dangerous point in the whole country. It is quite true that fires originate from other causes in other parts of the country, but I think it is generally understood that a great many of the forest fires have originated along the line of railway. The amount voted here, ($4,000) is merely a contribution, and it was given only after a conference with all the mill owners and owners of property all along the line of railway. The men employed are under their eyes, to a certain extent, all along the line. This policy, if I may dignify it by that term, was the result of a recommendation four years ago, of a conference which was called here in St. John's and was attended by representatives of nearly twenty companies, including Grand Falls, Albert E. Reed Co., the Norris Arm people, and others. These are the people who are contributing to the fund; and up to the present time from reports that we have had, the patrol has been most successful.

MR. COAKER—How much do these people contribute?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am not quite sure, but I think about two-thirds. Of course, the hon. member is quite right that this is a matter in which the responsibility should be fixed on the individuals who own the properties, but the difficulty is to do more than has been done in that respect. The late Administration passed a very strong measure in relation to forest protection and everything possible was done, and this was only a last resource to see if the forests of the country that remain could be saved.

As regards the agricultural vote, the hon. member wanted to know what work there would be seeing that there was only $20,000 to spend. Well, I would advise him to go down some day to the Department and meet the Commissioners. They will be very glad, I feel sure, to see him and give him some idea of the amount of work that has to be done. We have a hundred agricultural societies in Newfoundland today. When we came in there was one society here in St. John's; now, as I say, there are a hundred representing the people all over the country—five or six in each district—and nearly every society has an average membership of about 100.

The Government believes in this Agricultural Policy and the results which will flow from the improved seed and stock throughout the country will justify the expenditure. No doubt the criticisms of the hon. member were considered by them well-intended, but it must not be forgotten they were speaking from an Opposition point of view. It is very easy to criticise in this fashion, but facts go to show that last year alone thousands of official letters were received and answered and each letter was, needless to say, important.

Today we have, thanks to the persevering industry of these Commissioners, thirteen thousand men banded together in societies and making agricultural progress throughout the country. It was not unusual to see people using the same seed for thirty years. It was tragic to see the specimens of potatoes they were digging.

After the expense of fertilizer and seed, they had nothing to show but potatoes equal in size to marbles. This is perfectly true, and was unfortunately not uncommon. Prof. Robertson laid down the principle that with the same land with an equal amount of fertilizer and labour we ought to double our crops. That is what our aim has been. We have given out thousands of barrels of the best seed potatoes, with the result that people throughout the country today have good seed in their cellars for the coming spring. We have had splendid results. From seven barrels given out we have had fourteen, fifteen and sixteen barrels yield, and in one case thirty barrels were dug from one barrel of seed. That is too high an average. But if we can obtain fourteen barrels from one barrel of seed we will have doubled our crop. It may be asked what are we going to do with our potatoes if we obtain a yield double or treble the present one. Well, I may say, that I never yet knew of a barrel of potatoes that had to go to waste. It can be made into cattle or poultry food, and need never be thrown away. As for the Commissioners I consider they have worked conscientiously and have spared no pains over this work. It requires much labour to carry out this policy and these men have been working from morning until night to do so. Referring to sheep, I am surprised to hear the hon. member for Bonavista say that ninety per cent. of the sheep imported for breeding purposes have been killed or have perished. This is a very serious matter, and I shall have enquiries made of all the Societies to ascertain definitely whether this statement is correct. The greatest care was exercised on the part of the Commissioners as regards the selection of sheep, taking into account the climatic conditions. Sheep were ordered with special care regarding hardiness of breed. The Commissioners spent much time in discussing and deciding upon the particular breed they afterwards selected and whatever accidents may have occurred later were due to no fault on their part, or lack of care and foresight I am sure no blame can be attached to them, and I can assure the hon. members that whatever mistakes have been made will be rectified and amended as soon as it can conveniently be done.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we should continue any further with this portion of supply until a Minister of Agriculture and Mines is appointed with a seat in this House. The Premier is undertaking too much work, and responsibility, in being the spokesman for other Departments in addition to his own; besides, it is unfair and improper that such a course should be adopted. It is almost beyond human power for one man to keep in touch with the details of these Departments, consequently it is most unfair to this Committee and to the country, that no proper Minister is here to represent the Department of Agriculture and Mines, when this vote is being considered.

The cases mentioned by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister this afternoon are not at all parallel with the present case, in which the offices have now been vacant over five weeks and a period of three months has elapsed since it was known that the late occupants were defeated at the Polls. The head of the Department of Agriculture and Mines holds probably one of the most important positions in the country, and should now be in this House to explain to us how moneys have been spent in the past, and what his policy, with regard to the present Estimate, will be. In other

words, we should be told how the money we are now asked to vote will be expended. The hon. Premier has stated this afternoon that much good has resulted from his Agricultural Policy. There can be no doubt that an agricultural policy properly carried out with the assistance of socie ties who understand their work must be beneficial and result in good, but the appointment of Societies by themselves will not have very much effect in encouraging agriculture generally.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words relative to the question just debated by my colleague Mr. Kent. It is a matter of surprise to me to learn that the Premier has not as yet filled the vacancies in these important Departments. Although we do not doubt his knowledge of existing matters and his ability in affairs such as these, yet we wonder at the fact of these offices being so long kept open when a reasonable and proper time has so long expired. It is unjust to himself and to the country. For one man to represent two important Departments, and at the same time Prime Minister, almost amounts to an oligarchy. While jokes may pass in this House, it is regarded seriously by men in the Northern districts. We are being kept back by this infringement of constitutional rights.

Regarding the Agricultural Policy the people are at a loss to understand how good can be said to come out of it. They realize only, that from eight to ten thousand dollars has been spent on exhibitions and that good salaries have been paid Commissioners. They realize also, that there were good things in this country before this Act came in. The exhibitions have been expensive, but have benefitted the country little. The fisherman is too busy to grow vegetables for them; and only the men with the leisure to cultivate a few square yards of ground have been able to compete, principally officials, policemen, and such persons with plenty of time to spare.

It being now half past six, the Committee rose.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Committee had leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. JENNINGS gave Notice of Question.

MR. ABBOTT gave Notice of Question.

MR. COAKER gave Notice of Question.

MR. HALFYARD gave Notice of Question.

Mr. COAKER gave notice that he would tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to regulate the employment, food and lodging of men in logging camps, and a Bill to amend the "Workmen's Compensation Act."

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled the Report of the Royal Mission to Deep Sea Fishermen, Newfoundland and Labrador, medical returns for year ending October 1913.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn untill tomorrow, Tuesday, February 10th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, Feb. 10th. 1914.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from a number of the inhabitants of Harbor Grace for $150 to repair a road, known as the Cottage Road. This road has been neglected for a number of years. The petition is signed by 50 or 60 people. I hope the Government will give this matter their attention. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

QUESTIONS.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of returns of expenditure of an allocation of $100 made to P. J. Foran, of Grand Falls for repairs to road alongside railway.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—This matter is in course of preparation, and I hope to have it tomorrow.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing (1) did the Postal Telegraph transfer any cable or local business (that is, paid telegraphic messages) to the Anglo American Telegraph Co., at St. John's or at any other point of the system, during the years 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913; (2) if so give the total amount paid the Anglo for such work for years named; (3) what reason was there for transferring such business; (4) did the Commercial Cable Co. handle any paid business for the Postal Telegraph during 1911, 1912, and 1913; if so, (a) were such messages transmitted free of charge by the Commercial; (b) what amount, if any, was paid the Commercial Cable Co. for such work; (5) how many local cables have been laid by the Government during 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913, where were they laid and by whom; (6) what was the total cost of each cable including purchase price and expenses of laying and to whom paid; (7) by what means were they laid; (8) what amount was paid for local vessels in laying them, and how many dollars per day did the local vessel cost; (9) what sum, if any, was paid the Commercial Cable Company by the Government for cable laying, and why was the Commercial Cable Company's ship engaged for cable laying; (10) how many weeks was Superintendent Stott engaged at cable laying during the years 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913, (a) what was the total sum over and above his salary paid him for such work, (b) what amount was paid him for expenses, (c) how much did his expenses cost per day; (11) was any other member of the Postal department engaged at such work during the same years; (12) if so, who were they and what amount was paid each for such work; (13) how many lines are being operated by the Postal Telegraph Department, and what is the length of each line.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to inform the hon. member that the information is in course of preparation.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister if Messrs. Blandford and Morison are still acting as Heads of the Departments of Agriculture and Justice, and if they have been paid for acting, and if so, at what salary; also, if they resigned their seats in the Executive Council when they resigned the positions as Heads of the Departments, if so whether such resignations have been accepted.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—They are not acting as heads of the Departments and have not been acting, and of course are not being paid a salary. They resigned their seats on the 2nd of January and their resignations were accepted by the Governor.

MR. LLOYD—I would like to ask whether that answer is meant to include that Mr. Morison is not engaged

by the Department of Justice.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Not that I am aware of.

MR. LLOYD—He is not in the service of that Department nor being consulted.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Certainly not.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister what steps the Government proposes to take to repair the damages caused to the breakwater and breastwork at Fortune by a recent storm

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is in the same category as two other wharves one at Portugal Cove here in St. John's, and another at Pushthrough. These three wharves were carried away by exceptional storms, and instructions went on last Saturday from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to save the property from further destruction until the spring; in other words, to make temporary repairs. In the case of Fortune it is particularly a hardship on the people because as a number of the members in this House, are probably aware, the harbour is an artificial one, the two piers that jut out form really the entrance to the harbor, and one of these was badly damaged by the storm. The matter was brought to the attention of the Government by the representatives of the District.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. the Prime Minister, if it is the duty of any person in the employ of the Government or the Municipality of St. John's to make tests of milk supplies for consumption in St. John's, to ascertain the percentage of butter fats, or bacteria, or the existence of adulteration or impurities; if so whose is the duty, and if any reports have been made in connection therewith, and to table the same.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I presume it will be the duty of the health officer to inspect milk insofar as the machinery at his disposal will enable him to do so. I do not know if he has sufficient funds to procure the necessary equipment for the analysis for foods, milk and other articles in the necessary scientific way. I think that at the present time any analysis that may be necessary is generally made by a science master attached to one of the colleges, and that no special man is attached to the Health office, although the health officer has some equipment, and is competent to make tests. However, if my hon. friend is anxious to know the full particulars of the matter ,I shall communicate with the Health Office.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines what has been done with the tools and implements of the Agricultural stables.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That question has already been answered.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Mr. Kent, (in the absence of Mr. Coaker) a Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

LOGGING BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Mr. Kent, (in the absence of Mr. Coaker) a Bill entitled "An Act to regulate the employment, food and lodging of men in logging camps" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that it be read a second time on to-morrow.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

The following resolutions from Committee of the Whole on Supply were read a first and second time, and concurred in. Customs Department, $260,715; Contingencies $10,000.

INSPECTION OF FOODS BILL.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act relating to the Inspection of Foods in St. John's."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that while we were in Committee on this Bill the other day, it was suggested in the interest of grocers and other parties selling food, that a section might be inserted on the lines of the English Act, in relation to taking samples for the protection of the person accused. I have had a section drafted, therefore, which I trust will meet with the approval of the Committee.

It may be necessary hereafter, when the department is properly equipped with the necessary apparatus to go into greater details but I think this section will meet the present circumstances. It will be a protection to the seller and at the same time, when it is made public that a sample can be obtained of the foods he is selling, it will have a good effect on parties who keep shops and probably make them more particular as to the class of goods they keep.

MR. DWYER—Mr.. Chairman, I think that the best clause in this Bill is the one which refers to the milk supply. People will tell you that the farmers do not sell good milk, others will tell you that the milk meets its trouble in the milk can, but I can assure you that it is nothing of the kind. It is due to the fact that there are other causes that milk is not always what it should be. For instance, if milk comes seven or eight miles from a farm on a frosty day, it is certain that the milk will not reach the consumer in the same state as it left the farm. Allow the milk to freeze and then thaw it out, and you will find that it is weaker and more watery than it was before. This is one of the reasons why milk is not always of the best quality. No doubt, hon. members have often been in a store where milk is sold and have seen it on the counter while nearby are kerosene oil, salted fish, onions and other things for sale. The aroma of all these foods and oils is floating through the air, and a lot of it enters into the milk, for there is nothing that takes these things quicker than does milk. The result is that the milk is sold with all these impurities in it, and it is a bad thing for the child that drinks it; it is drinking so much poison. Milk is a conductor of all bad odors and the inspectors should give these shops their best attention. If the inspectors go to the stables and see how the cattle are kept it will do some good, of course, but if their work stops there it is practically useless. The places for them to go are the places where milk is sold in the city.

I have had great experience in milk, for I have been dealing in it day after day for nearly a lifetime, and I am very much interested in this matter. The farmer is not usually to blame, for he has sense enough to know that if he does not sell good milk he will lose his customers, and for that reason I would advise the inspectors to look elsewhere for the trouble, and having found it, let them do their best to remedy it.

I know that the people who sell milk in the city do not mean any wrong when they leave milk uncovered, for many of them do not know that it takes into itself the impure smells in the shop, and I feel certain that if it was explained to them how harmful it is, they would take care to have it

more carefully dealt with. Milk should be kept in an air-tight can, where none of these impurities can enter and not placed on the counter uncovered.

I merely wished to make these observations in order that the Inspectors might be induced not to give the whole of their time to the stables, but to look at the places where milk is sold in the city. There is a great need of improvement in the way our milk is sold and I hope that good will result in the measure that is now before us.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, before we go out of Committees I would like to make a few observations on the Bill before us, and in doing so I may say, that I have been struck very much by the courtesy which has been extended to us by the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, in dealing with this measure. Every suggestion offered by us has been received by him in the spirit in which it was offered, and every amendment suggested by members on this side of the House, has been taken up by him most carefully and fairly. I need not say that the attitude of the rt. hon. gentleman has been very deeply appreciated by members of the Opposition.

I am sure that the debate on the Bill up to the present time is an index that we recognize the importance of the measure which cannot but be fraught with much importance to the general health and welfare of the people. I wish to point out, however, that there is a side to the question that we should look at with the greatest of care, and it is that we must not be content with merely passing this measure, but we must consider its administration and the best means to be adopted to carry it out successfully. The Bill enlarges the powers of those who are in charge of the public health gives them greater facilities for carrying out their duties, and calls upon them to take upon themselves fresh duties. It is essential, therefore, that, in order that the Bill may be carried out, the Government must enlarge the staff of that department. I take it that this is in contemplation, for the words of the first section assume that more officers will be appointed than are now on the staff.

In enlarging the staff there is one matter that should be borne in mind, and which was referred to by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, and that is that at the present time we have no public analyst. Now, the whole question of carrying out this act and of preventing the sale of adulterated foods depends on a fully equipped department for analysis with a competent officer in charge of it. If the act is to be carried out at all the Government will be forced to consider the question of enlarging the staff and the appointment of a public analyst, and the equipment of a public laboratory.

There is another matter that has much bearing on the question before us and that is that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has been to some pains to draft an amendment on the lines of the English Act. He must have had some difficulty in doing this, for while the English Act does not enumerate the foods which come under its scope and includes all foods in general the present act enumerates certain foods, while others are left out. There is no reference whatever in our Act to the adulteration of drugs, and I am told by men well qualified to speak on the matter, that the adulteration of drugs is one of the worst evils from which we suffer.

I do not make these remarks in the spirit of fault finding, for I am quite satisfied that an earnest attempt has been made, but I make them so that perhaps next session, when the

Department has had experience in carrying out the Act, we may be able to make it still more perfect through the experience which they will have gained.

In regard to the analysis, let me point out that the present amendment does not give the full protection that is afforded by the English Act. Under that Act all foods are included, and all foods are subject to analysis, but in addition there is a certificate, and the form in which such a certificate must be given by the analyst. The analyst must state definitely if the food has deteriorated since the sample was taken, and whether the analysis has been effected by this deterioration. We have no such clause here, except in so far as certain foods only are concerned. For instance, if milk deteriorates, there is no protection to the consumer under this Act. For instance, milk may be taken and an analysis made; but owing to the perishable nature of the article the analyst may not be able to make a statement as to the condition of the milk at the time when it was received by the consumer. I think it might be well at some later session, if not now, to provide that when the analysis is made the analyst shall be called upon to state if the analysis has been affected by the deterioration of the food.

As I have said before, I make these remarks without the slightest desire to appear as cavilling, but because I believe that the appointment of a public analyst and the establishment of a public laboratory form the fulcrum round which the Act must be worked. Without them the Act is useless. The worth of the Act will be in the way in which it is carried out, and I know that all desire that it will meet with success. Great advances have been made in this direction during the past few years. Dr. Brehm and Inspector O'Brien have done good work and deserve the support of citizens generally, but it will be impossible for them to do their present duties and take over as well the work called for by this Act. It is not sufficient therefore, to amend the present law, but the Goverument must be prepared to extend the machinery of the department so that the desired improvements may be carried out.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say one or two words in reply to my learned friend, who is quite correct when he says that the present Act is in no way a full measure. It is really only a beginning. As I stated on the second reading of the Bill the whole matter has been under the consideration of the Board for the past two or three years. A year ago a Bill was ready for presentation and at that time some of the points referred to by my hon. friend were then discussed. It was thought, however, that it would not be desirable to encumber the working of the Act, that it would be best to make haste solwly in the matter, and for that reason the Bill is not as full as it might be, and there are not as many matters touched on and as much machinery provided as there would be if the Bill was introduced with the understanding that it was final and complete.

The English Acts apply to conditions that are the result of the growth of years, for in that country they have had analysis of drugs and foods for many years. What officials will be required to carry out this half measure will depend a great deal on the Health Officer. What appears to be most needed at the present time is an examination of our milk supply. The inspection of wines, spirits, and beers has been attended to in the past to some extent, but a more thorough inspection would seem to be

necessary, for I have heard it stated on many occasions, that a good deal of the intemperance that we see existing is to be attributed to the fact that liquor is not pure. In St. John's the wine sellers are a very reputable class, and I would not imply for a moment that they would put any ingredients in their spirits. It may be that the parties from whom they purchase may be to blame and it may be through some other cause. At all events, I have heard it said over and over again, that in the old days when liquor was cheap and there was little or no duty to pay on it, better brands were sold here, and liquor did not seem to have the same effect on people as a great deal of the liquor of the present day seems to have. Under our liquor laws, samples of liquor can be taken and this is occasionally done, but there ought to be an analysis now and then, as well.

I was particularly struck by the remarks of the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Dwyer, and I entirely concur with what he has said. No man in the House, and few outside of it are more competent than he is to give an opinion on our milk supply. His long experience, and his reputation bring much weight to his utterances, and the public outside will give his opinion much consideration for that reason. I agree with him that the trouble may not rest with the farm or dairy, but that a great deal of trouble is caused by allowing injurious foreign elements to enter into milk, which is often done by allowing the milk to remain in an open can in a small store, where there are articles of a perishable or odoriferous nature. As the hon. gentleman has pointed out, nothing is so susceptible to surrounding impurities as is milk. This can be appreciated even by the man who knows nothing of farming and I have no doubt that this matter will receive very careful attention by those who will be responsible for the carrying out of this Act. Some of the rules under the Act will deal with the proper sale of milk as well as clean surroundings or dairies, and farms, for it will be but labor in vain if we purify the source of our milk supply, and the people in town pay no attention to the matter. I have no doubt that the Health Officer, when the Bill becomes law, will take up all these matters.

I thank the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, for his reference to myself. The feeling I have had is that it is not a party measure but one in which both sides are interested alike. I have been only too pleased to accept any suggestions that have been made to improve the measure, and I thank my hon. friends opposite for the many valuable suggestions that they have made.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I think that a difficulty is going to arise in connection with the amount of milk fats present, and the absence of any legal standard of composition for milk. Under the British Act a legal standard is laid down with reference to the quantity of water, butter and other fats, and other constituents in the milk.

The question of what is adulteration will arise, when the analysis takes place. In what way is it illegal if the water is excessive, or if there is a deficiency in the quantity of butter fat, or in any other fats? There is a regular standard laid down under the British Act. Some of these difficulties will naturally come up when the measure is being carried out. When these questions do arise, they will have to be dealt with by the analyst.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I think this is a matter that concerns the city of St. John's probably more than any other place

I would like to express one or two ideas in connection with this matter. I was struck by the practical remarks of Mr. Dwyer, the hon. member for St. John's East. His remarks as to frozen milk led up to apparently adulterated milk. We recognize the fact that after milk is frozen once or twice it has the appearance of being very thin, and as if mixed with water. Whether that is borne out in a scientific way, whether the action of the frost affects the milk, by destroying the butter fat, or whether the chemical change alters the consistency of the milk, I cannot say.

As has been pointed out before this evening, milk is very often kept in small shops, and it is almost universally retailed in the city, by small shops, wherein are kept many other articles. I submit that that is one of the strongest arguments in favour of inaugurating or enacting such a measure as is before the Committee. It is a fact that in the small stores milk is kept in close proximity to kerosene oil, onions, fish and other articles, that give off strong odors. Now, milk is the most susceptible of all liquids, and it rapidly takes to itself odours and germs that may be floating in the atmosphere. This fact emphasizes the advisability of appointing some Board to prevent the infection of milk by the ignorance and carelessness of people who are not aware of the danger to which they are subjecting the general public.

It may not be dangerous for kerosene oil to be absorbed by milk—there may be no danger physically; but certainly it is not palatable. There is the greater danger, however, of the sewerage gases and atmospheric conditions that we experience going through some of our streets, in which milk would be sold. I think, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the present Act will be an instrument with which we can cope more efficiently than in the past, with such conditions as were outlined by Mr. Dwyer.

As to the necessity for enlarging the service to carry out this Act, I quite agree with the hon. member for Trinity, that it will be necessary to have other officials. If this Act is going to meet the requirements, we will have to put forth additional efforts and increase the staff of inspectors. The two gentlemen engaged today, as has been pointed out to this House, have done their work well, and there are no more worthy officials in the service. They are already hard worked, and will not be able to undertake the additional work thus foreshadowed. As to the laboratory work referred to by Dr. Lloyd, I think that Dr. Brehm is doing some laboratory work, and in an ordinary analysis he is able to give the required information. In cases where he cannot give the information, we have always got Mr. Davies who is one of the professors at the Methodist College and a very capable gentleman in such matters. Although we may not be able to carry out this Act in the most far-reaching way as in the great cities of Europe or America, yet I think we can make great improvements and remedy many present evils in the city.

It occurred to me the other day in speaking of the different articles that should come under the inspection of the Medical Officer, and that is the question of canned meats. Mr. Coaker pointed out where the deterioration occurred in barrel meats. If that is the case with barrel meats, I think that in the case of canned meats we have a much more dangerous article. I have heard of cases where whole families have been poisoned through eating impure tinned meats. Unfortunately, I think this matter would involve a great deal of labour

and trouble and it would be almost impossible to carry it out satisfactorily. I think that something could be done in that connection, even at the wholesale house where the inspector would have the authority to open so many cans and see that at least a percentage of the shipment was in good condition.

The keeping of meats for months and even for years, might be made impossible. I think that this is one of the most important features of the question which this Bill brings forth and it would be well if this matter was also included in the Bill. Thus, Dr. Brehm, the Public Health Officer, would have the right to inspect all kinds of tinned goods. I think that action is justified after the disclosures of a few years ago, when the tinned goods business was practically closed, and doing almost nothing, because of the fact that impurities were shown to exist in the food. It is a well known fact to us all that people today will not eat tinned goods, if it can possibly be avoided. In this country where the great number of our people are so far away from supplies, it is necessary for them to have tinned meat.

I think that the remarks of Dr. Lloyd show that he is only desirous of helping the Government in introducing such a measure. I am sure that if the finances of the country will permit, that we will one day have a laboratory and a public analyst.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the statement of the hon. member for St. John's East, who has referred to the deterioration of milk. I have used milk that has been frozen and kept it for a month or more. Even that deteriorated while frozen. At the end of four weeks you would not be able to use it at all.

If milk freezes it does deteriorate. How you are going to get over the fact of the milk freezing between the time that it leaves the farm and is delivered to the shopkeepers is the problem. With regard to milk in stores, there is not the slightest doubt that it is often brought into close proximity with kerosene oil and fish, and other strong smelling articles. Something should be done to remedy this matter. The simplest remedy would be to prohibit the sale of milk except from a proper receptacle, which should be air-tight, and provided with a tap for drawing off the milk. This selling of milk by opening a can and dipping down a measure is very bad. You could have a milk can divided into two parts, the inside to contain ice and the outside to contain the milk. Then you could have a tap connected with the outside division through which the milk could be drawn. I think that some such system as I have described would get over some of the trouble in connection with the odors getting into the milk. If you are going to carry this thing out effectively, you must have a sufficient staff. The present staff must be increased by at least 300 per cent. I thought that $20,000 would be required to carry out this Act, if you want to put it into active operation. If, however, you desire to experiment only, probably $10,000 would be enough.

Some reference was made to the importation of meats. Mr. Moulton said that when he bought beef or pork he always got a first-class article. Why, 20 per cent. of the beef imported this year, turned out to be rotten.

We know there was a tremendous demand for beef all over the world. I found it utterly impossible to purchase it anywhere. You could not get an order filled from any person in the United States; we sent wherever there was an offering for this material. No one wants to get inferior beef,

no one wants to get second class meats. You expect to get a good article for a good price. Mr. Moulton led me to think he meant that we attempted to import an article that was not first class.

It is most important that all beef or pork coming into the country should be inspected. I should say that there are 80,000 or 100,000 barrels of beef imported each year. You would want to have a man all the time looking after it. I am glad that the Government has seen its way clear to do something, and I hope that the country will benefit by it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, as to the point raised by the Colonial Secretary as to tinned foods, I see no objection to adding that to the Act. But I think that the Act as it stands covers tinned meat. It covers all meats whether tinned or not. It might perhaps, be better to further power to examine other tinned goods, tinned milk, etc.

As to the point raised by Mr. Coaker as regards the receptacles in which milk should be kept, that is a point that would be covered by regulation. There would be no need to make another section to the Act. Under section 9 the Governor in Council may make rules and regulations as to such points.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, just one word in relation to the point raised by the Hon. Colonial Secretary in relation to tinned goods. I think as the section originally read, it would cover all kinds of meat. But in specifying certain kinds of meats you are limiting the section. So that in order to have the section cover this point I think it will be necessary to add something.

The other points raised would be covered by the rules and regulations issued under section 9, as for instance the conditions under which certain goods should be offered for sale, the way in which milk is to be handled in process of delivery. We cannot deal with the minutiae of such regulations here as we have not got the detailed information at hand.

I think a great deal of good can result if the provisions of the Act are properly carried out. The conditions which have been shown to exist by this debate, in regard to the import of goods from abroad, calls for stringent inspection, and if knowledge of the fact of our having a strict inspection here is circulated in the centres of export abroad, it will have a salutary effect on exporters to this country, and put an end to their using this market for a dumping ground for goods which would not pass muster in the States or Canada.

As to the question raised by Dr. Lloyd regarding the appointment of a public analyst, and the establishment of a laboratory, I think that in good time that will be provided for, but as the Prime Minister pointed out this Act is of more or less a tentative nature, and the experience gained by it may lead to the establishment of this convenience.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I should like to see some provision in this bill with regard to the handling of flour. There is a great deal of mishandling of flour especially in the outports. I do not know whether there is any chance of obtaining any better conditions by a provision in this Bill, by means of enacting some law in connection with it. It often happens that when a barrel of flour arrives it is spoiled by a lot of dust and dirt in it. In the handling of it some carelessness is shown and sometimes a barrel is dropped and the head comes off. Some flour drops out, and it is scooped up with all the dust and dirt, and put back in the barrel. It would be better in those cases to

allow what drops out to be left out, because the consumer might recover for the amount not sent. As it is very often half the barrel is ruined. I should be very pleased if something could be done to remedy this condition of affairs.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman the point taken by the hon. member is a very proper one. It will, however, be covered by section 9 of the Bill. And a rule may be made in regard to the handling of flour by the medical health officer. I have made a note of it, and when the regulations come to be made, I will, if necessary, draw the matter to the attention of the Health Officer.

In section 1, I suggest the addition of "tinned meats and other tinned foods." That will cover that point which has been raised.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill to them referred, and had passed the same with some amendment.

On motion the report was received and adopted, and the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

EXPLOSIVES BILL.

Second reading of the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapters 40 and 41 of the Consolidated Statutes, respecting the storage and carrying of gunpowder and other explosives."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. It is intended to apply to merchant ships that may be armed under the authority of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty. At present our law applies to warships but of late years the Admiralty has made arrangements with the owners of fast merchant ships of the larger types, like the Mauritania and Lusitania, to be armed at all times, and it is desirable that our law as regards the storing of gunpowder may give them the same rights in port and otherwise as if they were regular warships.

The amendment is asked for by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty. I suppose there can be no objection, and I beg to move the second reading of the bill.

On motion the Bill was read a second time and ordered to be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

SEALING BILL.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend Victoria, Cap. 2, entitled "An Act to Regulate the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery."

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. The Bill is based upon the Sealing Agreement that was entered into between the owners of the sealing steamers and the F. P. U., a couple of years ago. It deals with the food to be used on board the sealing steamers, and the accomodation, and it also asks for some alteration in the Act respecting the dates of sailing and the prohibition of the killing of hoods for two years.

Now, with regard to section 1, dealing with the food and accomodation, I don't think there will be any objection on the part of the owners of the steamers. I have already gone into the matter with them, and they seem to be very anxious to do all they possibly can to meet the wishes of the Legislature and of the sealers. Subsection (a) of Section 1 states that the sides of the ships, where men sleep, shall be sheathed internally with wood. Well, until we made this agreement with the merchants, the usual thing was that the men were permitted to sleep almost anywhere in a ship, and in the larger ships, where the berths were under iron decks, it was found that the frost upon the iron, often melted and dropped down upon the men sleeping beneath. The

sealers asked that some means be effected of keeping the berths dry, and that is why we asked that the decks should be sheathed with wood where the men slept. That has been done during the last couple of years, under private arrangements with the owners. Sub-section (b) sets out that decks not permanently sheathed shall be sheathed temporarily, for the voyage, with three-inch plank properly secured. Sub-section (c)) states that all ships shall be fitted with portable iron frame berths, for the sleeping accomodation of the crew. All the large steamers are meeting that provision now, and it is giving a great deal of satisfaction. Some of them may not be just up to the qualification that we require, but I think that with very little expense those ships that have not got them now, can have them properly fitted. Sub-section (d) provides that hatchways shall be boarded in to protect men from draughts and weather, and that all hatches shall have water-tight coverings. There has been a lot of complaint in this connection, and the reason that we ask to have that provision made is because so many men fell ill at the seal fishery and attributed their illness to draughts and weather from the open hatchways. Now, we ask that the hatchways be covered and that the companion-way be boarded in. That has been done in some of the steamers, the Bowring steamers especially, who have adopted a splendid arrangement. Instead of taking off the hatches they have a shute down which they put the seals and the men have not been put to any inconvenience. Some complaint has been made about the tarpaulins used, not being what they ought to be, and that provision is inserted there, so as to make it imperative that good water-tight canvas be put on the hatches. Sub-section (e) provides that the sleeping quarters of the crew shall be heated by steam pipes. In most of the steamers they have steam pipes. During the last two years they have had time to get them fitted, and now all the men's sleeping quarters are heated with steam. Sub-section (f) states that a room shall be supplied for the accomodation of sick and disabled men. That is a very important point. All the owners have not lived up to their arrangements in that respect. Some of them fitted some sort of bunk up, to meet the requirements, but that is not what the men want. If a man is taken ill, he doesn't want to be left where all the crew are coming and going. He wants a private place and special attention, and the idea is that there shall be a room fitted in each of those large steamers to take the place of an hospital or private nursing room. Sub-Section (g) provides that the use of rifles by the crew, or any member thereof, for the purpose of killing seals shall be prohibited. What was asked was that the killing of seals with guns be prohibited all round, in wooden ships as well as in steel ships, but the owners of the wooden ships claim that if their ships are prohibited from killing seals with guns it would be just as well to keep them in port: that very often a fair, saving voyage is secured by going after old seals with guns, while if guns were prohibited they would not make enough to pay expenses, and that after a couple of years the crews, finding that it would be hopeless to expect to make any money would refuse to go out in these ships at all and they would have to lay at the wharves. It is necessary for the preservation of the old seals that guns be prohibited from being used by the steel ships. Again, the men claim that if these ships are permitted to use guns it means that the voyage will be prolonged, because if the ships

do not strike the seals successfully in the first instance, they will remain out until probably the 20th April, if they are permitted to use guns, whereas if they are permitted this privilege it means that just as soon as the young seals are cut up, the voyage will practically be over, which would be much more convenient to the men. Now, I find that the business men are quite satisfied that the larger ships should not prosecute the killing of the old seals, and generally speaking the conditions that we laid down in connection with that item are being accepted. Sub-section (h) states that wherever practicable a doctor shall be carried in each ship. Well, most of the ships do that now. The owners are doing the best they can to provide a doctor in each ship. Sometimes it is impossible to get a passed medical man, but they get students, and generally they do their best. It is imperative that every ship should carry a doctor, if it is at all possible to secure the services of one, or at least someone who is able to look after men that happen to get ill.

Sub-section (a) of section 2 deals with the amount of soft bread, (one pound) which shall be served to each member of the crew per week. Most of the larger ships did supply that last year, and gave general satisfaction. It seems to me too bad that this arrangement with regard to giving the men soft bread at the ice did not come into effect years ago. I found that the business men were very willing to take up matters of this sort with me when their attention was called to them, and prepared to do everything reasonable in connection with supplying good food to the men prosecuting the seal fishery. The only difficulty in the way of supplying soft bread was due to the fact that some of the ships were unable, with the fit out which they carried to supply the quantity required. Of course, the larger ships have a bakery on board to accomodate passengers in summer and there was no complaint with regard to these, but in the smaller ships bakeries had to be put in. I see no reason why the smaller ships should not supply soft bread as weil as the larger ones. There is a sort of bakery now being imported which would meet all the requirements. It does not cost a great deal of money, and each of those ships should be compelled to carry one so that the men could be supplied with soft bread. Sub-section (b) states that beef, pork, potatoes and pudding shall be supplied for dinner three times each week. It is almost ridiculous that we should have to come in here with a Bill providing for the food which the men at the sealfishery should receive, but we thought it best to go into details, so that there should be no misunderstanding. Sub-section (c) provides that stewed beans and fish brewse shall be supplied for breakfast on alternate days. A couple of years ago we made an arrangement to have beans supplied for breakfast, but found that the men tired of sitting down to beans morning after morning, although it is very good food and gave quite a deal of satisfaction. The men consider that fish brewse every second morning will be quite an improvement. Sub-section (d) sets forth that onions, potatoes and turnips shall be ingredients in the soup supplied on Saturday. Sub-section (e) states that fresh beef shall be supplied to each member of the crew once each week. Now, that is a new item. It was not provided. It was not amongst the provisions contained in the agreement of a couple of years ago, but the owners are quite willing to comply with it, and I feel sure that the poor sealers will be delighted to

know that at last the day has come when they will have fresh meat for dinner on board those sealing steamers on Sundays. Sub-section (f) provides that cooks shall be prohibited from any other work than cooking. Formerly the cook was taken from his work when it suited the convenience of the officers, and put out on the ice to kill seals or haul them on board, and as a result he could not properly attend to his duties as cook, and this provision is intended to prevent him from being called away from his proper work, and I think the men will be greatly the gainers. Section 3 provides that it shall be the duty of the owner, master or person on whose account any steamer shall prosecute the seal fishery in any year to observe, or cause to be observed, the regulations set forth in the two preceding sections. It is not necessary to point out the advantage of that, because someone must be held responsible for the carrying out of these sections. Section 4 provides that the owner or master of any steamer offending against any of the regulations set forth in sections 1 and 2 shall be liable to a penalty of not less than five hundred dollars, nor exceeding one thousand dollars, for every such offence, to be recovered in a summary manner by any person who shall sue for the same, before a Stipendiary Magistrate. Section 5 provides that sick and disabled men on wooden ships shall be transferred, when possible, to steel ships belonging to the same owners as the wooden ships. For instance, in the case of Bowring's fleet, if any of the men on board their wooden ships became ill, and the 'Florizel' or 'Stephano' were in the vicinity, the sick men could be transferred to the steel ship, and put in the room prepared for sick men. Section 6 provides that wooden ships shall not depart for the fishery, outside the Gulf of St. Lawrence, before 8 o'clock a.m. on the 12th March in each year. Steel ships shall not depart from St. John's, or any port south or west thereof, before 8 o'clock a.m., on the 13th March in each year, or any port north of St. John's before 8 o'clock on the 14th day of March in each year, under a penalty of four thousand dollars, to be recovered in a summary manner by such person as may sue for the same, before a Stipendiary Magistrate, from the owner, master, or other person on whose account such wooden or steel ship shall be sent to the seal fishery. The idea of that section is to give the wooden ships an advantage of about 36 hours ahead of the steel ships, and give them a chance of getting into the seals before the steel ships. Section 7 states that no hood seals shall be killed by the crew of any ship prosecuting the northern fishery during the years 1914 and 1915, nor the pelts thereof taken on board, under a penalty of one hundred dollars for each hood seal so killed, or for each pelt so taken, payable by the persons killing the said hoods, or taking the said pelts on board. Any pelts so taken shall be confiscated. That section means that no hood seals shall be killed for the next two years. The reason is that it is believed that the herd of hoods is being exterminated. There was a time when it was difficult to get after the hoods, but now, with those large, fast steamers prosecuting the fishery it is not so difficult, and when they once locate them it is not hard to kill them. In the case of the harp, the mother will not stand by its young, but tries to get away; the hood bitch, on the other hand, will stand by its young, and if you get into the family at all you can manage to get the bitch. Consequently, if you don't prohibit the killing of those seals for a time at

any rate, the whole hood herd will be exterminated. I think you will find that most of the people interested in the seal fishery will agree that a close season of a couple of years, at any rate, should be put on in connection with the killing of hoods. Section 8 provides that if it be shown to the satisfaction of the Customs Officer of any port, that a wooden ship has landed more than one-half of her crew because the season has become so far advanced that a full crew is no longer necessary, and if the said ship shall not land any portion of her cargo of seals, or refit, she shall again be cleared for the seal fishery by the said Customs Officer, and shall not be deemed to go on a second trip, provided she leaves port before the 10th of April in any year. No ship shall be allowed to land more than once in any season under the provisions of this section. There is a feeling now amongst the sealers against going in the wooden ships, because of the fact that the voyage is usually so long. As soon as those ships get all the young seals they can, they endeavour to get after the old seals, with the result that they are sometimes out till May. The value of the old seals is very small in any case; a certain amount is deducted for each skin that is damaged by shot holes; and cases have even been known where a skin has been so damaged that the crew have really to pay the merchant for bringing it in. Now, we want to permit the wooden ships to divide their crews. A good many of those interested in the fishery are quite satisfied to have this provision made. At the present time a ship cannot go on a second trip. She cannot come in and land any men and go to the fishery again. Last year the 'Erik' did it, because the crew demanded it. Now, we want to give every ship that wishes to avail of it the opportunity to come in and land part of her crew and go to the ice again. After the young seals have been killed off, a steamer could go to some port and land a hundred men, and keep fifty with which to continue to prosecute the voyage. Fifty men would be quite sufficient. When a ship is hunting old seals only about fifty men are engaged—as a matter of fact, fifteen or twenty or twenty-five men have to do all the killing. The crew could be divided, one part being shipped on condition that they could be landed during the voyage, and another part until the end of the voyage. Section 9 states that steel ships under 850 tons gross shall, for the purpose of this Act, be considered as wooden ships. The idea is that the "Sagona" and "Fogota" are not large ships, not much more powerful than the "Neptune" or the "Terra Nova," and although they are steel ships, it would be unfair to class them with such ships as the 'Florizel or the 'Stephano.' I think it is only right and proper that they should be classed with wooden ships and be enabled to take advantage of the privileges which are given the wooden ships.

Section 10 provides that no seals shall be killed by the crew of any ship before the 15th day of March, which is one day later than the time allowed by the present law. This has been considered by all experienced people to be sufficiently early, in fact many of the Union men would even go so far as to make the date of killing as late as the 17th or 18th of March. When this Bill will be in Committee, I will go into its details more fully, and I now ask that its principle be admitted by the House, and that it be read a second time.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, there can be no possible objection to many matters contained in this Bill, particularly the

first and second sections. As already stated by the hon. member, Mr. Coaker, many of the matters are already in force by reason of an agreement which has been in existence for some time.

The sub-sections of sections 1 and 2, must be a great advantage to the crew, who have now more comfortable quarters, and better food than heretofore, and it is the purpose of maintaining the present standard in connection with these matters, that this House is called upon to pass this Bill. Take, for instance, the supplying of a room for the accomodation of sick and disabled men. One can only place oneself in the position of a sick sealer to know what awful discomforts they must undergo even under the best of circumstances with the most comfortable surroundings. It is bad enough to be sick and one can imagine how uncomfortable it must be at sea unless proper care is taken to provide comforts. As regards section 2 there can be no objection as far as I can see. It provides for a variety of good and wholesome food, which must commend itself to everyone, and I am told that the owners are willing that it become law. Section (a) of section 2, provides that soft bread should be served to the crew three times a week. The only objection I can see to this would be, the difficulty to the smaller ships of being able to prepare it. But I have no doubt that this difficulty can be got over with a little expense. With regard to the last sub-section of section 2, which prohibits cooks from engaging in any other work, I think there can be little objection to its acceptance by this House. When we remember that two and three hundred men have to be fed aboard the ship, it is not very difficult to imagine that the four or five cooks employed will have all the work they can attend to. Sections 3 and 4, deal more with the question of penalties, and need not be discussed till we enter the Committee stage. Again, there cannot be any objection to section 6, which provides for the date of departure for the steamers. Section 7 deals with the prohibition of the killing of hood seals, for the years 1914 and 1915. I think this Bill ought to go to the second reading, so that every hon. member will have an opportunity of expressing his views upon it. There can be no question whatever about accepting the principle of the Bill, for there are many good things in it, but by adopting this 7th section without due and mature consideration, we may possibly be running the risk of preventing the wooden ships prosecuting the seal fishery. I do not mean to imply that it has not received consideration at the hands of the hon. member, but rather imply that on us in this House, falls the responsibility. We must take the greatest care before passing on the matter, and making it law. I am quite satisfied that we have reached a point in the history of the seal-fishery when a close season is necessary, whether that close season should be every third, fifth or sixth year can only be determined by the advice of experienced persons who have been actively engaged in this enterprise, during the past half a century. I am not prepared to say whether section 7 of this Bill would be a workable proposition if enacted into law. No matter from what quarter legislation is asked, we must be very careful before passing upon it and making it law, to give it our best and most careful consideration. If we do anything which will have the effect of preventing the wooden ships from going to the ice, we are lessening the chances of a large number of men of making a "bill." It must not be forgotten that the steel ships possessing as they do,

such power are much more likely to cut up the patches of harp seals, before the wooden ships can reach them, and under those circumstances what would be the position of the wooden ships. In my opinion they would have nothing else to do but return to port. If we were dealing with this section before the advent of steel-ships, it would be different,but now we must be careful not to place the inferior ships in a position disadvantageous to their owners, and crews. by restrictive legislation. Section seven would be unobjectionable if all the steamers were of the same calibre. Thirty years ago we had twenty ships going out to the fishery of the type of the 'Bear' and 'Neptune,' with the exception of a few smaller vessels like the 'Nimrod' and 'Iceland'. Today we have more powerful ships and larger crews. and it is not at all unlikely that we may before long witness six or seven ships of the latest pattern bringing in the whole of the Northern and Southern patches of the harp seals. Let us say, for the sake of argument, that half a million young harp seals are whelped on the front of the country, and it is not at all impossible that a few of the steel ships might kill that number. In such a case the wooden ships would come along only to find all those seals killed, panned, and if not actually taken on board, reduced into possession by those ships which arrived first on the scene of action. The enactment of a law making such a thing possible might have a deterrent effect upon the owners of wooden ships, in sending them out to prosecute the fishery. We have certainly arrived at a period in the history of the seal fishery when something must be done in the way of protecting the industry. Fifty years ago, six hundred thousand seals were brought into port, and three hundred vessels were manned with about thirteen thousand men. In those days seals fetched eight and nine dollars a quintal, while the men only receive one-third of the catch. The change in price has largely been brought about by the discovery of mineral oils which are used in substitution for our seal oil, which together with other conditions, make it impossible to realize the high price obtained in the past. The average catch is now about two hundred and fifty thousand. It is true that three hundred thousand seals may be brought in one year, two hundred and eighty thousand another year, but we never see nowadays a catch of four hundred thousand, notwithstanding the scientific and modern methods in vogue. The time has arrived in this country when if this fishery is to be preserved, we must make enquiries as to the best means to be adopted for its protection. Some people advocate a close season every third year, while others say that every fourth or fifth year would meet all requirements. I have not sufficient knowledge on this subject to say what should be done, and must rely to a large extent upon those whose experience teaches them the proper course to be adopted. Some years ago second trips were abolished for the purpose of allowing the old seals to escape, which were considered to be the breeding seals. It is very questionable now whether the preservation of the old seals is the proper policy to adopt, with a view of increasing the herds.

Section 8, which refers to the landing of half of the crew, requires some consideration, for it seems to me that it is going very close to allowing a ship under certain conditions to go out on the second trip. However, hon. members will have ample time to give this matter full consideration, before we reach the Committee stage, when, I have no doubt, the

very best will be done in the interests of the fishery. I do not think that this section would be availed of by the crews of the larger ships, for the reason that the Red Cross steamers owing to their New York service, must come in early, and Job's and Harvey's steamers are not likely to remain out very late, as they are generally under charter in the spring. The hon., the introducer of the Bill, stated that those who signed articles might be divided into two classes, namely, th se who were going to remain out for the full voyage, and those who wished to take advantage of this section of the Act. Some provisions should be inserted in this Bill compelling the owners to send men to their homes, otherwise the captains, under this section, would probably land men at a place most convenient, with the result that the men would be obliged to travel long distances to their homes. If men are landed, some provision must be inserted to prevent their being stranded, and falling back on the Government for assistance, for at that season it might be very difficult for the Government to obtain steamers, even if the expenditure was justifiable. I see no objection to the second reading of this Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

PARTRIDGE BERRIES BILL.

Second reading of Bill for the Protection of Partridge Berries.

On motion this Bill was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

SUPPLY.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, when the House was last in Committee on Supply I was speaking of the Agricultural Policy of the Government. We have fallen a long way short of the olden times in matters of Agriculture, and although it may be repeating ancient history, it may have some force and effect to compare what we are doing to what has been done in the past. In times past stricter attention was paid to farming than is now, great interest was taken and much enthusiasm exhibited. On June 23rd, 1843, a ploughing match took place at Brookfield Farm, Kilbride Valley. Thirteen ploughs entered. The contest was begun at noon and finished at 3 o'clock. After this there was horse racing. This House will be surprised to learn that 4,000 people were present. There was immense enthusiasm, and the only thing to be compared with that event in the interest evoked, today, is our annual regatta.

Now, Sir, we might look in vain today for any of the enthusiasm and interest that was exhibited over fifty years ago. These competitions encouraged the people to go into farming, and helped to arouse an interest in Agriculture.

Two or three years later, an exhibition of a similar nature took place a little distance from the King's Bridge Road. As a further evidence of the interest taken in agriculture in those days, I would point out that, not only did the Governor and the leading people in the city attend, but the occasion was even graced by royalty itself. I think it was His Royal Highness Prince Henry of the Netherlands who attended the latter exhibition. We cannot realize, nor have we any idea of the excitement or enthusiasm that was so forcibly exhibited on the occasion. The feature of this event was the presentation of prizes, which were presented by the Governor. Mr. John Dwyer, of Oak Farm,

grandfather, I think, of our present Mr. John Dwyer, M. H. A., won second prize, and the farm which produced the exhibit, is still in possession of the family.

The other winners of prizes were, Hon. Bryan Robinson, for the best cultivated farm of not less than six acres, and best grain crop; the prize for the best farm of not less than three acres waste land broken up and cultivated within the year, went to Dr. Carson of Craig Miller; for the best crop of potatoes of not less than half an acre the prize was given to Michael Scranton of Mt. Prospect; for best crop of oats of not less than one acre, a prize to Bishop Fleming; for best laid down meadow, to John Brien, Flower Hill.

Reference has been made to the money spent for prizes. The Government to make it appear that they were doing something encouraged the people to bring along exhibits. It made no difference if these exhibits were drapery or cutlery, or anything else you may mention, they are all considered worthy subjects for exhibition. That was what we consider wrong, in connection with these exhibits. It was a pure waste of money for prizes to be given for such things. We are not told how the $20,000 asked for will be expended next year. We are trying to get some information as to the expenditure of thls sum which we are asked to vote. I think we have been told by some of the members that the policy of distributing seeds and cattle will be discontinued. Now, if they do not send out any seeds or any cash, or any cattle, what are they going to do with the $20,000? Are they going to pay it out all in salaries? It was said that three Commissioners were originally appointed but that one had passed away, and that two were doing the work; and my opinion is that if the services of the other two were dispensed with, the work could be as satisfactorily performed. It is purely a matter of political expediency that keeps these men in office, and if they could be supplied by the Government with the salaries which they get now, for doing some other work, this $20,000 would be spent in a different manner. Politics is at the bottom of it. Certainly it should not take $7,000 for salaries, to spend $20,000 of an Agricultural Grant. There are two Commissioners at $1,500 each, that is $3,000. There are one hundred societies, and the Secretaries of each gets $20.00 totalling $2,000, then you have a Secretary of the Agricultural Board and there are travelling expenses and a hundred and one items coming in that bring it up to $7,000. It seems tc us to be very false economy to spend money in that way, and we cannot let the vote go through without protesting against it. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines introducing the bill in 1910, referred to the history of Agriculture in this country, and cited instances where prizes had been given to those engaged in agriculture. These prizes were given on a very different basis from the prizes given the past two or three years.

That was doing the right thing, giving prizes for the best farm of not less than six acres or for the best crop of oats or for the best crop of potatoes. Now, we squander thousands of dollars which are of no benefit at all, except perhaps, to the persons who get the prizes. See the contrast between the policy of fifty years ago, and the policy of the present Government. It is perfectly ridiculous and bears out what I said here some time ago, that I could not understand how any body of men put such a law on the Statute Book, which can in no way advance agriculture. I know some instances where eggs were sent to

an exhibition. The person who sent along these eggs to the exhibition changed the eggs he had with neighbors in the community, and got a number of large eggs and sent them along and got a prize, and that is supposed to be advancing agriculture. That is how money is wasted. Two hundred thousand dollars have been spent on this Agricultural policy. I give you the $50,000 that has been spent for seeds and cattle, and the rest might as well be thrown into the sea. Look at the petitions that are coming in here from every section of the country, asking for $20, 30 or 40 dollars to repair or extend a road to some garden. Is not that an object lesson to every member of the House of the great need for Agricultural Roads, and if this large amount that has been wasted the past four or five years on the so-called Agricultural policy had been spent on agricultural roads, it would have been the means of opening up the country from an agricultural standpoint, and would open much land that the people cannot get to now, because they have no means of getting there. Now, if roads were built those lands could be developed and the people could raise a much greater quantity of vegetables. That was brought to my notice in some places in Fogo District. The people were potato digging, and harvesting crops, and you could see women actually carrying potatoes on their backs in bags. The roads were in a bad condition, and were nothing but bogs and rocks. It is no use in developing agricultural land if you cannot get to it with wheeled vehicles.

We have no fault to find with the Government for sending out seeds. That is alright. But we look upon the greater part of the money spent under the Agricultural Policy as wasted. It would be better if the money had been given to build roads. In the localities where the roads were in a good condition the money might be given in the way of a bonus for clearing land. The Government were going to do this. They were going to forward agriculture by giving a bounty for clearing land so as to induce a greater number of our people to turn their attention to the cultivation of the soil. Well, after they were entrenched in power, they winked that promise out of sight, because the had to find places of emolument for their supporters. The extension of the Branch Railway could not provide jobs for them all, and then of course, they had to have an Agricultural Policy, with all its frills and fancies. Further than that, the Government had to amend the Act and put a law on the Statute Book to allow sitting members of the Legislature to become Commissioners, so anxious were they to get places for their supporters. All these things come under this Agricultural Policy and are the result of the errors and mistakes that were made in initiating it. That is apparent to everyone in the country. Now, that is all past history, and there is not much use in discussing it. The question at present is what we are going to do with this $20,000. Are we going to pay it out in sops? Are we going to pay $7,000 of it out in salaries? I certainly do not intend to allow it without making a protest. Is there nobody on the other side of the House to give an expression of opinion on Agriculture besides the Prime Minister. We are coming to believe that what he said when he left the Bond party—that he was the brains of that party—is true of him, and that he is at present the brains of the People's Party.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I never said any such thing I never made any such statement, that I was

the brains of the Bond party, or any other Party.

MR. HALFYARD—Well, if I have misquoted the Prime Minister, I apologize. I have heard the Prime Minister say during the present Session, that he was tired of having other people picking his brains, and getting credit for his labors.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Can't you see the difference between the two statements?

MR. HALFYARD—I believe that he is the brains of this Party, Sir, because he has taken up everything and no one else on the other side has had a chance to say a word. Why don't they get up and express an opinion. Are they afraid to speak—afraid of getting the Government into a greater hole than it is at the present time? There is a number of honorable members on the other side who have not spoken yet, and we are all anxious to have their opinion on this Agricultural Policy. Well, getting back to our point, as to what is going to be done with that $20,000. There has been no improvement in Agriculture the past four years under this policy. There was a Bill introduced here which was in keeping with modern ideas, but it was thrown out for party reasons. Now the Government finds that their policy has been useless and they are going to give it up as much as possible, but they must still hold on to enough to pay salaries to their supporters. That is what we object to. What we want is a policy that will encourage our people to raise agricultural products for their own needs so that we will not be sending out of the country, the vast amount of money that we have sent out in the past for agricultural products. We on this side of the House know a great deal about the people, and we have offered many suggestions, but no attention has been paid to them. And that is one of the evil results of party politics. Patronage rules, and place and power must be provided for those who support any party or Government. In conclusion, I would say to the Prime Minister and others who think that their resolutions cannot be criticised, that we hear the people criticizing them and we know that they should be criticized in spite of all that we have heard the Prime Minister say in their favour.

"So may the outward shows be least themselves;
The world is still deceiv'd with ornament.
In law, what plea so tainted and corrupt.
But, being seasoned with a gracious voice,
Obscures the show of evil? In religion,
What damned error, but some sober brow
Will bless it, and approve it with a text
Hiding the grossness with fair ornament."

So it matters not what proposition is brought up. You will get people to get up and defend it, and hide its defects in a flow of language and words, such as only lawyers can use.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I wish again to repeat the position which I took here yesterday afternoon, in connection with this part of the Estimates, and I wish to protest against proceeding with the Estimates as they stand at the present time. I wish to protest in the first place on the grounds that we have here no Minister of Agriculture. No person holds the position of Minister and there is no person who can perform the functions of Minister in this House, and I do not think that any question of difference as to whether this is a constitutional matter or not, can get

over the practical position that we have here today. We are here today considering the affairs of a most important Department, a Department which has in its care all the natural resources on land of the country, we are here considering that Department considering the transactions of last year and the current year, and voting its supplies for next year, and yet we have no head of the Department here who is responsible for it. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that this is fair to the country, and in order to better show the fact that this Legislature is not properly supplied with information from that Department and not in a position to go on with the Estimates, I would point out that we have not got the Minister's annual Report before us yet. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines is supposed to place before this Legislature, within fifteen days after its opening, a Report from his Department. We have not got any Report from that Department except the Report from the Board of Agriculture, and some statistics from the Crown Lands Department, is not before the House. There is a report called for by the Departmental Act, dealing with the Department as a whole, which should have been supplied. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are also without the reports of the Agricultural Societies. We are without a Minister, without a report of the Department, and without the reports of the Agricultural Societies; and in fact, to be asked to vote Supplies for this Department, as things are at the present time, is an outrage on the House. I think Sir, that before proceeding with this portion of Supply a Minister ought to be appointed, and he ought to take his place here in this House. The present position is not in accordance, I submit, with the spirit of the Constitution, as it is worked today, and I will go as far as to say that the Head of a Department like the Agriculture and Mines, in a country like Newfoundland—which is looking for the development of its agricultural, its mineral, its timber, and all its natural resources—should not only be in the Legislature, but should be here in the representative portion of the Legislature and he should be here when the Supplies for his Department are going through. The Prime Minister, I understand, at the opening of the House today, informed the House that the late Minister of Agriculture has resigned his position, not only as Minister of Agriculture but also his place in the Executive Council of the Colony; and he also made the same statement about the Minister of Justice. Now, the Minister of Justice stands in exactly the same position as the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Justice has other functions besides the functions which he uses in his duties as Minister of Justice in relation to the people. He also has duties in relation to the Governor. He is an official member of the Executive Council, and there are numerous legal matters that every person who is a member of the legal profession will know may at any moment render it necessary for the ex officio interference of the Attorney General, and it would have to be promptly acted upon, and we have no Attorney General, and have not had one since the beginning of the year.

However that is not the immediate question I am dealing with. The question I am dealing with is in relation to the Agricultural Department, and I must protest against going any further with the Estimates of this Department, until a Minister of Agriculture has been appointed, and has taken his place in the House—either permanently or in an acting capacity —until we have proper and regular

Reports from his Department and from the Societies to which the votes that we are now dealing with were distributed during the past year. We are told by the Auditor General that the vote of $40,000 which was voted for this Department last year, had been spent when he drew up his Report—presumably at the end of September, when the accounts for the year were closed. At the present time we have got in connection with this Department, not only the absence of a Minister, the absence of a report, the absence of accounts from these different Societies, but we have also got the Departmental accounts overdrawn before half of the year is over and the work of the Department going into the present financial year; and still we are asked to go on with the vote for this Department without getting any explanation of any kind from a person who knows this Department and who is authorized to deal with such matters. I think Sir, it is wrong in principle, it is wrong as a matter of practical convenience. It is unfair to the country, and unfair to the House, and I think, I may say that it is unfair to the Department with which we are dealing.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this ought to be deferred and I will move that the consideration of the vote for the Agriculture and Mines Department be deferred until a Minister of Agriculture be appointed, and take his place in this House; or that the Government will satisfy the House as to his absence, and tell the House what their intention is in regard to this important Department, and the Department of Justice, and until the reports referred to are laid on the table.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, as regards the Reports, I think the request is most reasonable, and I have no objection to the Committee rising until these reports are tabled. I was not aware that they had not been tabled. I think the votes could then be gone on with. Of course, I do not mean that my honorable friend, should waive any of his rights to make any further motion.

MR. KENT accordingly deferred his motion.

The Committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again on to morrow.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

MR. CLAPP gave Notice of Question.

MR. STONE gave Notice of Question.

MR. ABBOTT gave Notice of Question.

MR. JENNINGS gave Notice of Question.

MR. TARGETT gave Notice of Question.

The House then adjourned until tomorrow at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 11th.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a very numerously signed petition from the inhabitants of St. George's asking for a sum of money for the building of a public wharf and freight shed. Also a petition from the inhabitants of Low Brook, Codroy, for a sum of money to complete the construction of an agricultural road there. I have much pleasure in supporting these petitions, and I ask that they be referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Port Anson, in the district of Twillingate, asking

for two allocations of $300 each, for the construction of roads in that place. This is another new settlement which is rapidly growing and the people, therefore, are in great need of these roads. I would ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of La Scie, in the district of St. Barbe, praying for the allocation of $1,000 to complete the public wharf at that place. La Scie has grown considerably within the last few years and is now quite a big settlement. I made it my business to ascertain the amount spent there during the past twelve months, and I found that there was a sum of $50,000 spent in fishery supplies. I have been there when the 'Prospero' arrived, and I know that in stormy weather it is next to impossible for goods to be landed or for the people to ship their fish on board the steamer. It is the duty of the Government to look into this matter and to allow these people some advantage in the way of public expenditure.

I have not the advantage of knowing what was spent in connection with the wharf, during the past 12 months for my question to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries concerning the matter has not yet been answered. I have asked for grants on several occasions and it is not fair to ignore them. The roads are not in a good condition, and it would mean much to the people if they could land their goods at the wharf. I think, therefore, that it would be a step in the right direction to grant the prayer of this petition, and I have much pleasure in supporting it.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Long Harbor in the district of Placentia Bay, asking that a telegraph office be opened there. The petitioners state that in the spring of the year it is a good place for bait and if the people could get in touch with Grand Bank, Fortune, and other places it would mean a good thing for them. I trust that the prayer of the petition will be acceded to, and that the Government will see its way clear to grant the request of the people, during the coming summer. I would ask that the petition be referred to the proper Department.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition just presented by my hon. colleague, and I think that what the petitioners desire is very fair and reasonable. Long Harbor is an important place and the establishment of a telegraph office there will mean a lot of money to the people, for there is considerable trade transacted. This being so it is not fair to deny the people the facilities that are granted to other places.

Within the past two years considerable improvements have been made in the District. Eighteen or twenty stations have been established, and some five or six cables laid to the most important islands. Needless to say, the people appreciate what has been done in this connection, and all those places that have not telegraphic communication are desirous of having it. I trust that the Government will see its way clear shortly to instruct the Postal Department, under whose jurisdiction these matters are, to have an office opened there.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and I trust that when it comes before the Govern ment, it will receive the consideration which its importance merits. I know

the harbor referred to, as I have lived very near there. I know of the isolation of the place, which has no connection with the rest of the coast. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Lawn and vicinity in the District of Burin, asking for an Elective Road Board. Lawn is an important settlement, the people are industrions and progressive and they now seek the right to elect their own Road Board, a request which I am sure will be granted. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition, and ask that it be referred to the proper Department.

MR. LEFEUVRE—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bonavista, asking for the sum of $75, to be allocated towards the making of a road through some gardens. This road is so situated that in the Spring and fall it overflows and the people who own the gardens are unable to sow their seed till late in June. The petition is signed by a lot of people and I trust the Government will be able to meet their request.

MR. WINSOR—I beg to Support the petition and I think that if the Government spends the money as requested by the petitioners, they could not spend it in a better way.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the Returns of the Reid Newfoundland Company from June 30th 1912, to June 30th 1913. Also the Report of the Government Engineer on trunk railways, to December 31st, 1913. Also the Report of the Government Engineer on the Branch Railways from January 1912, to December 31st 1913.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House the following statements and answers to questions:

Reply to a question asked by Mr. Jennings.

Reply to the question of Mr. Abbott concerning the Fever Hospital.

Reply to the question of Mr. Winsor, concerning grant to Lawrence Carew.

Reply to Mr. Grimes, as to expenditures in the district of Port de Grave.

Reply to Mr. Halfyard, as to the Court House at Holyrood.

Reply to Mr. Stone, as to expenditures in the district of Harbor Grace.

Reply to Mr. Jennings, as to expenditure of $50 at Flat Islands.

Reply to Mr. Jennings, as to a grant of $300.

Reply to Mr. Jennings, as to $100 to Mr. Foran at Grand Falls.

Reply to the question asked by Mr. Halfyard.

Reply to the question asked by Mr. Clapp.

QUESTIONS.

MR. CLAPP asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary whether it is the intention of the Government to extend the telegraph lines from Bonne Bay to Trout River, District of St. Barbe, and if so, will the work be done the coming summer.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, the Government have this matter under consideration.

MR. CLAPP asked the Minister of Public Works if it is the intention of the Government to complete the bridge at Trout River, District of St. Barbe, and when.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—This matter will receive early consideration.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of the amount of money the dredge cost while operating at Lamaline in the District of Burin, and the number of cubic yards of mud removed during 1913.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In the absence of the Minister, who is detained by weather at Burin, I will have this prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House copies of the returns of special, local and main line grants expended at Dildo, for the year 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—This statment is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the amount of moneys expended by his Department at Elliston, in the District of Trinity, from June 30th 1913, up to Feb. 1st, 1914.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—This statement is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the amounts paid by his Department for printing each year from 1909 to 1913.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In the absence of the Minister, I will have this statement prepared.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing whether two mares were imported free into Carbonear District, in the year 1913, and if so, by whom were said animals imported.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—There were none such imported.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the names of all persons receiving the Old Age Pension in the District of Bonavista.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table that statement.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of the expenditure of the vote for 'Propogation of Lobsters,' from the first of May last to date.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In the absence of the Minister I beg to table this statement.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing all, other than local, moneys expended in Carbonear District from July 1st, 1913, to date, for what purpose, and by whom spent.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There were no such moneys allocated in this Department.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing all, other than local, moneys expended in Carbonear District from July 1st, 1913, to date, for what purpose said moneys were expended and by whom.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—This will be prepared.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the report of the Agricultural Societies for 1913. We shall not proceed with the votes on this subject until the Opposition have had a chance of reading them. In reply to the question of the Leader of the Opposition, in relation to arbitration awards, I beg to say that part of this is already tabled. I am informed that the Report of the Dept. of Agriculture and Mines asked for by the hon. member was tabled on January 28th.

INSPECTION OF FOODS BILL.

The Bill entitled an Act relating

to the Inspection of Foods in the city of St. John's, was read a third time, and passed, and ordered to be sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking their concurrence therein.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister 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. CLAPP—I am pleased to see a slight increase in the salary of the Postmaster at Brent's Cove of $5. But I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary why the salary of the Postmistress of Flower's Cove has not been increased. As I have pointed out on several occasions this is a very important office. It is one of the most important distributing centres in St. Barbe District and there is a money order office attached to it. There are thousands of letters sent through there, and she only receives $40. I do not know whether she is paid for the use of the office, and I do not know whether she is allowed any amount for fuel. But, with a money order office attached she ought to be kept from temptation. As I have pointed out to this House before, it is not a fair wage to give for the work at Flower's Cove. I notice the Postal Official at Bonne Bay gets $200; that is little enough. Why should not the Postmistress at Flower's Cove be better paid? She gets $40 a year and is called up at every hour of the night, and has often to go to work in the very coldest weather. She should be paid at least $100, instead of $40, and I trust that before next session some increase will be made.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, the reference to the Post Office stipend at Flower's Cove, by the hon. member for St. Barbe, touches a principle more far reaching than the individual case. I notice that the Minister of Finance in explaining the Estimates stated that a number of salaries had been increased since we were here last year. It is hard, looking at the Estimates, to see on what principle these increases were made.

Following the remarks of members on this side of the House, who are familiar with outport Post Offices it has appeared to me that there has been great discrimination. A Postmaster in one settlement gets an increase whilst a postmaster in neighbouring settlement doing the same work gets nothing. It is very difficult to understand. Whether it is that the man who is most aggressive gets the increase, or whether it is that he has some political pull or whatever the cause, no person who reads the Estimates can get away from the fact that the salaries are unfairly distributed. There are salaries here that vary from $100 to $500. I understand the difference between a large distributing centre, and a small way office. There is a great deal of difference, but in the small offices why one should get $10 another $50, I cannot understand. Take Torbay as an instance. That is an office with a quantity of work, handling a large amount of money every day. It has a large Post Office and the settlement of Torbay is the seventh or eight largest settlement in the Island. The Postmaster gets $50. That is not the way to encourage a man to do his work well. The man who is doing the work at Torbay has been doing it for a number of years, is a most competent official, does the work thoroughly and fully, but is not paid at all. $50 for Torbay could not pay for the board with which he divides off the office for work. From my own knowledge, I know that the Post Office is a place of common resort for

the people of the settlement, and other places.

If we look down the list we see, $20, $15, $10, $8 a year. Why this distinction is made and they are not graded according to the importance of the work and the size of the settlement in which they work, I cannot understand.

It is unnecessary for me to say very much to the members of this Committee as to the importance of this service. Those in charge of Post Offices, distributing centres, way offices, etc., all require to be competent, reliable and efficient. If any error creeps into any part of the Post Office system it is a most serious matter no matter how small the settlement may be. If we lose confidence in the Postal service then the whole trade of the country suffers. And so in order to ensure efficiency in this important service everyone is prepared to pay for it. It is unreasonable to expect good work to be done under the old conditions. If we do not pay for it, then it will be put aside in favor of better paying work. and the more remunerative work will be done first. When the Estimates are being prepared next year, this service of the Post Office should be thoroughly reformed. It is a matter, made the subject of complaint from year to year. I have heard members complaining about the post offices in their constituencies. I have heard complaints both inside and outside the House of the faulty service, and it is all due to the want of a proper wage scale for the work that is being done.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, just a word or two. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in regard to the pay of outport Postal officials, and that in a great many cases the pay is very small indeed. But this condition of things is not brought about by this Government.

MR. KENT—That does not matter.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I was just going to point out that when the hon. member was in the Government we did not hear these complaints from him.

MR. KENT—You did so.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—When the hon. member was Minister of Justice did he not have the pay of the Postmaster at Torbay increased.

MR. KENT—I did. I had it increased from $30 to $50.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Why did you not make the pay adequate to the services?

I quite agree with the hon. member that he is one worthy of every consideration at the hands of the Government. And in reply to my friend, Mr. Clapp in regard to the pay at Flower's Cove, I may say that that is only in keeping with hundreds of applications for similar increases,and if this matter is to be taken up it will have to be taken up as a whole. I quite agree that these officials are not adequately paid. But you cannot give large sums where there is not very much mail handled. Since I have been in the Department, I have received hundreds of letters from Postmasters on this matter, but it would be absolutely impossible to deal with it except as a whole. Conditions of affairs alter. The building of railways and the addition of steam communication make big changes in mail matters. There are places where in the old days the mail came once a fortnight, nowadays these steamers arrive three times a week. In cases like that you cannot expect to carry on the work without additional machinery. The increases that appear here are not based on political pull, but according to the merit of the case. It has never been with us a question of

political leanings, but the cases have been examined and the increases given on the merits of the application.

I would welcome a thorough investigation of the Postal system of the country. An adjustment of the whole service would in my opinion be necessary.

Now, as regards these small salaries, the inadequacy is in some cases not such a hardship as one at first sight might suppose. Take the case of Petty Harbor. The Postmaster there gets $50. That is a very thriving settlement, and quite a large mail, and Mr. Bishop is probably one of the most reliable men in St. John's District. He likes to have that Post Office in connection with his business. It probably increases his business. He has not complained. This applies n many other cases that the Postmaster likes to have the office as something auxiliary to his business.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the Hon. Colonial Secretary that a complete re-adjustment of the Postal Service is necessary all over the Island. As the pay stands now it is often not worth the Postmaster's while to attend to his business.

Apart from that I ask why they make flesh of one and fish of another? The Postmaster at Burin gets $100. Why should that be so?

The Postmaster General agrees with me, as I know he has asked the Government to increase the wages of the Postmistress at Flower's Cove, because he looks on it as a very important office. She has to deal with a tremendous mail winter and summer. Why she should get only $40 is incomprehensible. My objection is that if it is impossible to give increases all round, why give them at all. But when you are giving increases it is my duty to ask why deserving cases in my District are not attended to. I would also like to know whether there is an allowance for fuel. Because you cannot expect them to find fuel during the winter months for such a sum.

I do not get up merely for the purpose of finding fault. I am merely defending the rights of the Postal officials in my District. And in the cases where the officials have been recommended for increases by the Postmaster General year after year, I ask that they be attended to in the Additional Estimates.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman just one word in relation to this matter. I think there is a great deal in the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition, and I notice it has been concurred in by the Head of the Department. No one will deny that the salaries are far from adequate as compensation for services in such an important branch of the public service. But I wish to inform the Committee that the Government has had this matter in view and has endeavored, as far as possible, having regard to the claims of the other services, to increase the small salaries in this Department. When we came in four years ago this vote was $17,000. Today it is $26,000. Now, it has been suggested that there has been discrimination. Personally I know of no discrimination. As far as I know, there was not one application for an increase that was refused. There may appear to be discrimination, but they are really the results of change of conditions. There has been a great change in mail conditions all over the country. Steamers and trains have added work. These changes have doubled and trebled the work in many places, and this has been represented by the Postmaster General to the Government. In order to classify these offices it would be necessary to have a Commission of Enquiry

sit, or else get a full and ample report from the Post Office Inspector in relation to all the aspects of each Post Office. We would have to take each Post Office, and find out the quantity and value of the work done there, the number of times the mail comes, the number of letters, the number of registered letters, the number of money orders and parcels, in other words you would want to measure the whole work. You would have to look at those places which are only open half the year, the population of each place and generally every aspect of each Post Office. Then you would have such cases as the one at Petty Harbor, where the Postmaster divides his time between his business and his postal duties, and where the work is only done as a supplement to the business. Some of the salaries are ridiculousiy low. But if you give a small addition to each Post Office it would mean a very large vote. We have now between 800 and 1,000 Post Offices. If you gave a rise of $10 each, that would mean $8,000; $20 would mean $16,000, and if we had an investigation, as has been suggested with a view to classifying these offices, we would then be able to make proper additions. In some cases you will find that the Postmaster is getting $40 for a weekly mail, while in others you will find the same salary where there is a mail tri-weekly. Still the difference may be due to the difficulty of distribution or other cause of additional work. It may be found that for some offices the amount is very small, but then in most of these there is a small amount in addition for rent.

In any case I can assure the Committee that any changes that have been made in recent years have not been made with any discrimination by reason of political pull, and you will find in nine cases out of ten that the increases have been made on the recommendation of the Postmaster General.

MR. COAKER—I notice there are nine Post Offices receiving the princely stipend of $8 each; seventy Post Offices receiving ten dollars each. Give each of those an increase, so that no Post Offices shall be receiving less than $15 a year. Why, the House ought to pass a resolution thanking those people who have been keeping Post Offices for ten dollars a year for their services. I notice that Cat Harbour Post Office last year received $15, and that this year it is increased to $50. That is a rather considerable increase. The Rt. Hon. Premier said that there was no discrimination. Certainly not—the Government would not think about it; but the peculiar thing about this increase is that the Postmaster at Cat Harbor is the only non-Union man in the place. Now, I have no intention of protesting against this increase of $35. I am enormously pleased to see that this man has got it. He is a worn out fisherman, a man, I suppose, nearly seventy years old, and I certainly have no objection to his receiving an increase of $35 for doing the same work that he did last year. I do hope that the Government will see its way clear to giving the seventy that I have referred to an increase of at least $5 each. I agree with the Hon. the Colonial Secretary when he states that there should be a Commission of investigation into this whole business; but he will undertake to do something wonderful if he undertakes to appoint a Commission to investigate Post Office salaries, because it would be a tremendous undertaking to find out what each office ought to receive. I do hope that the Government will have an investigation into this matter, and that when we meet again there won't be

such a difference between the different salaries. I believe that the Hon. the Colonial Secretary is a man that will endeavor to do the best he can. Our experience during the session has been that he has been very fair and moderate in his expressions and that he is doing his utmost to meet the wishes of the House, and I believe that when the time comes for him to leave the position that he now occupies that he will leave a record behind him that the country will be proud of, and the future historian will be able to proclaim that the Hon. Mr. Bennett was the most up-to-date Colonial Secretary that we have had in this country. So far as the F. P. U. men are concerned, I wish to say that we appreciate the work that he is doing, and hope that it will continue.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I notice that the amount allowed for the Cupids Post Office is the magnificent sum of $20. Now, when we consider the number of people that that post office has to serve—comprising not only the people of Cupids but those of Burnt Head as well—a total of about 1500—six cents a day seems rather poor compensation. It is all very well for the Colonial Secretary to defend his Government. No doubt, they have done some good—certainly to him; but it is rather an absurd argument to put up that because previous Government have done nothing in this respect that they should follow the same course. The Premier has referred to an increase of six or seven thousand dollars in the salaries of this Department during the past year, but you will find that that increase has gone to the large-salaried men of the Department. I have no objection to those men getting increases, but I think that the men who receive small amounts should be considered also. The Post Office officials in the outports, especially in a place like Cupids, where there is quite an amount of work to be done, are more deserving of consideration at the hands of the Government than some of the higher officials, and I think that in the interests of justice and fair play the salaries of those men should be increased. I note in looking through the Estimates that not one increase is given to any of the Post Office officials in the district of Port de Grave. I do not know what the reason is, unless the Government is punishing the District for the stand which it took at the last election; but certain it is that the officials in this District have just as much right to an increase as those in any other District. I think that at least $40 should be voted for each Post Office. That should be the minimum amount; and I think that if the Government is fair in connection with Cupids, when the Supplementary Supply comes before the House they will add at least $20 to the amount which we are now voting.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, just one word in reply to the hon. member. I don't think any increases have been made since the recent election. I mention this in connection with the hon. member's statement that his District was being punished because it did not support the Government.

MR. COAKER—The vote for the carrier to Coakerville is unnecessary, and should be dropped as there is no one living there at present. The vote of one hundred and two dollars for the carrier from Gander Bay to Boyd's Cove, should not be voted as the service is unnecessary.

MR. STONE—I would like to ask the Government why Mr. Edward Gardiner mail courier to Ireland's Eye was dismissed and Mr. Edward Cooper was given the position? As far as

I can ascertain, Mr. Gardiner performed the services in a very satisfactory manner. Now the only reason I can see for his dismissal was that he was not a supporter of the Government, whilst Mr. Cooper was a strong supporter. I do not think it is fair either to the Government or to the people that a man should be dismissed from the service whilst he is performing his duty satisfactorily.

DR. LLOYD—Before this vote is passed I beg to rise to support the demand made by my colleague, Mr. Stone, for an explanation of the dismissal of Mr. Gardiner and the appointment of Mr. Cooper. Mr. Stone made a protest and absolutely no notice was taken of it. I think that is not fair either to the District or to Mr. Stone or to this House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER The Colonial Secretary took a note of it.

MR. LLOYD—I can quite conceive that the Colonial Secretary does not know the circumstances and it would be unfair to expect him to stand up in every case and give an explanation. But I do not think that we ought to pass this vote before the explanation is forthcoming and I would ask that this section be deferred until the Colonial Secretary is in a position to be able to give he explanation.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There can be no objection to that; as a matter of fact, when Mr. Stone made the protest the Colonial Secretary said he would inquire to-morrow.

MR. LLOYD—I can quite understand that it is impossible for the Colonial Secretary to give this explanation at once. It may be a matter not in his cognizance but still as I said, there is an explanation due to the House before the vote is taken.

While I am on my feet I would like to call attention to a vote already taken, in connection with the Postmaster at Shoal Harbor. I understand that when the Bonavista Branch Line was opened the Postmaster's salary was cut from $100 to $20. The reason given for the reduction was that Shoal Harbour had been a distributing centre for Smith's Sound, and when the Branch was opened it would no longer be a distributing centre, and therefore the authorities reduced the salary from $100 to $20. Now he points out to the Department that owing to the train service on the Bonavista Branch, instead of his work being less than before, he has actually more to do, and that he is therefore called upon to do more work for a smaller salary. He protested to the Postmaster General, or rather he refused to take the money, saying that $5 a quarter was an absurd sum to offer for the work required. He was then raised to $40. But he was not satisfied. He said his duties were increased and he saw the Colonial Secretary—I do not know whether it was Mr. Bennett or his predecessor, Mr. Watson.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—It was not I.

MR. LLOYD.—It must have been your predecessor, Mr. Watson. His salary was then increased to $60. He was offered $20, then $40, and then $60, and in the Estimates the vote was $60. I would point out to the Colonial Secretary that his salary is still $40 a year less than it was eighteen months ago, and he claims that he has more work to do to-day than at that time. He also points out that up to twelve months ago he was allowed a cask of oil towards heating and lighting his office, and that that has been taken away to-day. Now I may tell the Leader of the Government and the Colonial Secretary this, that there are a number of cases that I have come across where the Postmasters have not had the opinion that they have about this Service and about in-

creases in this service. The Leader of the Government and the Colonial Secretary say—and I believe with truth—that none of these increases are made with political reasons and partizanship has nothing to do with them, and as I have stated I do not wish to question it; but what I want to point out is, that many of these Postmasters are labouring under the impression that politics has quite a lot to do with it. The authorities say it has nothing to do with it, and the Postmasters say it has everything to do with it. I am not in a position to say which is correct. I leave it to the future, because it is evident at all events that the Government must do something to correct the impression that prevails that justice is not being done all round. The hon. member, Mr. Bennett, has already told us that claims are put forward and merits are considered, and the Leader of the Government has practically said that wherever claims were made last year they were acceded to, but there were some cases where no claims were made. I was therefore pleased to hear from the Colonial Secretary as head of that Department that he was hopeful in the very near future to go into the whole question and he was supported by the Leader of the Government, and I hope that when this is done that justice will be done all round.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, before going away from this vote there is another matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the Colonial Secretary as Head of this Department, and that is the loan which we took here some two or three years ago in reference to telephones. I would like to know whether the Government has adopted any system in the matter of installation of telephones throughout the Colony. A loan was authorized here—I think it was for $150,000—for the purpose of installing a system of telephones throughout the Colony. Now I understand that in some places telephones have been installed, but I do not know upon what system the Government has worked this matter of installation, and how the matter of this loan which was raised for this purpose stands at the present time. I think the Colonial Secretary ought to give the House an explanation. I would again like to call the attention of the Government and of the Colonial Secretary in particular, to whose Department it would relate, to the telephone system in St. John's. It is true, Sir, that the Telephone system in St. John's is owned and operated by a private corporation, but I think every person who has to do with telephones in St. John's will admit that the system is inadequate, unsatisfactory and that you cannot use it at all for any kind of private business. In any other country where a telephone system is installed you can hold an uninterrupted conversation with any person upon any matter without fear of either being overheard on other wires or being interrupted by Central. Now, both these things are a constant complaint by the business community who use the telephone in St. John's. It is a matter which the Postal Department ought, I think, take in hand. I have noticed, for instance, the Board of Trade Reports from time to time complaining of the unsatisfactory condition of the Telephone System, and any person who compares it with outside systems must be satisfied that it is both inadequate and unsatisfactory. The Government announced the policy of improved Telephone communication not only throughout the Colony, but also for the City of St. John's, some two or three years ago. Well, as far as St. John's is concerned we have still the same antiquated system going on and while some telephones have been installed in some sections of the coun-

try, it is not quite clear upon what system the Government have proceeded. I mention the matter so that the Colonial Secretary may give the Committee an explanation of this Telephone business.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, I beg to support the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in his remarks concerning the Telephone system. We have in the city of St. John's to-day one of the worst systems in use anywhere in the world. It is impossible to get through a conversation without interruption. The Board of Trade made representations to the Government some years ago upon the necessity for an improved Telephone System as in other countries, and the Government, I understand, have been negotiating with the Anglo-American Telegraph Co., which now controls this service, for what reason I do not know, except it be that this Company had a telegraph monopoly for fifty years. During those fifty years they installed twenty telegraph stations. Since the Government instituted the Postal Telegraph they have established over two hundred. Now what can you expect from that Company? You have in St. John's to-day quite a number of people who would only be too glad to put money into a venture of this sort, if they had a franchise. There are about 800 telephones in the city, paying on an average of $35.00 per annum, which would mean a revenue of $28,000. Now the Board of Trade put this question before a Telephone Expert and he estimated that the cost of installing a system similar to the one in use in Montreal would be only $50,000. The income at present is about $28,000 per annum, which is more than half of what it would cost to install an up-to-date service. I therefore think it is the business of the Government and the duty of the Government to give us something like an up-to-date telephone service.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Leader of the Opposition as regards the Telephone service, that as far as my personal knowledge of the thing goes, about a year and a half ago the Government Engineer took the matter up to look into the merits and demerits of the different systems. He has had the matter under consideration and has been endeavouring to arrive at some decision, as to what system he would recommend the Government to take up. Up to the present time nothing definite has been arrived at, but I have no doubt that in the near future something of a definite character will be done. I agree with the Hon. member for Bay de Verde that our present system is not up to the requirements. It is not satisfactory and is not anything like what would be in evidence in a city of this size in other parts of the world. Whether the system in St. John's and in the outports can be operated as one system is a matter that requires consideration. As regards the telephones that have been installed in the outports, these installations have been merely of a temporary character and to link up one settlement with another. If the Government decides in the near future to install a system of telephones all over the Island, these telephones would be utilized in that connection.

Before I sit down, I would like to say in reference to the matter of Mr. Gardiner, referred to by the hon. member, Mr. Stone, that he will recognize the fact that I answered a question yesterday in reference to this gentleman as to certain monies received by him, and I was not asked at that time to give the reason for his dismissal, or why he was succeeded by another man. I am not personally aware as to why he was changed, but I wish to assure the hon. member that I did not lightly brush

aside his enquiry as the remarks of his colleague would imply. I paid attention to him, and I have always endeavoured to answer and give all information to hon. members opposite in connection with my Department. I will enquire to-morrow from the Postmaster General as to why this man was dismissed, and I shall have much pleasure in tabling the information.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the remark as to what might be implied from my support of Mr. Stone's demand, I may say that Mr. Stone made the demand and no information was given him and no notice was apparently taken of his request. If the Colonial Secretary made a note of it we knew nothing about it, and I rose and asked for an explanation. The mere fact that the Colonial Secretary took a note was not in our knowledge. The complaint was made openly, and a reply should be made openly, and it was not sufficient to take a note.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member expects the Colonial Secretary to answer every question off hand. He might have given me time to reply. He must understand that the Colonial Secretary or anybody else cannot at once answer every question in regard to a Department of that magnitude. If anything turns up concerning which I think it is desirable to furnish information, I take a note and furnish the information when I can get it. It is not necessary to get up and state that. It would be sufficient for the hon. member to ask me on a future occasion if I had got the information.

MR. LLOYD.—It is not sufficient by any means. We are asked to pass a vote, and when information is asked for the hon. member should get up and state whether he is prepared to supply the information. It is not sufficient for him to remain silent and allow the vote to go through without saying anything.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this man Gardiner, I know something about the matter, as I was in British Harbour the time the transfer was made from Gardiner to Cooper Cooper belongs to Ireland's Eye about two miles across the Arm. Gardiner had been the courier to bring the mail over to Ireland's Eye. Gardiner was a strong supporter of the F.P.U., and the people down there understand that he was dismissed for political reasons. The matter has caused a lot of talk in British Hr. Council, and they decided to back up Gardiner and in fact they were going to take the mail bags from Cooper. Then it came out that Gardiner was getting a salary for doing no work, and that Cooper was also drawing a salary for doing the work. Now that the Government find out that Gardiner got the money they say it was a mistake, and they are going to try and get it back.

Now, with regard to telephones. In the F.P.U. policy laid down in the Bonavista platform we have a provision for the extension of long distance telephones. I have been a telegraph operator and have given a lot of time to the business, and I became an operator because I wanted to know something about the system and not because I ever intended to remain an operator. I have always considered that the opening of telegraph offices in many places was a waste of money, and that what was required was a telephone system. Now, you could take the wire that is at present put up in many parts of the country and use it to operate a telephone system, and you could do away with very many of the telegraph operators. It would cost about $20 a year for each one. What we would suggest is that the Telephone be installed in the Post Office and that the Government pay the postmaster an additional $20 a year for looking after the telephone. If a man

wishes to write out a message he can do so and give it to the Postmaster who will transmit it, or a person can go into the office and use the telephone for five or ten minutes and pay a fee of five or ten cents. You can operate over the wires at present in use up to a distance of fifty miles. Some of the telegraph offices now in use do not do $25 worth of business, and in many places you could open a telephone office in the post office and do away with the services of the telegraph operator. The business transacted in these telephone offices would not be of a very private character. What the ordinary fisherman usually wants to know is whether his vessel has arrived in St. John's, or when she will be leaving, or something else of that kind. Now, take the case of a line from Goose Bay to Bonavista and through that country on the south side of Bonavista Bay. You could install telephones in that country for about $1,000. At present these people have no connection with the outside world. Now take Fogo Islands. They have four telegraph offices. What is wanted is a telegraph office at Fogo and the other places can be linked up by telephone. The telephone can be brought into the smaller settlements that are now without communication, thereby giving all the people more satisfaction than they have now, and at less expenditure. I hope the Government will take this matter up, even if it does cost twenty or thirty thousand dollars to construct the system. It will be cheaper in the long run. The proper course would be to have a report on the matter from some man who understands it, such as Mr. Stott, and I am sure that you would find that you could dispense with half the telegraph offices and save the amount now given the operators for salaries. The telephone service would cost very much less and it would give more satisfaction, and the people would give you the credit for the improvement.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, we have heard this afternoon from the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister in reply to the question of my hon. friend, Mr. Kent, with reference to the telephone system, the convenient reply that nothing definite has been done or arrived at, but that the matter was under the consideration of the Government. I would remind my rt. hon. friend that the road to a certain place is paved with good intentions, for it seems that when any improvement is suggested from this side the Government has already considered it and ope to do something about it in the future. The telephone system is a matter of considerable moment to our people and particularly to the people of the outlying settlements. In the district of Port de Grave there is the same demand for telephones. The telephone service in the city is under the control of a private Company, and it is known to all who have had occasion to use it as one of the worst systems in the world. It is not a system such as the city demands, and it is time that some improvement was made in it. My hon. friend, the member for Bay de Verde, has dealt with this matter, and I heartily endorse his remarks. The Government should take this matter up at once, for if they can improve the system in any way and benefit the people, there can be no object in allowing it to remain under the control of a private Company any longer than we are compelled to do so. The Company is in the business with a view to making a profit out of it, and it is not surprising that we hear so many complaints. My hon. friend, Mr. Hickman, has told us of his experience, and many others have the same complaints to make.We are told that $50,000 will instal a new service that will be a great improvenent on the present service. If the Government is as progressive as it

claims to be, why should it not make use of the revenues to bring about improvements of this kind. They have collected the largest revenues in the history of the Colony, but they have not spent them for the good of the public, and the result has been that a large portion of them has gone to private corporations. The Reid-Nfld. Company have received the largest share of the revenue, but the public have received very little. Here is an opportunity to spend some of the revenue in a way that both the city and the outports may derive some benefit from it. In speaking of telephones I would like to point out how advantageous it would be to have public telephones in the city as they have them in other places. At the present time all the telephones are in homes and private places, and a person wishing to call a doctor, for instance, has to go into a grocery store or some other place, unless he has the telephone in his own house. Often he cannot do this, and has to go around perhaps for an hour or two looking for a doctor. If we had public telephones he could go to it at any time. It would be a great advantage to citizens in this and other ways, and it would not be a difficult matter for the Government to give the question more than passing consideration.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, before we pass from this matter, I wish to thank the Hon. Colonial Secretary for his explanation, but there is one point made by him to which I would like to refer. That is his remark that the Government Engineer has been considering the matter of the telephone service for some time. If we hope to have any improvement made in the service within a reasonable limit of time, some other Department ought to take the matter up, for even now the Department of the Government Engineer is overburdened with work. If the Government Engineer attends to the work on the railway alone he has quite enough to do. He has to deal with in that connection the maintenance and upkeep of the system, the construction of branch railways and many other matters, and it is really enough work for one man to do. You can hardly expect that this official, a very excellent man in every way, can give the time and attention necessary to evolve a telephone system. He has to do other work that an engineer should not be called upon to do at all, such as drawing plans for public institutions. Such work should be attached to the Public Works Department, where there are proper officials. The work of the Government Engineer's office ought to be confined to the construction, maintenance and upkeep of the railway. If it were confined to these matters there would not be so many complaints from business men because of the lack of transport facilities and want of rolling stock. From time to time we hear these complaints and the last report of the Board of Trade refers to the fact that goods at Sydney could not be handled by the Reid-Nfld. Co., the reason that they gave being the want of rolling stock. About three years ago a loan of $150,000 was authorized for the construction of telegraph and telephone systems throughout the Colony. I agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Coaker, that the extension of the telephone service to the small settlements in the different districts will be a great convenience to the people, and there will be no need for a heavy increase in the expenditure to carry this into effect, if the matter is dealt with systematically. The principal thing is to have it based on a satisfactory system and then it will work automatically. If that is done, it will prove a great benefit to the country, outports as well as city.

The matter has been three years now in the hands of the Government

Engineer, and I do not know if there has been any report.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes.

MR KENT—If that is so, the Report should be in our hands, so that we may see what progress has been made. The present position demands prompt action and we should take it. The practical result up to the present has been nothing with the exception of a few telephones installed throughout the country .

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, with reference to the telephone system, I think I am safe in saying that an improvement in the present service would be a great benefit to the people. If all the settlements could be linked up during the coming summer it would be a step in the right direction, for it would be of great assistance to the fishermen. They could get news as to the quantity of fish, herring and bait that was around and be able to proceed to that locality and obtain their share of the good things going. That would mean material benefit to them all.

Whenever I hear of improvements being asked for I always like to look at the other side and see how much it will cost to have these improvements brought about. While we are here discussing outharbor Post Offices, and I see twelve pages of closely printed columns, I cannot see how we can look for many improvements until we can pay for them, without increasing taxation. However, this system of linking up the settlements with the telephone, is one that will pay indirectly through the benefits it will give our fishermen and, as it has been pointed out, if the work is done properly, it should not cost very much to the Colony.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the Report of the Government Engineer has not been tabled here, because it was decided not to make it public. After the vote was taken here for $150,000, the Government instructed the Government Engineer to go abroad and make a study of the systems in force in Canada, and the United States. The Government Engineer is a most capable official and he specialized in this branch, before he came here. He gave us a most exhaustive Report, and contrasted the systems used in Canada and the United States with our system. Up to the present time, the Government has not been able to decide as to the best system to adopt. I understand from my hon. friend, Mr. Hickman, that a system could be installed in St. John's for $50,000, but the Government Engineer is under the impression that it would cost $150,000 to instal a good system in St. John's, not to speak of the long distance telephones. We were hoping we might be able to combine the service here with the long distance telephone service in the outports, and to link up the different settlements, as it has been suggested.

In the first place, we want a good system in St. John's. This would pay, and the public would not be called on to pay anything, because the revenue would more than pay the interest. Then we want a long distance service that would extend throughout the Colony, and link up all the important settlements. In addition to this, there would be another service, which would link up the smaller settlements. In connection with this, it may be possible to do away with the costly machinery of telegraph in some places, and substitute the telephone.

The matter has been under our consideration for some time, and the more we have considered it, the more difficult it has been found to adopt a system that would give satisfaction. We hope, however, that before we

meet again, the whole matter will have taken a definite shape. As regards the present system, we have nothing to do with it, for it is under the control of a private corporation. The Anglo-American Telegraph Company are operating under their charter and we have no power to put them out. The only thing that will do this is competition, but it must be remembered that they have the right to operate that telephone system, whereas nobody else has the right except the Government. What they would do if the Government established a system here, is their affair. What would happen if we gave a charter to another private company is also a matter for them to deal with.

I think I can say that before we meet again the matter will be dealt with, and I agree with all that has been said as to the necessity for improvement in the service.

DR. LLOYD—I should like to know if the Government has decided to instal a system.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The Government has not come to that decision.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that the Committee had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow. On motion the report was received and adopted.

On motion the remaining orders of the day, were deferred till to-morrow.

MR. CLIFT gave Notice of Question.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a bill to Amend Title I. of the Consolidated Statutes, Cap. 2, entitled: "Of Representation in the House of Assembly and the Powers and Privileges Thereof; and also a bill to provide for the investigation of Combines and Monopolies.

It was moved and seconded that when the House adjourn it adjourn until tomorrow (Thursday) afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, Feb. 12th.

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

QUESTIONS.

MR. CLIFT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House, a detailed statement of all expenditure under the heading of Old Age Pensions for the year 1912-1913, and from 30th of June 1913, to date.

HON. MNISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The answer to that question is being prepared.

MR. CLIFT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all expenditure under the heading of Tuberculosis Campaign, during the year 1912-1913, and from the 30th of June, 1913, to the present date.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, the information asked for is contained in an answer to Mr. Coaker, of Jan. 22nd.

REPRESENTATION BILL.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER asked leave to introduce a Bill to amend Title 1, Chapter 2, of the Consolidated Statutes, entitled "Representation in the House of Assembly and the Powers and Privileges thereof."

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, and on leave granted this bill was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

COMBINES AND MONOPOLIES BILL

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER asked leave to introduce a Bill to

provide for the Investigation of Combines and Monopolies.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister and on leave granted this Bill was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SUPPLY.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I understand that during the late administration a contract was made with the Commercial Cable Company to land their cables here. The present Government refused to acknowledge the contract, and commenced a law suit with the Cable Company. The result of that suit has not been made public, but I understand that the Government were sustained by our Court, and the Company appealed to the Privy Council.

What I would like to point out is that as I understand it, this Company now avoids paying the Government $4,000 for landing their cables, and so the Government gets nothing for that privilege.

I want to say a few words in reference to the Marconi Stations on Labrador. I understand there are twelve stations on Labrador, and the rate is fifty cents for ten words. There are a great many settlements not connected with the stations, settlements where the mail steamer calls. The Reid steamers have Marconi systems and receive messages to be transmitted by mail to their destination at the rate of $2.20. So if you send a message from here to Labrador, it would cost fifty cents; whereas, if you sent it, to be repeated through a steamer, it would cost $2.20. I think some better arrangement should be made if possible. Another complaint in this regard is that these stations are situated on mountains, and some miles from the settlements. Some system of telegraph or telephone connection would be very inexpensive, and at the same time very beneficial, and I think some such connection should be made.

MR. STONE—Mr, Chairman,I would ask the Colonial Secretary if he has enquired as to the question I asked yesterday.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman this morning I had a letter from the Postmaster General in regard to the courier, Mr. Gardiner, who was dismissed. I have just received a copy of this letter of March 12th, 1913. It shows that a petition was presented by the people of Ireland's Eye saying that he was inefficient and that on various occasions they did not get their mail, although the weather was quite favorable for him to cross. Acting on this petition the Postmaster General appointed another person.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in regard to the matter raised by the hon. member for Bay de Verde, I may say that that contract is still before the Courts. I have no doubt the facts of the case are in the knowledge of the Committee, and I do not know that I can enlighten them any more than they are at present. In 1905 a contract was entered into with the Commercial Cable Company. The year before they went out of office the late administration made another contract with the Company altering and extending that of 1905. When the present Government came into office, they found this contract and were not satisfied that the contract was in the interests of the Colony, and consequently would

not ratify it. A suit was subsequently taken in regard to the whole matter, and the Supreme Court upheld the position taken by the Government. That judgment was afterwards set aside on appeal. The matter is still sub judice. There are other proceedings in hand, and I do not think it would be in the public interests that I should discuss the matter in detail. If there is any particular question upon which the hon. member would like information, I would be very glad to furnish it in so far as I have the facts.

In regard to the other matter of the charge by mail steamers for the transmission of Marconi messages, that is a matter into which I shall enquire. I very much doubt whether we have any power to control such a matter. We only have control over those with whom we are in contractual relation in regard to the system, and I very much doubt if we can control the rate at which steamers transmit messages by their private systems of wireless telegraphy.

As to the distances of stations from the settlements, that is a matter that both the present and the late Administration left largely in the hands of the Marconi man that went down to instal the stations. It is not everywhere that you can instal a wireless plant. It has to be in a certain position. It is desirable that it should be as high as possible so as to have no land in between it and the next one. But even that difficulty can be overcome by having some arrangement by which the messages can be sent down to the settlements.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, just one word on the matter referred to by Mr. Hickman in regard to Marconi messages to Labrador. I think that if the conditions referred to exist, every step to have it remedied should be taken. Every effort should be made to facilitate the fishermen and the trade in general in this important matter, and now that attention has been drawn to it, I hope the Government will make every enquiry. In regard to the charges they are somewhat different. The charges by the Marconi Company are laid down in the contract, and I do not think they can be changed. You will find the rates fixed in section 9. That section covers the powers of the Company in regard to the tolls to be levied by themselves. The charges between steamers and, say, the Anglo, would be more than those charged between station and station, and I do not think that anything the Government can do can compel the Company to reduce these charges. But the Government should do everything in their power to make the contract service as free and convenient as is commensurate with the cost of the service.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary whether anything is being done in connection with the White Bay steam service. On the loss of the Duchess, I believe the Fogota made a few trips and gave every satisfaction. The Duchess was a very poor ship. Her accomodation was very limited. I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to have a ship of larger capacity, or whether the Fogota will contine the service.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, nothing has been done in the matter up to the present. It is under the Government's consideration, and provision will be made in the spring.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, in regard to the British Harbor case, I believe there was a petition upon which the Postmaster-General acted. I would like to be furnished with a copy of the petition.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I will furnish it to-morrow.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Government if they have considered the question of the removal of the telegraph official at Tilt Cove. I have no doubt that that man is an efficient servant, and when the place was in the height of its prosperity, $500 was not too much for the services which he performed. But at the present time I don't think there are any more than 12 families there, and a man like Mr. Cunningham is not now needed. In my opinion, if Mr. Cunningham were transferred to a more important section, and an office kept at Tilt Cove at the usual rate of $140, it would be sufficient for the needs of the place at the present time.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member, I quite appreciate the remarks which he has made. Mr. Cunningham is a very efficient operator, and his usefulness is lost in such a place as Tilt Cove. The department is all the time requiring efficient operators, and every day almost there are openings calling for the services of such men as Mr. Cunningham. I will draw the Postmaster-General's attention to the fact that it is desirable to find a more important position for Mr. Cunningham, and ask him to bring about the alteration at the first opportunity. A cheap operator would be able to fulfill the duties of the service at Tilt Cove at the present time.

There are one or two questions which I desire to answer in connection with the Postal Department. I was asked to explain why the salary of the mail clerk on the Stella Maris was increased from $200 to $300. The Postmaster-General reports that his salary was increased in order to place him on an equal footing with the mail clerks on the other boats. Also in reply to the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, in relation to the salary of the postmaster at Shoal Harbour, the Postmaster-General reports the salary was reduced and a cask of kerosene oil discontinued because the work has decreased since the Bonavista railway has been in operation. Formerly this was a distributing office for the whole side of the Bay.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat the position that I put forward yesterday, that owing to the new service in Bonavista Bay the work of this office has increased rather than decreased.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I will enquire into the matter.

MR. KENT.—I would like to call the attention of the Government to the wharf at Portugal Cove, in the district of St. John's East. I think that the Government are aware that during a recent storm this wharf was carried away, and I think that the wharf facilities for a place that is the terminal port of Bell Island should be somewhat better than they have been up to the present. The wharf required here is a large one, and I think that, in view of the fact that you are not likely to have a surplus this year to dispose of in connection with works of this kind, you ought not to depend upon an allocation from this source for the purpose of putting a permanent wharf there. During the last few years there has always been a surplus, a portion of which has been appropriated for marine works, but in view of the position this year, I think that an appropriation ought find its way into supply now, or Supplemental Supply, for the purpose of the construction of this wharf. As I have said, Portugal Cove is the terminal port for Bell Island. Every day there are passengers and mails passing through. In fact it is the only port on that side of the Bay that is always available for the purpose of the traffic between Bell Island and St. John's. I understand that some instructions have been given by the Department of Mar-

ine and Fisheries in connection with this matter, but I want to impress upon the Government and the Committee the need of putting some solid, substantial structure there that will meet the requirements of the traffic.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with my colleague, the hon. leader of the Opposition, with regard to the matter to which he has just referred. When the wharf was demolished, I was informed of the matter over telephone, and I got in touch with the Minister of Marine & Fisheries. As Mr. Kent has said, some steps have been taken, and I do really hope that the Government will see its way clear to make some special provision for this work, because it is a matter that does not concern St. John's East alone. The ordinary grant for St. John's East would not only be completely exhausted if this wharf were to be built out of that account, but so far as I can gather it would not even repair the present structure. Now, I would like to point out to the Committee that the opinion is current down around Portugal Cove and amongst those who use the wharf, that the opportunity should now be availed of to improve the whole condition of the wharf and to make it very much larger than it was. Of course, such a structure would cost a very large amount. I hope that the Government will give its earnest consideration to this matter, because the wharf is an important one, and its not being in good condition is a very serious detriment to the very many people, many of whom do not belong to St. John's but are working on Bell Island and reside in various parts of Conception Bay. In the interests of all concerned, I join with the hon. leader of the Opposition in the hope that something may be done in the way of a special vote to deal with this matter.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that I have to object to the passing of this vote this afternoon in the absence of the Minister of Marine & Fisheries. There are a considerable number of items in the vote with regard to which I would like to get information. Take this herring fishery protection vote of $800. I would like to know what has been done during the past year in connection with the protection of the herring fishery, and in what way this $800 was spent. We should have some informa tion upon that matter. Then there is the vote for cold storage for bait, $5,000, I would like to have a statement from the Department showing how this $5,000 was spent last year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—Not spent at all.

MR. COAKER—Then what is the necessity of taking a vote if it is not spent. As it is the intention to bring in some resolutions dealing with fishery matters, would it not be just as well to leave this vote stand for the present, and until we get some further information. I presume these resolutions will be brought in on Monday next, and we may then be in a better position to deal with the vote than we are now. This vote of $5,000 is alright if it is spent in the proper way. Again, take this vote for $16,000. I would like to know how that was spent.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—You will find it in the Departmental report.

MR. COAKER—That is another matter. I find I did have the report and glanced through it in a hurried way. I think it a pity that members have not a printed copy. I don't think that more than two men on this side of the House have seen the report. I myself have only had an opportunity of glancing through it. I notice that a vote of $15,000 is being taken for dredging. In view of the

fact that the cost of this work last year amounted to $24,000 or $25,000, I do not see how the Government can expect to have the work done this year for $15,000. The vote for the propagation of lobsters is $5,000. That is a vote that you might have dropped in view of existing conditions. I find that last year $4,000 of this vote was expended in connection with a motor boat and incidentals that had nothing whatever to do with the propagation of lobsters, and about $1,000 spent in the purchase of lobsters. Now, I have had some experience in connection with the lobster fishery. I think I stated here before, that I considered that the Government's ideas were not practical ones, and would not do very much good. The only way to propagate the lobster fishery is to put on a close season. As I presume this matter also will be dealt with in the resolutions which the Premier proposes to introduce, I doubt whether any good could be served at the present time by proceeding with this vote. I should like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be present to give us the information which we require in connection with this matter, and in view of the resolutions which we are going to have from the Government I think it is only right and proper that we should know something about what is going to be done before we pass these votes. In view of these remarks, I should like to know what the Government intends to do.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I have no objection to allowing the vote to stand.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, the other day when we were dealing with this vote for agriculture I objected to going on with it in the absence of the Minister—not only because of the fact that he is not here in this House, but because there is no Minister—no person directly responsible for this Department; and I objected to the votes for the Department being taken until the Governor in Council had appointed a Minister of Agriculture and Mines to take charge of affairs, and have the Department of which he is the responsible head properly organized as required by law. It is evidently the intention of the Government to ignore these protests, and to force, by virtue of their majority in this House, this supply upon the Committee, upon the House and upon the country. Now, I say that the Department is not properly organized. If you will look at the Act establishing this Department you will find that it calls for a Minister of Agriculture and Mines. There is no valid reason why a Minister of Agriculture and Mines should not be appointed; look at it from any point of view you wish, the Government cannot justify, under the present circumstances, the absence of an official head of the Department.

Here is a Department of the public service under the control of which is placed all the material resources of our country on land. Agriculture, mines, forests—every one of our land resources, is in charge of this Department, and here we are today in session for nearly five weeks and no Minister of Agriculture has yet been appointed. The Government is aware that provision is made by law for the appointment of a Minister who can take his seat right away in this House. This Act was passed expressly to meet such a condition as we are faced with today, and why the Government has failed to take advantage of that Act and appoint a responsible head of that Department, passes my understanding. There is an Act which was passed in 1899, which provides for acting appointments, and under which a member can hold an appointment for six months without seeking election. The object of this Act is to

enable the Governor in Council should a vacancy occur in such a Department as that of Agriculture and Mines, or Justice, to have a responsible head of the same in the Legislature; and immediately upon the occuring of a vacancy to make an acting appointment, which would enable the head of the Department to take his seat in the House, and be responsible to the House, and to the country for the administration of the Department. Now, the Government has a following in this House, from which they can select a man who is capable of filling the office of Head of this Department. They can appoint a man who will fill the position just as competently as the Minister who has just laid down the portfolio. That Minister was defeated at the last General Election, in October. He retained office until the beginning of January, and since then the office has been vacant, and there has been no head of this Department, and yet we are asked now to deal with the Department as if there were a responsible head there. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is due to this Committee and to the House that this portion of Supply should stand over until an appointment has been made, and until a Minister, whether permanent or acting, takes his place in this House. I think it is treating the Committee shamefully to ignore these protests. The only reply that we got the other day in relation to this matter from the Prime Minister, was that the matter was under consideration and that he did not consider that it called for serious comment by the Committee.

I think it is a matter for serious comment. I do not think the Committee ought to tolerate for a moment the absence of the heads of two Departments such as these. The Prime Minister undertakes to perform the work occasioned by the present vacancies. His argument is that his Government as a whole is responsible for the work and that while such work is performed no fault ought to be found, but surely in this there is a lack of organization as well as inconvenience of having no responsible official head. The positions, too, are vitally important. Take, for example, the question of coal areas, or agriculture—and yet we are told we ought not seriously to comment on the fact that this Department is not properly organized. I think the time has come for the House to protest against this.

I now beg to move that unless the Minister of Agriculture and Mines be appointed at once, or a reason sufficient for non-appointment be given, the Committee do defer the vote under the heading of Agriculture and Mines.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, as regards the question raised by Mr. Kent, I would like to point out that a few days ago, I asked why these two positions were not filled. As far as could be seen there was no foundation whatever for the delay in filling the positions referred to by the hon. member, Mr. Kent. That there must be serious reasons, seems more or less apparent, and the people are getting suspicious. We are willing to give the Government time to consider the question. Indeed, a week or so, ought to suffice. We are not favored with the confidence of the Government, and we can only judge superficially. But there is the realization that each week makes the position more serious. This cannot go on forever. The Government cannot continue to be run in this way. The people cry out against it. Every day I get about two hundred letters, and of these at least fifty refer complainingly to this matter. We can only hope that before a week is over the Government will come here and tell us their arrangements, and end the matter.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I must say I agree with the tenor of Mr. Coaker's remarks, and I cannot but wonder if we are going to put this through while the present condition of things prevail. The Government now are taking an outrageous advantage of their majority to impose on the people of the country. It is unfair to press these estimates under the circumstances, or until at least we are told of a reason why the vacancies have not been filled. We can understand no valid reason and can only realize that the position is more serious than it looks at present. We are establishing a precedent for the future, which may be fraught with very serious consequences. As I have pointed out there was a special Act made in 1899 to meet a contingency such as this, permitting the appointment of an acting head for the space of six months. If there are differences between the members surely the interest of the Colony is to be considered before those of an individual. As for us, we are all busy men, who desire to push things forward if possible, that we may return to our respective private occupations. We are faced, however, with a question of great gravity, and in the interests of the country we demand that either these appointments be made before proceeding with the supply or else that we should get an explanation of this most extraordinary proceeding. There should be responsible heads to whom reference might be made, concerning the details of the Estimates for these two Departments. I must therefore insist upon my amendment being put to the House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, It might be regarded as a lack of courtesy if this motion was allowed to be put by the Chair without an explanation on behalf of the Government. I have already stated to this House everything that I am in a position to make known, and have answered questions put by hon. members opposite in respect to this matter. What I said was that the absence from this House of the permanent heads of these two Departments was not a matter of serious comment when the defence of the votes of those Departments were undertaken by other Ministers. I laid down what I considered to be a correct statement of the constitutional position. I do not wish to be understood as saying that those vacancies could go on for ever or for an indefinite period. Two Ministers of the Crown and Heads of Departments were defeated at the last election. They resigned on the second of January, and their resignations were accepted on the tenth or twelfth of the same month, and it would have been quite constitutional for these gentlemen to have held offices to this day and hour, as being quite within the limits of reasonable time. There is no necessity now to argue this point as they both resigned voluntarily, and of their own accord. Since their resignation, which was only four weeks ago, no appointments have been made. The hon. member Mr. Kent, has labored on the point that the work of the office of the Department of Agriculture and Mines had not been performed. It must be remembered that every Department has its Deputy Head, and the work was going on just the same as if a Minister had been appointed. There is no doubt that the Ministerial Heads of Departments do a lot of work, but in reality most of it is performed by the Deputies, especially in the absence of the Ministers. The very name Deputy implies what duties that official is expected to perform, but he cannot come here and explain the many details of his Department. That responsibility is now assumed by another

Minister of the Government. I say that the absence of the Head of the Department is not a serious matter of comment, especially when such a short time has elapsed since the vacancies occurred. Only a month has gone by since the resignation, and cases can be found when men occupying important headships of Departments were absent from Parliament during a whole session. To give an example, when Parliament was not in session, let me remind hon. members that in June 1902, a vacancy occurred by the resignation of the Minister of Justice, but it was not filled until the following month of December. In this matter, I do not desire to hold back the slightest information, and if I was in a position today to announce to this House the names of the two gentlemen who were going to fill those positions, and the vacancies in the Executive Council, I would be only too delighted. I have no object in keeping back any information. I stated here the other evening that I had no information to give, and that the matter was under the consideration of the Government, and will be taken up in the regular way. I may disabuse the minds of hon. members if they think that the office of Agriculture and Mines is kept open owing to the difficulty of deciding between individuals who are looking for that position. There are no claimants for the office, directly or indirectly, neither has any man on this side of the House discussed the matter with me, either by himself or by any person on his behalf. The difference of opinion as mentioned in a certain section of the press is false and fallacious, and only published for the purpose of endeavoring to make trouble. One must not mind every thing that appears in the papers. I took up a newspaper the other day, and read an editorial which stated that because I had given notice of certain Resolutions, I had stolen from the hon. member Mr. Coaker, his ideas of the sealing Bill, and all the kudos which attached to its passage through this House. The hon. member well knows that I never made any attempt to steal his ideas in connection with his Bill, for I had not seen it until days after I had given notice of the Resolutions. The House will remember that I had spoken favorably of the Sealing Bill and agreed with its sections, except one or two which had reference to the killing of old hoods, and the possible undesirability of landing portions of the crews. I had put my motion for the resolution off, so that there could be no possible conflict between their consideration and that of the Sealing Bill, and at the time I gave notice of the resolutions I had no idea of the nature of the provisions of the Sealing Bill, which were not printed for days afterward. I may state that the motion of which I have given notice has no relation whatever in any shape. or form to the subject matter of the Sealing Bill, except in relation to the close season, and as to whether a time has not been reached in the history of the sealfishery when some means should be devised to save this industry from utter destruction. And the same question arises with regard to the lobsters, and other fishery matters, which I need not at present state. I mention these facts to demonstrate how false and misleading some statements are which appear in the public papers.

I think my hon. friend will be fair enough to see that an important matter like the filling of two Departmental Offices—and the filling of one means the consideration of the appointment of a member of the Executive Council, because I think the Attorney General must by law be in the Executive Council—is not a mat-

ter that can be rushed at in a few days or a few months. I wish to make clear to the hon. gentleman in connection with the statement he made that I had not given any explanation; that the reason for this was that I had no explanation to give and nothing to add to what I already said, and it was not due to any lack of courtesy on my part.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion of my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, a motion made in consequence of the extraordinary state of affairs that exists in the Government in relation to this House and in relation to the country. But if the position is extraordinary, I venture to submit that the explanation of the Leader of the Government is far more extraordinary. He has labored the point that he as Leader of the Government has had not had sufficient time to come to a decision on this important matter. If he did not say so in so many words, he laid stress on this point, and mentioned over and over again tnat it was not a matter to be rushed at; that it was not a matter to be decided in a day or a week or a month. What I want to point out is that he has had much longer than a month. The necessity of appointing these two Ministers was plain to the Leader of the Government over three months ago. He knew on November the third that these gentlemen had been de feated at the polls and that it was necessary to appoint some men to take their places in this House, and that position was before him over one hundred days ago. Over fourteen weeks ago he knew it was necessary for him to be up and doing; but he was not up and doing, and he therefore put himself in the position of having to give this labored explanation which he gave this afternoon. I agree with my friend, the Leader of the back row, that there must be something behind it all, or this position would not exist. There must be something very tangible behind it or the Leader of the Government would not have put himself in such an unenviable position as he now occupies. In his explanation he has told us nothing. All we know is that he does not intend to let a century roll by without making the appointments, but he intends to give us no information whatever. Then he told us that he has not discussed the matter with anybody on that side of the House, and that noboly on that side of the House had any conversation with him on the matter.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I made no such statement. I was replying to the Leader of the Opposition. He stated that there were rumors going around outside that the reasons that these positions were not filled was that there were a number of applicants, and that the Government could not agree on the persons to be appointed. I stated that no man on this side of the House, had either directly or indirectly, made any application to me. I made no such statement as attributed to me by the hon. member for Trinity. I was answering the statement of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, who said that rumors were going around outside.

MR. KENT—I did not refer to any rumours.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The point I want to make is that statements were made that the reason why the offices were not filled was because there was a number of applicants, and the Government could not agree on the persons to be appointed. Now I want to say that that is not correct, because no one applied for either of these positions—no man on this side or no man on the other side. I did not say that the Government had not considered the question at all.

MR. LLOYD—Well, I have given the Leader of the Government an opportunity of making himself clear. He did not do so before and I therefore gave him an opportunity of making himself clear on the point. I did not wish to misinterpret the words of the Leader of the Government and I gave him an opportunity of fully explaining the matter.

The Leader of the Government has laid down the position that even had the Ministers continued to retain office until to-day they were doing nothing that was not perfectly constitutional and that could not be justified by good precedent. In support of that position he gave the instances and authorities which he had quoted the other day.

Now, I wish to refer to what I said the other day that no such precedents are of any value and that the only case of importance I found of a Cabinet Minister holding office and not taking a seat in one of the branches of Parliament is the case of Mr Gladstone, and that course of conduct has not been repeated in the last fifty years. I will go further, and say this, that in the opinion of Mr. Gladstone himself—because he has left on record his opinion of that incident—his action in holding office as a Minister and not having a seat in the British House of Commons was against the spirit of Parliamentary Government. We have also the opinion of another strong Parliamentarian—Lord Morley—on the matter and he tells us in his letters that it is a course of action which should not be tolerated as it would be too dark and dubious. I will put that opinion of Mr. Gladstone's against the rt. hon. the Prime Minister's opinion. But the rt. hon. the Prime Minister has offended not only in that regard. He has offended in a second way. He has offended in keeping these men two months in his Ministry, although he knew that they had been defeated at the Polls and that the House would soon meet. He has told us that they resigned on January the 2nd. That is over five weeks ago. He knew that this House was soon going to meet, and yet he took no steps to have Ministers in this House to represent these Departments.

He has said that if some other Minister would assume responsibility for these Departments in this House that that is all that is required from the constitutional standpoint. Let me point out to the Leader of the Government that his action is absolutely illegal. It is not a matter as to whether it is constitutional or not but it is absolutely against the laws of the realm. The laws of the realm do not say that it is sufficient to have the Deputy Head conducting the Department. They say that there must be a Head of the Department who must be a Minister appointed by the Governor in Council. True nothing is said about the question of the time when the appointment shall be made, but it is obvious that the intention is that the appointment ought to be made forthwith and without any delay. Now unless we on this side of the House had protested against this action of the Government by every means at our command, we would not be doing our duty to our constituents. We would not be doing our duty to the country, if we had not voiced a strong protest and seen that that protest was recorded in the journals of the House.

The motion of the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Kent, being then put to the Committee, was lost.

MR. LLOYD.—In reference to that vote for exploration of coal areas: may I ask what is going to be done with that money?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—We are awaiting the visit from Pro-

fessor Dunstan. I suppose any expenses incurred will come out of that vote. It has been a dropped balance so far.

MR. LLOYD.—What is the scope of Professor Dunstan's work? Has anything definite been laid down?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I understand Professor Dunstan will come here and hold considerable conference with Mr. Howley upon the information in the possession of the Department, and he will probably visit the coal areas himself. It may be necessary to have the principal seams at Howley and Cleary's areas uncovered, and Professor Dunstan will then be able to see the coal himself. He will also get Murray's Reports and Fletcher's Report on Cleary's area, and other available reports. He will then be able to fully advise the Government and will probably make an important statement in one of the bulletins of the Imperial Institute and in that way perhaps attract capitalists, or he may make a report which would justify the Government in taking the matter up themselves.

MR. LLOYD.—Then I understand that nothing in the way of actual exploration is intended?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Professor Dunstan will probably see what information he can obtain and embody it in a report to the Imperial Institute.

MR. COAKER.—I want to draw the attention of the House to one or two matters in connection with the vote for Petty Surveys and to the public accounts for 1912-13 in connection with this vote. There are several items in these accounts that I think should not be there. I notice one payment of $56 and another payment of $50 to William Dunn for cab-hire. That is $100 to one man for cabhire. Now I think that the officials in the Department of Agriculture and Mines should be able to perform their work without hiring cabmen to drive them round St. John's, or if they do drive round I think they should pay for it out of their own pockets. Now, there is another item in these Public Accounts to which I should like to draw attention, and that is the payment to Mr. Howe of nothing less than $1,000 for travelling expenses during the year 1912-13. Again, I notice that the sum of $278.28 has been paid to Mr. Peyton for surveys in connection with Moore's Marsh and Wild Cove in the District of Twillingate. Then there are several amounts to Mr. Hearn of Brigus. An amount of $100 for making a plan of Colliers, and $50 for the same work, and then $45, and again $100, making in all $295 for plans of Colliers. It would appear that whenever Mr. Hearn had nothing to do he made a plan of Colliers and sent it in to the Department and got paid. There are a large number of matters in these Public Accounts upon which I should like to speak, but I do not wish to take up the time of the House. It is in connection with many of these smaller payments that appear in these Public Accounts that a tremendous amount of public money is wasted, and it is these small amounts that we are going to get after.

I notice also in going through the accounts that there is an item for $70.00 for motor hire in connection with the Harbour Main Agriculture Exhibition. I am sure this amount cannot be accepted by us as correct and necessary without some explanation. I am sorry the Minister of Public Works is not here to explain it, for I am sure that neither he nor the Commissioners would think of using a motor car on that occasion at the public expense. We certainly ought to have an account of it. Yesterday we were furnished with an account of the expenditures in Hr. Grace District, and I am very sorry that it was possible for the Government to lay upon the table such an account as that furnish-

ed for the expenditures in Hr. Grace in 1913. As far as needless expenditure is concerned, the other Districts can certainly hold up their heads to Hr. Grace. Let me read to the Committee some of the items of the account as furnished. (Hon. member reads extracts from expenditures). I have no objection to money being spent on roads leading to a number of of gardens, nor have I any objection to bridges being repaired when it is for the benefit of the whole settlement, but I do strongly object to those amounts, which I have read, which are for the benefit of private individuals only. Many of them are or private reasons only, and I notice, too, that one or two persons, particularly one Martin Sharpe, have received several grants. The list that I have read is only a twentieth part of the grants made, but they are sufficient to show that we should put an end to these small grants. The object the Government had in making them last year is open enough, for if it had not been election year, not half the grants would have been made. This system of giving small private grants will have to cease, and all moneys allocated to Districts will have to be spent through the Boards. If this is done the people will get good results. Our friends in Hr. Grace district will not be in any way pleased with the F.P.U. for having these grants exposed to the public. I know my hon. friend, Mr Young, who is sitting opposite, had nothing to do with these grants for, of course, they were made before he was a member, and even before he knew he would be a candidate in the recent election. Now that he is here I hope he will not tolerate the grants for his district being made in this way, but that he will insist on the moneys being spent through the Boards. If the people want wells, by all means let them have them, but do not allow a man to have one in his own back yard at the expense of the public. I am sorry the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here to let us hear particulars as to the grants I have read. I know he will not be pleased when he learns that we have asked for them, but the Councils in the District have requested me to obtain the information.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Chairman, as the representative of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, which position I am supposed to have assumed, I should like to make a few remarks in reply to the observations of my hon. friend. In the first place as to the sum of $56.00 paid for cab-hire in 1913. The hon. gentleman says that this amount was paid to the surveyors for driving around town. If that is correct, I object to the expenditure just as strongly as he does, but I think it will be found that not a dollar of the amount was spent in driving around town, but in bringing the surveyors out on the Portugal Cove Road and to Broad Cove and other places several miles from town. I have no doubt that it was for services such as these that the money was spent, but I consider it of sufficient importance to have it enquired to. I shall be very much surprised if the money of the Department has been spent in the way which he has suggested. Another amount which he has referred to is the sum of $1000.00 paid to Mr. Howe, the Chief Ranger, for disbursements. A detailed statement of that expenditure will be produced, and I feel sure that it will be found that the disbursements were necessary in connection with the duties of Mr. Howe in preventing forest fires and in having them put out. My hon. friend will find that there is a voucher for every dollar spent by the Department. He has also referred to the amount of $278.00 paid to Mr. Peyton, one of the most reliable men in the service, as probably my hon. friend,

Mr. Jennings, may know. I have no doubt that the amount paid to him can be fully justified. What happens very often is that applications are made in different parts of the Colony for land and water powers and there is no plan or record of the settlement or river in the Department. They then give instructions to a reliable surveyor to have a plan made and the work is usually given to the nearest competent man. This is no doubt how the services of Mr. Peyton became necessary, and why he was paid this amount.

My hon. friend also stated that Mr. James Hearn of Brigus had received sums amounting in all to $295.00 for making a plan of Cupids and he suggested that when Mr. Hearn had nothing else to do he would sit down and work at this plan. I have no doubt that there was work at Cupids, and that Mr. Hearn was called upon to do it, as he was the nearest surveyor. Certainly, there could have been no motive as to politics, for Mr. Hearn was a very strong opponent of the Government. However, I shall inquire into the amount.

MR. COAKER—I shall also be glad if the rt. hon. Minister will inquire into the amount of $9 for cab hire for J. W. McNeily.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I shall have that enquired into also. There is also an amount of $70 referred to for use of a motor car in connection with the Harbor Main exhibition. I do not know the circumstances of that expenditure, although I was present at the exhibition. I went there by train and returned in the same way. There may have been a motor used in connection with the exhibition, either before or after it, but I know nothing of it. However, I shall inquire into it.

I have taken some notes concerning the expenditures in Harbor Grace District, and I shall be glad to suggest to the Department that it is of sufficient importance for an explanation. Of course, we are all acquainted with the history of these expenditures. It is the only thing a member can do in a District where there are no local Boards in the place, to look after these small matters. When the country arrives at a more perfect state in these matters, then all these matters will be attended to by Road Boards, whereas now the members have to look after them. I think that my hon. friend will find in every case that he has mentioned, good and sufficient reason for the expenditure.

Nothing, in my opinion, requires more attention than the water supply all over the Colony. Two years ago, I took the matter up with Dr. Brehm, and I requested him to ask the magistrates and public officials to let him have a detailed report as to the water supply in their Districts If any hon. gentleman is interested in the matter, I shall endeavor to furnish him with the data that were obtained on that occasion. My attention was drawn to the matter, by the reports of the Tuberculosis Committee, and I feel bound to say that the most awful revelations were made as to the water that our people were drinking, in numbers of places. The matter has been in my mind for some time and I hope that before we meet again something may be done, whereby a regular system, or plan, may be adopted throughout the Colony, so that our people will be supplied with clean and pure water. Some of the reports that were received disclosed most shocking cases, such as wells being sunk in places in which the surface waters entered, and other wells sunk near graveyards, to the danger of the public health.

It is true that in many instances the expenditure is very small and we may be inclined to treat the matter

lightly, and possibly joke about it. I want to make it clear that sometimes it is a matter of very grave seriousness. What is wanted is some qualified man to go around the country under the directions of the Department of Public Works, who will treat this matter in a scientific and up-to-date way, and make it possible for all our settlements to have a good water supply. This will cost money, but it will eventually mean a gain to the Colony, for it will be certain to result in a decrease of mortality, a great deal of which is due to bad water supply.

The people of St. John's have a good water supply and we are apt to overlook the fact that in places all over the country people are often put to great trouble and inconvenience to obtain water.

For these reasons, I think it will be agreed that there is no better way in which a surplus grant could be spent, than in giving people as good a water supply as possible. Money spent in this way is not wasted, although owing to local conditions it may be necessary to allocate the grants in small amounts. We are prepared to give full particulars of all these grants and I feel sure that it will be found that there was justification for every expenditure.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, while I entirely agree with what has been said by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, as to the necessity for good water supplies, I must say that what we object to is not the grants for wells, and other works, but the way in which some of these grants are spent. I speak from personal observation, for I know of two or three wells which were made from grants to private individuals in our District. These wells were dug in a locality that suited the parties who received the grants, and nobody else. Wells built like this are of no use in the world to a settlement, for only a few can take advantage of them. That has been the trouble and it is a very serious matter in some outports where people have to go as far as half a mile to get water.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with what the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister said about the necessity for wells, but what I objected to was the large number of small grants that were made for wells that could be of no use whatever to the people of the settlements. I have no objection to the making of wells that are necessary for the people of a place, but I do object very strongly to the public having to pay a man for digging a well in his own backyard. Even larger sums of $100 and $200 have been spent, from which no good will come to the people. I know of a case a couple of years ago in Trinity Bay, where a man received a grant of $60 to dig a well. He commenced digging and when he got down four feet, and could see no sign of water he came to the conclusion that it would be no good digging any longer. He therefore, filled up the hole again, and sent in his Bill to the Department here, for $60 and he got it.

In my journey through Trinity Bay I happened to go to New Perlican, and there I saw several holes blasted in the rock, and covers over them. The people asked for grants to sink wells, because they could not obtain water; but no systematic course was adopted as to where the wells should be sunk. If some person was appointed who knew something about these matters and selected certain places and dug wells, it would be very good; but we should see that they are safeguarded from impurities. Bonavista, more than any other place, wants good wells. I hope that something will be done during the next four years to

give Bonavista a decent water Supply, and to remedy many faults that at present exist. There is one public well in Bonavista at the side of the public road, a most unsuitable place, as it gets all the drainings.

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.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Committee had leave to sit again on tomorrow.

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 Amend 6 Ed. VII., Cap. 3., entitled: 'The Aliens Act 1906.' without amendment.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a personal explanation. In looking over the 'Daily Mail' newspaper I came across an article alleging that I had in a public club, made fun of the Salvation Army coat worn by my hon. friend, Mr. Jennings. Now, Mr. Speaker, those who know me in this House, and outside of it, know that I am made up of different material from that. Some of my best friends are in connection with the Salvation Army, and no one is a greater admirer of their work than I am. I want to tell the members of this House, and particularly the hon. member Mr. Jennings, that that statement is absolutely false and that it is the work of some political assassin. The hon. member has no greater admirer personally, than myself, and I hope that he will accept this explanation that I am giving him.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to say that this is the first time that this article has come to my attention. I accept the statement of the hon. member, Mr. Moore. I suppose the cut of the coat is a bit peculiar.

MR. MOORE—I never noticed it, Sir.

MR. JENNINGS—The coat happens to be the best one that I have, and if the cut of it is not in accord with the rules of the House, I shall apologize to the House. However, I accept the statement of Mr. Moore, who has never shown me any disrespect, and I shall think no more about the matter.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I had nothing to do with the publication of that article in the 'Daily Mail,' and I would have prevented the appearance of it if I had known of it in advance.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to refer to the matter of wells in my district of Harbor Grace, as I was in the Chair of Committee when it arose, and could not speak on it. In one end of the District it is absolutely necessary to have more wells; the water supply there at present is bad, and spreads disease. In the other end of the District there are very few allocations for wells as the natural water supply is good. District members cannot be expected to watch the expediture of every dollar. When an allocation of $25 is made, apparently in a man's interest, we cannot assume that it is misspent, and investigate every instance.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, in relation to a question asked as to an item for motor hire in connection with the Harbor Main Agricultural Exhibition, that was expended for conveying H. E. the Governor and his party to and from the exhibition.

On motion the House then adjourned till tomorrow at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

FRIDAY, Feby. 13th, 1914.

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

PETITIONS.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of the Highlands, asking this House to extend them the benefits that have accrued from the granting of bonuses for the clearing of land. I ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Clement Hudson and others of Pouch Cove, in the district of St. John's East. The petition points out that there is a well just inside Mr. Hudson's property, dug by himself some years ago, which is now being used by the public, and it asks an appropriation to enable him to connect this well with the public road, so as to enable the public to use the well without going in on his property. Since the well was made Mr. Hudson has allowed the public to come in and use it freely and without intervention, but now he finds that gaps are left open and he has lost cattle and sheep and met with other inconveniences, and a small appropriation is asked for to put this well at the disposal of the public. It is very conveniently situated for the people in that neighborhood, and a very small allocation would enable him to give the public access to it. The water is very good, and good water is a difficult thing to find in the neighbourhood of Pouch Cove. The main supply of water for the place is from a spring. The water passes down through the centre of the settlement and the people have been objecting to it for some time. I have made considerable efforts to have some means adopted to protect the water in that spring from cattle and other means of pollution. This well, if placed at the disposal of the public, would supply a large section of Pouch Cove. I would ask that the petition be sent to the Department of Public Works, and that the matter receive attention at as early a date as possible after the spring opens.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, I desire to support the petition just presented by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I trust that the Department will give its best consideration to the prayer of the petition.

MR. MORRIS.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present two petitions from the residents of Little Harbour, and of St. Joseph's, on the west side of Placentia Bay, on the subject of the extension of the telegraph line to these places. At present the new telegraph line, built last year, runs from Baine Harbour down around Placentia Bay, and within about a mile of these two settlements. These settlements are very prosperous ones, and there is a considerable amount of business done there, and they are certainly entitled to the privileges to be derived from the establishment of telegraphic communication. The people on the west side of Placentia Bay were, until within the last year or two, entirely isolated in the matter of telegraph communication, Baine Harbour being the only station from Black River or Piper's Hole, around the Bay. Now that the whole Bay has been linked up by wire, the people of these settlements are very desirous of being connected with the system. It would not cost very much to connect a wire with the main telegraph line. About a mile of wire in each case would do. I have very much pleasure in presenting the petition, and I hope that the telegraph authorities may see their way clear to grant the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition just presented by my colleague. As he truly says, both these places are quite iso-

lated, and they feel themselves particularly so now, as during the last three or four years Placentia Bay has been considerably linked up and brought into touch with the outside world by telegraph extension. I do trust, then, that the House will take into consideration the prayer of the petitioners, and that it will remember that the people of St. Joseph's and Little Harbour are as much entitled to the advantages of telegraph communication as any other part of the district. I wish to emphasize the fact these two places are composed entirely of fishermen. They fish right up to Christmas, and they commence in the early part of April. I do trust that the Government will give every consideration to the petition, and that they will acquiesce in the prayer of the same.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Speaker, for the reasons set forth by my colleagues I have very much pleasure in giving my unqualified support to this petition. Another reason which I would advance why the prayer of this petition should be acceded to is the fact that St. Joseph's is one of the greatest bait centres in the whole district, more especially in the Fall of the year. There are at times anywhere from two to four hundred schooners resorting to this settlement for squid bait, so that the establishment of a telegraph office at St. Joseph's or Little Harbour would be of the very greatest convenience to the whole District, particularly to the fishermen. I therefore have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition, and I trust that the Government will see its way clear to accede to the same.

MR. LeFEUVRE.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition which has just been presented by the hon. member for Placentia & St. Mary's, Mr. Morris. For the reasons set forth by the junior member for the district I would appreciate the action of the Government in extending the advantages of telegraph communication in that locality.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

The Chairman from the Committee of the whole on Supply reported certain resolutions which were read a first time as follows.

Lighthouses, Blockhouses, etc. $109,-175.00.

Postal and Telegraph Departments, $703,555.85.

EXPLOSIVES BILL.

On motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend Chapters 40 and 41 of the Consolidated Statutes, respecting the storage and carrying of gunpowder and other explosives."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of the Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I think I explained the effect of this Bill on the second reading. The idea is that the present law in relation to the storage of gunpowder, dynamite and other explosives shall not apply to any merchant ships which may be armed for self defence or otherwise under arrangements made by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, and which may enter any port of this Colony. I may say that this legislation has been asked for by H. M. Government, in relation to merchant ships which may be requisitioned in the event of war. This regulation would really only apply to the very largest ships, vessels of the type of the Lusitania and Mauretania. The smaller class of ships, such as those which frequent our ports, are not likely to come in any way under the provisions of this amendment. Similar legislation has been passed by the Parliaments of all the other Dominions—South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and the Dominion of Canada, and it is really only that the legislation may be universal that we are

asked to amend our law, and not with any idea that there will ever be any necessity for it, because, as we know, these very large, fast ships which may be utilized by the Admiralty and partially armed—ships which are sufficiently fast to get away from the enemy—are not likely, for some time at least, to be operating in our waters. It will be remembered also, that in addition to the printed section, I mentioned to the House when we were on the second reading that I would submit certain regulations suggested by the Department of Customs in relation to this matter, for the purpose of ensuring the safety of the public in the event of this class of ship ever coming into our waters. The regulations are now incorporated in the Bill.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the whole reported that the Committee had considered the Bill to them referred, and had passed the same without amendment.

On motion the report was received and adopted, and the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

PARTRIDGE BERRIES BILL

On motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act for the Protection and Growth of Partridge Berries."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that the subject matter of this bill was gone into somewhat fully a few days ago, when a number of petitions were presented from the District of Bay de Verde and vicinity. I think there were something like 12 or 15 petitions presented, signed by some hundreds of parties, and in the early part of the session, when we were debating the Address in Reply, we had some instructive and interesting remarks from the hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman, in relation to this industry. Prior to that I had had considerable correspondence with Mr. W. A. Munn, who is taking a very great interest in this matter. With a view of carrying out the wishes of the people in the districts referred to, I have caused this Bill to be prepared and now submit it for the consideration of the Committee. As the Committee is aware, many petitions were before the House and set forth the views of the petitioners in relation to this matter, and we may reasonably assume that, as this is a small industry that comes right home to every one of these people, they are probably better informed than anyone else in relation to it. I have had the following figures prepared from a statement from the Customs Department, showing the export of the partridge berries during the past 10 years:—

EXPORT OF BERRIES FOR TEN YEARS.

1903-4	879 barrels	$5,259
1904-5	1,827 barrels	9,764
1905-6	1,255 barrels	6,271
1906-7	2,103 barrels	$12,102
1907-8	3,302 barrels	19,030
1908-9	4,417 barrels	20,603
1909-10	8,655 barrels	40,452
1910-11	6,181 barrels	17,702
1911-12	2,913 barrels	11,256
1912-13	3,753 barrels	15,696

The principal section of the Bill under consideration is as follows:—

1.—No person shall take, pick, sell, or have in his possession, any partridge berries, between the first day of August and a date to be fixed by notice in the Royal Gazette by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, which last mentioned date shall be between September 5th and September 15th in every year, and of which notice, in addition to publication as aforesaid, shall be posted up in some conspicuous place in every settlement

in the Colony.

It will be noticed that the section provides a date between the first of August and a date between the fifth and fifteenth of September between which picking or selling partridge berries would be unlawful. It was thought better to allow the time to be fixed by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines who would be in a position to obtain information from all parts of the country when the berries would be ripe enough to pick, so that rules could be made to apply to all sections of the Island. It might be found that the ripening season is eight or ten days different in some sections of the country. When the Agricultural exhibition was held here in 1910 Mr. W. A. Munn had circulars distributed on the value of partridge berries, and on the immense industry of cranberry growing, which had been created at Cape Cod, U.S.A. It is a very interesting circular, and I would like to read it to the Committee

PARTRIDGE BERRIES.

The industry of picking these berries for export has been wholly developed in Newfoundland during the past fifteen years. Less than twenty years ago, these berries were sent to St. John's in flour barrels, and went a begging for less than seven cents per gallon.

Now they are worth twenty cents a gallon, and give a diversified labour—to the berry-pickers, the coopers manufacturing the barrels, and the saw-mills for the staves, besides the freight paid for handling same.

This year the crop has not been so plentiful in some districts as last year.

For 1909 the Customs Report shows that there was exported.

8,655 Barrels, Valued at $40,452.00.

It would be a difficult matter to prophesy on the future prospects, and how soon we will reach an annual export of 50,000 barrels. To give an instance of how this business may be built up, we need only refer to the following facts on the Cranberry industry in the United States. Only a very small percentage of land in any country is adapted to the growth of Cranberries, but from a humble beginning in the cultivation of these berries, from the wild state, at Cape Cod in 1850, it has increased to an output last year of over 567,000 barrels, valued at about $3,000,000. More than half this crop was produced in the bogs at Cape Cod. These Cranberries are exported from the United States to all parts of the world, for what American would be deprived of his Roast Turkey and Cranberry Sauce when Thanksgiving Day comes round.

It is more than probable that in a few years we will be cultivating our "Partridge Berry," and producing a finer fruit than we can get to-day. Our sportsmen, who tramp the hills and barrens, can testify to the unlimited extent to which this business can be extended even under present conditions.

The Partridge Berry, as we call it, or as it is better known on the foreign markets, the Lingon Berry, is a great favourite amongst the Norwegians and Swedes; and it is this population, scattered over the North American continent, who look for the Lingon Berries. In Norway the jam or sauce made from the Lingon is placed on the table for breakfast,dinner and supper, as regularly as we place our plate of butter on the table The Norwegians tells us that the berries we ship from Newfoundland are a superior article to any they get in Norway, and are the very best to be had anywhere.

Here in Newfoundland we do not appreciate these berries as we should, but let us take a lesson from these

sturdy New Englanders of Cape Cod, who have cultivated their Cranberries where practically nothing else would grow, and have made it a National dish with one hundred millions of people.

We have a solid foundation to work on, we know the fondness of the Norwegians for these berries, and the delightful, piquant, tart-sweet taste that gives this berry its special flavor; and when properly advertised,will lead to a greatly increased demand from all connoisseurs looking for new delicacies.

It makes the finest sauce and relish for all kinds of meat, fowl, game and fish.

It is unexcelled as a flavour for soda drinks, also ice-cream and water ices.

It makes a delightful, fine-tasting filling for cakes, tarts, pies, and all kinds of pastry.

It is one of the most prolific berries to be had in Newfoundland, and keeps for an indefinite time preserved in fresh water alone.

For jams, jellies or sauces, all that is needed is cooking with pure cane sugar.

Here, then, is a natural resource of untold value for Newfoundland that may reach the million dollars in a very few years. It grows in the moss on the hills and barrens, where practically nothing else will grow. It flourishes without sowing or plowing, and all we need do is to harvest the fruit and exercise care in marketing it.

It is an industry for women and children during the holiday season, who find ready money for unskilled labour, and the most healthful exercise that it is possible to get. What greater inducement can there be to develop this business?

W. A. MUNN.

I may say that the matter of Cranberry-growing has been taken up by the Board of Agriculture who have communicated with the Cape Cod authorities with a view to obtaining all information in connecton with this industry as carried on there. The information we require is as to the kind of soil needed for the raising of the berries and particulars about the cost of reclaiming the bog lands for the purpose. It may possibly be found that we possess the same kind of bogs, and low marsh land which has been found so well adapted to the growing of Cranberries in Cape Cod. We have miles of level bog and marshland around St. John's which no doubt only requires proper draining and treatment to be adapted to the growing of cranberries. We must have a great deal of land, apparently of the same class as the berries are grown on at Cape Cod, and I hope that the growing of partridge berries and cranberries may yet develop into an industry of magnitude. I would also like to read to the Committee letters received from Mr. Munn in relation to the petition already presented to this House and generally referring to the export and prices of the berries.

January 24th 1914.

Sir Edward Morris,
Premier,
City.

Dear Sir,—Your valued favor of the 22nd just received.

Herewith you will find twenty petitions from the different settlements in Bay de Verde and Trinity District. These petitions are all worded the same, and numerously signed by the principal people interested in this business at all these settlements In every case the people are unanimously asking for this Law to be passed as it should have been done for the benefit of the Industry many years ago.

The principal question on which you

have to decide is the fixing of the date between the 5th and the 15th of September. In Canada their Law reads the 15th of September, but the majority of our people in Bay de Verde believe that the 10th of September is the right time, but in an occasional year the berries are ripe about the 5th. After going into this matter as carefully as possible I believe your best plan would be to leave the date open as mentioned in the petition, and give the Magistrate in each District power to regulate this date. As the Magistrates are continually travelling around it would be very little extra work for them, as of course they would soon find out from the principal people engaging in this industry their opinions whether the crop would be early or late in ripening. By getting the Magistrates interested it would enable you to get some statistics, which are badly needed, and form a correct opinion, and say five years from now it would enable you to bring in an amendment if found necessary to make a fixed date.

In talking the matter over with Mr. Tuff ex-Magistrate at Old Perlican he considered that this plan would be the best, and it might be that different parts of the Island may want different date for picking similar to regulations for catching lobsters.

Herewith you will find the Nova Scotia Law for the protection of the growth of Cranberries and Foxberries, and I believe a law worded something similar to the enclosed is what is needed for us.

The average price paid Berry Pickers past season, 36 cents per gallon.

Commission paid to Agent for buying and shipping, 2 cents per gallon.

Cost of barrel, 80 cents, equals 4 cents per gallon.

Freight paid on Barrels, 30 cents, equals 1½ cents per gallon.

Total 43½ per gallon.

Price paid past season was 43½ cents per gallon for berries delivered at St. John's equal to $8.70 per barrel of 20 gallons each. To this has to be added the cost of opening barrels, and inspecting and filling up shortage as there is always a shrinkage with this fruit. When you add the cost of freight and Insurance charges delivered at Chicago it brings the price to at least $11.00 per barrel, and allowing for shrinkage of measure on way they cost at least 60 cents per Imperial gallon.

This will prove to any one the appreciation of the quality of our Newfoundland Partridge Berries. The consumers in the United States pay nearly double the price they do for the famous Cape Cod Cranberries. The retailers in the United States get a higher price for them, than they do for Strawberries.

These are facts from our books and ready to give the proof at any time.

W. A. MUNN.

January 30th, 1914.

Sir Edward Morris,

Premier.

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 27th just received, and while it is difficult to give exact explanations I believe the following facts will explain as near to the mark as possible.

Mr. LeMessurier's figures are to the end of June each year. To bring it up to December 31, 1913, the exports shows 3736 barrels for the past season.

From facts that I have gathered from our Berry Company, and competitors I believe that the figures for 1912 should be about 4500 barrels instead of 3753. I mentioned this to Mr. LeMessurier last summer, and he said, it is possible that some entry may not have been passed.

As regards values I am giving you herewith an average price that we sold these berries each year for the

past ten years. I am making further enquiries to find why recent export entries were valued so low.

The Board of Trade sent out a circular the past fall asking the exporters to give full value to show the correct volume of trade that has been done during the season.

Year.	Quantity. Brls.	Value. per brl. for St. John's:	Totals.
1904	1,827	$5.70	$10,414
1905	1,255	5.70	7,153
1906	2,103	6.20	13,038
1907	3,302	6.20	20,472
1908	4,417	6.20	27,385
1909	8,655	5.70	49,333
1910	6,181	5.00	30,905
1911	2,913	5.50	16,021
1912	4,500	5.50	24,750
1913	3,736	9.00	33,624
			$233,095

There are many reasons that govern the quantity each year. There are off years with all kinds of cultivated fruit, but with wild fruit it is still more precarious.

We get the information from our people that the berries are blighted. This may be caused by a continuance of bad weather when the berries are in bloom, or it may have been an early frost before the berries have been properly formed, but I believe insects are the worst pest for these berries. They have the same difficulty at Cape Cod with the Cranberry crop, and are learning now the proper methods to destroy these insects, and are doing it most effectually.

When I was in Bay de Verde district last September I found the crop exceptionally short, but owing to the very fine weather the women travelled long distances, often five and ten miles, carrying their bag of five or six gallons of berries. In a good season 10 to 13 gallons is often picked by a woman during one day. I found invariably last fall that the best patches of berries were behind shrubs, where they had been protected from the continuance of N.E. winds during the blooming season in July. The people told me there were no berries of any account on the barrens or in the open at all this year.

The very law that the people are asking for, "The Protection of the Growth of Partridge Berries", is another special reason why the crops are short.

The best patches or berry grounds near the different settlements are trampled over so often that large quantities are destroyed. If the weather should turn out wet or a thick fog, nobody will go any distances through the bushes. Another reason is some extensive fires have devastated many places.

Regarding price of berries.

The crop of 8,655 barrels in 1909 was exceptionally large. Some shippers had a difficulty in marketing all, and that helped to depress prices the following year. Then we formed a berry company to insist on proper inspection before shipping, as there were many complaints on the foreign markets. These complaints were short measure, and green or white berries.

When we improved the standard of exports we found the foreign buyers were making a big profit. The Berry Company could not fill all the orders we got, and one or two of our largest customers thinking that others were getting a preference over them started a competition with the Berry Company here.

When we found the crop was decidedly short the past year, we determined to make these United States buyers to go their limit, and see what they really were prepared to pay. As far as I can hear there is only a very small proportion of last season's crop now unsold in foreign markets, which looks well for next season, but

prices are certainly too high for a big crop.

You cannot go astray by doing anything in reason to develop this industry. There are only a few places where these berries grow. Norway and Sweden are the principal places and it is the Scandinavian population living in the United States, who are so fond of these berries. They tell us that our Newfoundland berries are better and of richer flavor, than any to be had in Norway.

Will be pleased to answer any other questions.

Yours faithfully,
W. A. MUNN.

I beg to move the adoption of the first section.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this Bill. Although the more northern districts are not as yet interested to the same extent as Bay de Verde, and other sections of the country, still great numbers of gallons of partridge berries are locally consumed. I think that the tenth of September is barely enough to commence berrypicking in the district of Twillingate, for, on an average the berries are about ripe at that time; of course, some seasons owing to weather conditions, the berries ripen a little earlier, sometimes a little later. I have seen a few local cranberries in my time, and if my recollection serves me right, they grew in soil, fertilized with decomposed vegetable matter. If cranberries are to be cultivated it will be necessary to prevent cattle walking over the grounds. Cattle appear to be very fond of the cranberry plant.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I think a general law applying to all parts of the country might work a hardship on people who wanted partridge berries for home consumption at a date earlier than September the fifth. It seems to me that this Bill would apply more to Bay de Verde where the berry industry seems to be established, than for any other part of the country. I fail to see why other parts of the country should be prohibited from taking berries for local consumption any time after the 15th of August, or at the latest the first of September.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is not the intention to limit the time to any particular date, but merely to give the Minister of Agriculture and Mines power to fix a date between the fifth and fifteenth of September, and due regard will of course be paid to Harbor Main District, as well as any other District. The same reason arises why we should prohibit berries being picked too early as in the case of preventing steamers leaving for the icefields before a certain date.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Harbor Main. I do not see how his constituents can suffer by not being allowed to pick the berries at an earlier date, because before the fifth of September they are not ripe, and by waiting a little longer the people would get a better berry. I trust the Government will approach this matter in earnest, for I believe that if properly experimented upon, it will be found that the partridge berry can be cultivated as well as the strawberry. The soil where partridge berries and strawberries grow is practically of the same sort. It is different in the case of cranberries, where the soil is wet and marshy. Very successful results were obtained from the cultivation of the cranberry at Cape Cod, and although it took from one to two thousand dollars to prepare an acre of berryland, yet something like five thousand dollars per acre was realized as an annual profit. One can readily see what great wealth this might mean to the

country. Some years, of course, the berries are much more plentiful than in other years, and the scarcity of berries in exposed places last year was due to the prevalence of cold east winds. Berries were fairly plentiful in sheltered places. I understand that the soil on which the cranberry grows is useless for the growing of any other crop, such as vegetables. The District of Bay de Verde has probably taken more interest in this industry than the other parts of the country, no doubt owing to the fact of lack of knowledge that there was a good market for the berry, but no doubt from this time forward other Districts will be equally interested. I beg to give my hearty support to this Bill.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I think that the idea of protecting the partridge berry with the view of promoting a large industry, is a very desirable one. The hon. member, Mr. Hickman, deserves the thanks of the whole country for bringing this matter before the attention of the House. Only a few years ago partridge berries were brought here in barrels and sold for three or four cents a gallon, which marked them practically as a commodity of very little export value. Industries such as these have small beginnings, but very often develop into large national industries. I think that the industry will develop in a direction beyond the mere exporting of the berry. When the attention of the public has been fully drawn to this industry you will probably have the berry preserved and cultivated as has been done with the cranberry in Cape Cod and in many places in the Dominion of Canada. I have much pleasure in supporting the various sections. I hope that before the 15th of September comes around we will have a Minister of Agriculture to define the time when these berries may be picked.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill and I think it is a very wise one. I have had an opportunity of travelling in this country to a large extent, and I have seen places where these berries grow in extraordinary abundance. I remember when you could get these berries at your door for ten cents a gallon. The industry is bound to grow. I had no idea that certain people in St. John's were exporting these berries. I heard that they were being used for dye, but I did not know that they were being exported to make jam, and if these people can realize twenty or thirty cents per gallon for berries, I think with the protection afforded to the industry by this Bill it should grow to a large extent and make it worth while for our people to engage in it. I have much pleasure in endorsing Mr. Kent's remarks with reference to Mr. Hickman the introducer of this Bill.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks regarding this Bill. You will find more places than Bay de Verde, where this industry is carried on. Up in Trinity Bay there are quite a lot picked every year, and last year there were a great lot of berries destroyed by men and women and children picking them too early in the season. I think there should be a time set for picking these berries. The hon. Minister of Public Works made a remark about people being allowed to take these berries for household use before the fixed date. I do not think that should be allowed. You would probably find a great number of people picking these berries for sale, as well as for their own use, and doing a great deal of destruction. If these berries are picked too early you will find that they will not keep, and great harm may be done to the industry in this way.

I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Bill now before the House. I am very pleased with the way Mr. Hickman has gone into this matter. When he went down to the District of Bay de Verde berries were selling there for 15 cents a gallon, and when he came back they were selling for 30 cents a gallon. When we were down there we found that a great number of women came to pay their respects to Mr. Hickman because of the way in which he had raised the price of these berries. I am very glad to see that he was returned, and I am sure he will see next year that nothing less than 30 cents a gallon is paid for these berries.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of supporting the Bill, and I am glad to see the attention that has been paid to it by various members of the House. It may seem a hardship to some not to be allowed by law to pick those berries whenever they like but I do not think it is a hardship after all, as the berries are of very little use until they are ripe. But there is a point that I wish to make and it is this, that these berries ripen in this country at different times and I think it would be a hardship to frame a law that would set a date for picking these berries all over the country. That, I think would be unjust and unfair. In the southern parts of the country they ripen from ten to fifteen days earlier than they do in the northern parts, and I think it would be unfair to have the same date set for the whole country. I hope the introducer of the Bill will give attention to this point. In Placentia and St. Mary's, the District I have the honor to represent, there were quite a lot of these berries picked and sold last year.

MR. COAKER—What price did they get for them last fall?

MR. DEVEREAX—They got the regular price. I am not sure what it was, but I am sure that our people got as good a price as anybody else, because our people are as cute in regard to anything like that as any people anywhere else in the country, and if anybody else got thirty cents a gallon I am sure that our people got the same price. Now, with regard to the Bill now before the House, I remember some years age reading an article about the partridge berries. The article was written by the late Bishop of Harbor Grace, Bishop McDonald, and I think he was the first one who brought this before the country as a commercial proposition. I think if we should get the back files of the 'Colonist' in the olden days you would find several articles written by him. Now, while Mr. Hickman deserves every credit from this House and from this country for his work in connection with this matter, nevertheless there were others equally entitled to credit in bringing this commercial proposition before the Colony.

I do not know why this berry is always called the partridge berry. That is not a suitable term. The reason why I remark as to the name is that it may have a result later on in connection with the industry, that we do not look for. I think you ought to call it something else. I think you ought to call it the Newfoundland cranberry. I think with a name like that you would find it easier to introduce it in the foreign market.

MR. HICKMAN—They are never sold in the foreign markets as partridge berries.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I don't think they should be called partridge berries. I think some other name should be inserted in the Bill.

MR. HICKMAN—They are also called fox berries and lingon berries.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I think they should be given some other name. I have much pleasure indeed in giving the Bill my hearty support.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reported that they had considered the Bill to them referred, and had passed the same with some amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

SEALING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Coaker, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill, entitled: "An Act to amend 55 Victoria Cap. 2, entitled: 'An Act to regulate the prosecution of the Seal Fishery.'"

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, in moving the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider this Bill I wish to make a few observations regarding its principles. The other day when talking about Agriculture the hon. the Premier wanted to know how much vegetables were used in the sealing steamers. I went to the trouble to find out, and I find that as regards potatoes, that there are now 1,800 barrels used in the steamers as against none before the sealing agreement was entered into. There were some put on board for the Captain's table but what I now refer to are in addition to those put aboard for the Captain. There are 360 barrels of turnips, 180 sacks of onions, and 360 barrels of flour now used. It has also increased the consumption of pork and beef and there are 180 barrels of each now used, and 360 sacks of beans. All these are in addition to what were used before the agreement came into force.

Some oppostion has been raised to Section 7 of the Bill, which provides for the close season in 1914-15 for hood seals. Now, the contention opposed to that section of the Bill is that it will interfere with the wooden ships, and I have received some letters from some of the owners in connection with this matter. I have a letter here from Messrs. Baine, Johnston & Co. objecting to it.

Now, there are only five wooden ships--that is not including the 'Fogota' and 'Sagona'—sailing to the front this year, and as I understand from what the Premier has said that it is his intention when introducing his Sealing Resolutions next week, to insert something with regard to a close season, I have no objection to withdrawing that section, if the Government intend to move in this matter and appoint some Committee and probably take evidence from the Captains and others who understand the sealfishery, so that some provision of this nature can be made in the House next year. In the meantime, I would like to show to the Committee that the wooden ships have not brought in a great many hood seals since the steel ships have been prosecuting the fishery. I have some statistics for the last six years. In 1913 the steel ships brought in from the front 7,500 hoods and the wooden ships brought in 3,000. In 1912 out of a total of 21,736 hood seals brought in from the front, the wooden ships brought in only 406. In 1911 out of 35,000 brought in the wooden ships brought 17,300. Out of 10,000 brought in in 1910 the wooden ships brought in only 150. In 1909 out of 14,000 brought in the wooden ships brought 2,000 and that year the 'Florizel' brought 11,000. In 1908 out of 500 brought in the wooden ships had 300. In 1911 there were 1,700 brought in by the 'Beothic,' and 4,300 brought in by the 'Adventure.'

These figures do not go to prove

that if a clause were put in the Bill prohibiting the killing of hood seals the wooden ships would come in clean, because since the steel ships came in the wooden ships have not been able to get them. The wooden ships for the period under consideration have not got more than 20 per cent. of the catch. These wooden ships cannot compete with the iron ships as they have not the same power to force their way through the heavy ice. Since the steel ships have been carrying on the fishery the number of old seals taken has been on the increase. Of course, any year the ice breaks up early the steamers all go looking for the old ones. Then if you get the young hood you will also get the old bitch hood, because it will stand by its young until it is killed. Capt. Kean in a report of the sealfishery made to the Fishery Department advocated a close season for bedlamers, and he pointed out in that report how easy it is to kill whole families of hoods in case they are reached before the young take to the water because the mother hood will stand by its young until it is killed. Now, the reason that that section is out in protecting the hoods is that three years ago the F. P. U. brought this matter before the owners and asked that no guns be put on board any of the steamers. It was finally agreed that guns would only be carried by the wooden ships, and in order to protect the hoods it was agreed that a $2.00 fine would be imposed for every bitch hood brought in. Every sealing ship owner in the country, with the exception of the Newfoundland Produce Co., signed that agreement.

That year the 'Nascopie' got in trouble with her propellor and missed the young seals. She came across the hoods and got 20,000 of them, amongst which were a large number of bitch hoods. No action was taken to recover the amount because there was no way to dispose of the penalty. Now, one way to protect these hood seals would be to have a close season in 1914-15, but as I have said, if the Government intend to move in relation to this matter, I have no objection to withdrawing this Section of the Bill, and waiting till next year for something to be done in the matter. Now the sealing agreement that I have just referred to made with the owners, refers to another matter which I hope will be taken up by the Government next year, that is, in connection with the panning of seals. It asks that there should be no right of property in panned seals. This will compel the large steel ships to pick up their seals promptly, and many seals which are now killed and lost would be saved. I may say there is a very strong opinion in the country in favour of the adoption of this proposal, that there should not be any right of property in panned seals, and from what I can learn I believe that this would be a good enactment and fully justified and in the interests of the sealfishery. I think that the killing of seals should not be allowed until one day later than at present. Seals about March 17th grow 5 lbs. a day and a patch containing 200,000 seals would grow 450 tons in a day, or about the weight of 25,000 prime young seals. This is a matter that the Government should consider very seriously when it is bringing in the resolutions with reference to the seal fishery.

I am of the opinion that in the course of a few years you will find all the steel fleet owned or controlled by a trust. These large steamers will be managed by the trust, and the wooden ones will not be allowed to participate in the fishery, or at least, not in the front of the country where the steel ships are. This will mean that six or seven steel ships

will have all the seals in the front and they will be under the command of a commodore, who will correspond to an admiral in the Navy. He will say to the different captains: "You go south," or "You go North," and so on. The whole thing will be planned out beforehand, and as it is certain that one of them will strike the main patch, it will be an easy matter to communicate with the other steamers, as they will all be fitted up with wireless apparatus. This will result in the whole patch being cleaned up. I do firmly believe that this state of affairs will be arrived at, unless it is prevented by the Government, and I have said so to the owners of the steamers. They merely smiled at me and said that stranger things have happened. I trust the Government will agree to the suggestion of a close season, as intimated by the rt. hon. Prime Minister, for unless measures such as this are taken, it will not be long before we find that the whole herd has been killed out.

Another matter about which there is a grievance is the payment of the captains, who now receive four per cent of the gross value of the voyage. Last year we thought to have this amount decreased and one per cent. allowed to the officers, but it fell through. We hope that next year there will be a change made so that it will be impossible for the captain to get more than three per cent. and the remaining one per cent. to go to the officers. These men receive practically nothing, although some of them are the equals of their captain. They receive a share among them. and they consider that this is unfair. The owners also think it is unfair, and for these reasons there should be no great difficulty in having the scale changed.

Some object to the landing of crews, or a portion of a crew previous to the 10th of April but I am afraid that if the Committee does not allow this section to pass there will be considerable trouble among the crews on the wooden ships. We have had examples of it already, for last year the 'Erik' was forced to go to Bonavista and land a hundred men. The crew refused to proceed any further with the voyage and for a time they had quite a rough time on board. I had particulars of the event and I am afraid that if the steamer did not land the men they would have taken control of her. In the year before the 'Diana' was forced to come home, because the men refused to stay out any longer, and the result was that Capt. Blandford lost his command. The same thing happened the year before that, in the same steamer.

If there is no way of obtaining a satisfactory arrangement, there will certainly be trouble, especially if they miss the young fat, and spend two or three weeks vainly looking for old ones, and there is a prospect of the men receiving no more than five or ten dollars for their spring's work, it is a very serious matter to the men, and to the owners, and something must be done in the matter.

We suggested first that the voyage terminate on April 15th, but the merchants objected to this very strongly for they claimed that under such conditions it would be impossible for the wooden ships to get any old seals. They said that they got the old seals between the 20th and the end of April, for it was easier to get them at that time and that in most of the seasons it was at that period that the wooden steamers got the most of their old seals. I did not object to their position, and finally some of the owners wanted to take out their crews in two sections, one to stay out the whole voyage and another to come home earlier. I then said that I would put in a section to cover the matter

that would be satisfactory to the crew. One or two of the owners objected on the ground that the steamer might be driven out of her way in order to land crews, but I submit that this can be made a matter of arrangement.

For instance, a Captain may take a part of his crew from Catalina and agree to land them there again on the 10th April and ship another fifty men who will agree to serve the whole voyage. There is nothing to prevent him from doing this, and he could easily get five hundred men from Catalina, Melrose, Bonavista, Elliston and vicinity, if they did not have to stay out the whole time. The same would apply to other places, such as Fogo. It would not be much trouble to land these men, for the steamers are usually right off the coast on the 10th April, and it is only a matter of twenty-four hours to land the crews and put to sea again. I can see no objection to the section, and I feel sure that it will result in good to all concerned, and, as I have pointed out, there is certain to be lots of trouble if it is not passed.

I have prepared some statistics as to the number of ships which have prosecuted the seal fishery, and I find that the largest number of ships went to the icefields in 1857, when there were 400. These took out 13,000 men. 500,000 seals were taken, and the value of the fishery was $1,200,000. The largest number of men were engaged in 1861, when 292 ships took out 14,421 men.

Another point that we might take into consideration is the effect which the steel ships have on the catch. I have gone to the trouble to find out how many seals have been brought in since the time when they first went to the icefields. We may take 1909 as the starting point, for there were five ships engaged in that year that were of this class. During that time 1,353,000 seals have been brought in, whereas during the five years previous 1,260,000 seals were obtained. That is a difference of 93,000. The average since the introduction of steel ships has been 270,600, and the average of the five years previous was 252,000. The hoods have been diminished during recent years, since the introduction of the steel ships. The average from 1909-13 has been for the steel ships 18,400. For the five years before that it was 24,000. From 1898 to 1903 there were 120,000 hoods brought in; from 1903 to 1908 there were 72,000 hoods brought in, and during the past five years there have been 92,000 brought in.

There has been a considerable increase in the number of old harps slaughtered, for during the past five years 59,800 old harps have been brought in, whereas in the five years previous to that there were 20,300 brought in.

Captain Kean speaks of a close season for bedlamers, and suggests that none be killed for the next three years. There has been an increase in the number killed, for during the past five years 63,800 bedlamers were brought in, against 54,600 during the previous five years, showing an increase of 9,200. This goes to show that the bedlamer seal will become extinct unless some steps are taken to protect them, and the same applies to the old harps, for the figures I have named show that the increase in the number taken during the past five years has been 39,500. There has been an increase also in the number of old and young hoods killed.

The average number of seals taken from 1860 has been as follows:

1860-1870	232,000
1870-1880	240,000
1880-1890	220,000
1890-1900	227,000
1900-1910	286,000
1910-1913	250,000

The largest number of seals brought in in one spring was in 1831 when 686,000 seals were taken. In 1871, that is about forty years ago, the catch was 486,000, or 200,000 less than it was in 1831. In the old days of the thirties the average must have been between six and seven hundred thousand, whereas it is now less than 300,000, which is a very considerable falling off, and, as the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has pointed out, some protection is certainly called for.

I do not see why there should be any objection to the Bill, except clause seven, which I am willing to withdraw, in view of the action which the Government intends to take next year. I hope, however, the Committee will see their way to adopt the section giving the wooden ships the option of coming in and landing some of their crews. Nobody can raise any objection to the clauses concerning the food or the accommodations. All these matters have been discussed with the owners, and we have made it clear to them that we have no desire to be harsh, but to be fair to them, and to expect them to be fair to us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if there is any other matter on which any hon. member would like to have information, I shall be glad to let him have it. I have in my possession much information and statistics, and shall be glad to give the Committee as much information as it is in my power to give them.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about the Bill now before us, but what I shall have to say will not be in opposition to the measure, because it has been introduced by a member of the other side of the House. I think the planks to sheath the decks need not be more than an inch thick. This is a small matter, and the merchants do not seem to think much about it, but I think that one inch plank will be of just as much service as a three inch one. It also seems to me that if section 3 of the Bill is put in force right away, it will be a very great hardship for owners of wooden ships to have everything ready for this spring.

MR. COAKER.—The section to which my hon. friend refers deals only with steel ships.

MR. MOULTON.—I have no objection to it if that is the case. I am in accord with most of the sections of the Bill which deal with the cooking of food, provided that it will be possible in the wooden ships to have soft bread cooked for the crew. To my mind they will find it a very difficult thing to do.

I agree with much that my hon. friend has said concerning the killing of seals, but I think it would be a great mistake if the ships were prevented from killing hoods this year. It costs a great deal to fit up the steamers, and I think it would be a great hardship on the owners and on the men if the steamer met a lot of hoods and they could not kill them. However, I would favor a close season once in five or six years, and I have advocated this for many years.

I do not agree with section 8 of the Bill, for I think that if we allow this to be carried as it stands, it will mean that we shall be taking the control of the voyage out of the hands of the captain. There are lots of men who like to prosecute the voyage for a fortnight or so, and, if they cannot get a load of seals by that time, they want to go home. If the steamer does not strike a good trip in that time there are sure to be some disturbers who will want the steamer to call at some port, and this may mean that the Captain and the rest of the crew will lose a good catch because of the time lost in landing these men. Then there is no provision made in the Bill for the bringing of these men to their homes. They will be landed

no doubt at the nearest port and, if the section is allowed to stand, there certainly ought to be some means provided whereby the men can be brought to their homes. Those men who go to the seal fishery for a short time and then want to be landed cannot expect the Government to be responsible for bringing them to their homes, for it would be unfair to other taxpayers if one man's passage is paid and not another's. The men must find their own way home, and this will mean in some cases considerable hardship, and I expect it will also mean a lot of trouble.

When these men demand to be landed the Captain will have to do so, and this will mean that he will have no control. There are other serious questions that may arise out of this section, and I trust there will be no objection to allowing it to stand over at least for another year. In the meantime all the questions arising out of it can be considered very carefully, and it is possible that a solution of the difficulty may be arrived at that will be satisfactory to all concerned.

I would like it to be understood that I make these criticisms not from any party sense, for I thoroughly agree with everything possible being done to improve the conditions at the sealfishery. My chief objection is that it is rather late in the day to bring some of the sections into effect this year. The most of the sections we can carry into effect at once, but those sections concerning the advisability of which there is a grave doubt, can be held over till next year. I congratulate my hon. friend on the manner in which he has introduced the Bill, and I feel sure that he will accept what I have said in the spirit in which I have advanced it.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman, in connection with sub-section (b) of the first section of the Bill, I would like to see a regulation or a rule to the effect that any steamer that has not the services of a doctor shall be compelled to have his substitute obtain a list of instructions from a medical man before the steamer sails to the ice. I submit this because I have a case in mind which happened some years ago, when a young man of respectable family gained the consent of his people to go to the seal fishery on the understanding that a relative of his would look after him while he was there. While they were out at the icefields the young man felt indisposed and the man who was looking after him advised him to stay on board. Before leaving the ship, the friend went to the chief steward and asked for a dose of medicine and the steward went to the medicine chest, and obtained some medicine, which was eventually given to the young man, who drank it. It proved to be a dose of carbolic acid, and as a result the poor chap suffered very much, and eventually died. Once a century is quite often enough for a sad case like that to happen, and I trust, therefore, that some precaution will be taken in this Bill to guard against such a thing happening again. With reference to the other sections of the Bill, I may have a few observations to make later on.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, In reply to the observations of the hon. member for Twillingate I think the Bill in its present form makes the matter as safe as it is possible to make it. The idea of the section is to have a man who is skilled in medicine, for my hon. friend will see on reflection that it states that all ships must have a doctor wherever it is practicable.

I think it is much better to leave the doctoring to be done as heretofore by members of the crew who have become more or less skilled because of their experience, even though they never had any proper medical

instruction, than to have men instructed at the last moment or men who would simply gather their ideas from reading printed regulations. This "amateur" work was probably the cause of the very accident which the honourable member for Twillingate referred to. In the absence of a properly qualified doctor I would much prefer to trust myself to a man who would prescribe a remedy based on his experience and observation in the past, than to have myself taken charge of by a man whose training was entirely limited to reading some regulations which he would probably either misunderstand or misapply. By all means have a supply of medicine, but if there is not a doctor around let it be administered by a man of the class I mention.

Whilst I am speaking, might I suggest to the honourable the introducer of this bill the desirability of somewhat amending the penalty clause for breaches of sections 1 and 2. There should be a graded penalty so as to meet the merits of the complaint. At present the bill provides a penalty of "not less than five hundred dollars nor more than one thousand dollars" for all offences. Now whilst there are offences in the sections which would justify a severe penalty, there are others not at all in that class. Thus, a violation of sub-section (g) of section 1, which prohibits the use of rifles on board of steel ships should be differently treated in the way of a penalty than a breach of sub-section (d) of section 2 which makes it obligatory to have onions in the soup supplied on Saturdays. Again I think that for breaches of section 1 the owner is more properly the person who should be held liable, and for those of section 2 the master. Of course I recognize that if it were shown to the satisfaction of any Court that the necessary supplies were put on board a steamer to allow the provisions of section 2 to be complied with, the master would be the person probably held liable. But as section 4, the penalty section, now stands this matter is open to doubt and confusion. I would suggest to the introducer of the bill that the section be amended thus wise: "The owner of any steamer offending against any of the provisions of section 1, and the Master of any steamer offending against any of the provisions of section 2 shall be liable to a penalty of not less than $25.00, nor more than $500.00."

I also think that provision should be made making it necessary that it should be shown that the crew complained to the captain of the breaches of section 2 at the time of their occurrence. It often happens that in the rush of a sealing voyage rules are set aside by mutual agreement between the master and crew, and in such case it should not be open to members of the crew to afterwards come in and take action in the courts. Besides there are offences of which it would be almost impossible for the captain to have knowledge unless a complaint were made to him.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Chairman; with reference to the accident referred to by my hon. friend, Mr. Jennings, I might point out that every ship carries a proper sea medicine chest provided with directions for use of the remedies. In this case there must have been negligence or carelessness in following out directions, and that is a thing which cannot be prevented: it happens at times on shore and among competent druggists. Accidents of that kind happen but once in many years. For the Bill before the Committee I have nothing but hearty approval. I am in accord with Sections I, and 2 and also with Section 3 which states that it shall be the duty of the owner, master etc., to observe the

regulations set forth in the preceding sections. One of the sub-sections states that not less than 1 pound of soft bread shall be served to each member of the crew three times a week. There is no one more desirous than I am of seeing every improvement made in the sealers' bill of fare; but I see a difficulty in the carrying out of this sub-section. When a vessel is deeply laden and meets with nasty seas and adverse weather, it may be impossible to bake the required quantity of soft bread. Consequently, on the return of the vessel to port, a captious person might lay a complaint against the owner for a breach of the section. I think it would be unjust to penalize the owner in such a case. He might be quite prepared to give the men the required quantity of soft bread; but adverse conditions prevented the cooks from baking it. With regard to section 5 (which provides that sick and disabled men on wooden ships shall be transferred, when possible, to steel ships belonging to the same owners) I have nothing but approval, provided that the member of the crew was not suffering from some infectious or contagious disease. Were he suffering from some infectious disease, I think it would be a mistake to transfer him to another ship and thus run the risk of spreading the malady. I think that before this clause goes through the Committee it should be altered. With regard to section 6, I have an open mind and may possibly have a word or two later.

With regard to section 7, Mr. Chairman, I have a distinct objection; an objection to it on the grounds that it is not fair enough now.. I don't think I could more clearly state my objection than by reading a letter copied by me, some 4 years back, in reference to this matter.

(Here the hon. member reads the letter.)

That is my reason, Mr. Chairman, for not being in accord with section 7. With section 8, I have an open mind and before the matter goes through the House I may come to some opinion. I am not altogether in accord with section 9. At present the law provides that seals shall not be taken under 38 lbs., but we allow seals to be taken on the 15th of March. It might happen that seals before that date had attained the necessary weight; but owing to this provision ships in the fat would be unable to kill them. I think it would be wise on the part of this House to fix a minimum weight at which seals could be taken and to increase that weight a pound or two beyond what it is at present, and then allow the seals to be taken as laid down in the Statute Book.

I take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of stating my intention of moving an amendment to the effect that the purchasers of seals sold in Newfoundland by a vessel owned outside Newfoundland shall be liable for the crew's share of the voyage. It does not devolve upon me at present to give my reasons for suggesting this amendment; but I am prepared to give them to any member of this House. I would ask that this amendment be given consideration.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman, I should like to add my support to the provisions of this bill, especially sections 1 and 2 which provide accommodation for the crew, and for their being properly fed. I am also strongly in favor of the amendment just proposed by my hon. friend, Mr. Downey.

To the other section, I have no objection. I did see some objection to section 7, dealing with the close season. That seemed debateable, but I

am glad the hon. introducer has seen fit to withdraw it.

Section 8 might lead to some confusion unless some provision is made for the men to be brought to their homes so that the men will not be landed at some distant point where they would be stranded for conveyance home. I was very interested in the history of the seal fishery given by the introducer and I am sure the committee fully appreciate it. I am very glad that my friend Mr. Downey introduced that last section with regard to the purchasers of seal being liable for a share of the voyage. It has come to my knowledge that there is a great necessity for such a law and I am sure the introducer will be only too ready to accept such an amendment. I have much pleasure in supporting the whole bill now that the objectionable section has been taken out.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the bill before the committee has recommended itself to our most favourable consideration The second section provides for the proper accommodation of these that go to the ice. It seems to me that all that might be a matter for mutual agreement between the owners, masters and crew. The seal fishery is a business undertaken by the owners and those who go out to prosecute it. It is a mutual undertaking, and is for the benefit of both parties, the crew being as much interested in it as the owners, and I think that a great deal if not all contained in that section might be a matter for agreement between the owners and crew. The introducer has pointed out that whereas all these provisions have found their way into an agreement, that agreement has not been strictly carried out, and for that reason he has asked us to make it law. Every section should I think meet with the approval of the committee. We all want to see the sealers treated well both in accommodation and food and no objection can be raised to any section of this bill except perhaps in regard to section 4, referred to by Mr. Higgins. That requires some consideration. Take for instance the point raised by Mr. Downey. The Bill provides for not less than 1 pound of soft bread to be given to each man. It is quite possible that weather conditions may make it impossible to carry this out and I think they ought to be guarded against the possibility of the Captain or owners being mulcted in damages. Take again sub-section (e) "Fresh meat shall be supplied once each week" That is a very good and proper provision, but I think it quite possible that conditions might arise when it would be impossible to carry it out. The meat might deteriorate, and become unfit for food. But still not supplying it would be a violation of the section making the captain liable to penalties. As far as the other sections are concerned, I think they are desirable and I am entirely in favor of them. Section 7 seemed debateable, but that has been withdrawn. I give my hearty support to the bill.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman just one or two words. I think the bill is one that will commend itself to everyone interested in the seal fishery. And I think the hon. introducer deserves the gratitude of the whole country, for the manner in which he has taken hold of the whole problem of seeing to the comfort of those that prosecute this important industry. We all know that the condition of affairs at the ice to-day is such as to need legislation. The introducer has informed us that most of the provisions in the bill were contained in an agreement previously made with the owners of the ships. Unfortunately

the agreement was not carried out in its entirety and such an agreement is only enforceable at the option of the owners. And we should not leave a matter of this kind in such a loose condition and in this bill we are asked to enact a law acceptable to both owners and crew.

The question of enforcing sections 1 and 2 has been discussed. It could very easily be arranged to have the fine that would be imposed for these different offences made so as to grade with the offence. It should be made more elastic. There are some offences that do not merit so severe a penalty as $500, and it could be made so as to give the magistrate a larger discretion. The matter referred to by Mr. Downey should be considered in connection with the enforcement of these regulations. I think the master or owner should not be made liable except for some breach caused by his act, knowledge or default. And I would distribute the blame in proportion to the guilt. And the magistrate should have the option of fining the owner if the offence was caused by his act or default. If it is shown that the offence arose from circumstances over which no one had control then no offence should exist.

As to section 7, that is very debatable ground. When we start dealing with the natural history of an animal we are approaching unknown land. We have not yet got to that stage when we can say anything definite about the natural history of our seal. Anyone with a knowledge of the Behring seal fishery will know that scientists of the highest repute have differed upon the very point involved in this section. And so, I think it would be very wise if we carried out the suggestion made this afternoon and leave this matter to be dealt with in connection with the measure which the Prime Minister has intimated his intention to introduce or else to have it come up before the House in this form next session so that in either case every member of the House will have ample time to enquire into the facts, and obtain a knowledge regarding the habits of the seal, so that we can form an intelligent opinion on the matter.

There is only one other section to which I wish to allude and that is section 8. From what the hon. member for Bonavista has told the committee, I think we all recognize that there is an evil requiring remedy. He has pointed out that during the last few years trouble has occurred on board ships prosecuting this fishery, more especially on the wooden ships, by the men wishing to finish the voyage before the captain does. He proposes a remedy for this. It is probably a step in the direction in which it should be taken, but we will have to consider certain things in the working out of this remedy. Suppose for instance if a captain calls into a northern port to land a crew of St. John's men. The crew will have to choose between staying aboard the steamer or going ashore at a northern port. What is going to be the result. Are you going to have the crews of these ships selected from one locality? so that the men from the northern outports will man the ship that prosecute the northern fishery and those who will remain be selected from the neighbourhood of St. John's. This is simply a suggestion which I throw out for the consideration of the Committee in considering this section. On the whole I think the bill is one that will commend itself to the community. In regard to section 4, I think perhaps it would be better if some addition were drafted to cover the suggestion of Mr. Higgins and Mr. Downey.

MR. WINSOR,—Mr. Chairman, I

have much pleasure in supporting this bill. This is a step in the right direction and a very important one at that. It deals with the comfort of those who are the mainstay of the country. Some two years ago I was at a F.P.U. convention, and I was appointed to a committee to draft a law in connection with the seal fishery. I was appointed to bring in a report on the matter. We brought in a report recommending most of the clauses now contained in this bill. The men there thought that such a bill could never pass. That the men should have potatoes and beans was considered absurd. A sealer was only a sealer and had never been considered before. I am glad I made that report, but I must confess that when I brought it in I never thought it would be before this House within two years, and I little thought that I would be here to support it.

When I look over this bill it brings back to my mind the conditions that existed when I went to the fishery first at 15 years old. When I look back over that time and see the condition in which we lived year after year, I cannot help thinking that had we at that time anyone interested in the toilers of the country, we would have had as good conditions then as we have now. At that time we lived almost entirely on hard tack. When I think of it the marvel to me is that we lived through it. Of course when we were sailing from here the governor used to come down for inspection. We cleared down the ship and the governor came down and looked over everything, nice and bright, tasted a nice piece of No. 1 bread and thought it very nice, and then went off thinking how nice and comfortable we all were. Hard tack is very nice —but not to live on for six weeks.

In regard to a lot of things in this bill there is no doubt, but that they are going to do considerable amount of good, because, I can see the necescity for these remedies myself. As to the protection of the seal fishery 'tis perfectly evident from the catches of late years that the herd are diminishing. We must therefore protect it. If we do not protect it we will lose it. The best way to do that is to protect the old seals. A captain and crew going after hoods with guns do a great deal of damage to these patches They shoot without killing hundreds of seals and these are never recorded and are dead by next year.

It being now 6.30 the debate was adjourned.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that the committee of the whole House had considered the matter to them referred, made some progress, asked leave to sit again.

On motion this report is received and adopted.

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 "Of the Exhibition of Advertisements" without amendment.

It is moved and seconded that the remaining orders of the day stand deferred.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of Question.

It is moved and seconded that when this House rise it do adjourn until Monday at 3 of the clock in the afternoon. The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, Feby. 16th, 1914.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from certain residents of Millertown and Badger, stating that these localities are

not represented in this House, and that the electoral boundary does not take in these settlements. It is earnestly requested that the District of Twillingate be extended to the westward, so that it may take in these places. I give it my heartiest support, and I understand from the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister that it is his intention to bring in a measure which will bring about what the petition has asked for. The petitioners also refer to another petition presented to this House, in which it was asked that the towns of Norris' Arm, Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls and Badger be made into a separate District. This would to a very great extent, open up the question of redistribution of seats. I trust that the matter will receive consideration, and if it is not found possible to consider it during the present session as it will take time, perhaps it will receive attention during some later session. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting what my learned colleague has said. The men there have not the privilege of voting. They have to go to other places in order to do so. The first part of the petition will, of course do away with that.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Hant's Harbour for the repair of a road, which is in very bad condition, especially in winter when it is covered with snow. A good road is very badly needed there.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition presented by my colleague.

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bonavista for the repair of a bridge. The structure, which forms part of the principal thoroughfare of that place, was built about 13 years ago. The petitioners are of the opinion that a sum of $100 would be sufficient to repair it. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Speaker, I think this question ought to be considered by the Government. If the matter was attended to promptly it would save money.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition that the dredge be sent to Rushoon. The harbour is very shoal, and the petitioners are unable to carry on their business satisfactorily. I trust that the Government will give it consideration.

MR. MORRIS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition. I know the locality and I think that it would do a lot of good if the dredge were used in this harbour. I also know the people, and I do not think we have a more industrious people anywhere in this country. It is a fine harbour, but unfortunately is being gradually filled up with sand. The water of the harbour is now too shallow even for the fishermen to proceed with their avocation. It would mean better accommodation for vessels, and it would be more convenient not only for the fishermen of the harbour itself, but also for the fishermen of Burin. One side of the harbour is in Burin district.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in giving my unqualified support to this petition, and I endorse all that has been said in its favor by my colleagues. I know the harbour of Rushoon from personal experience, and I know the necessity for this petition, and I would strongly urge upon the Government to send the dredge there as soon as possible to do this work. In some of the places where the dredge has been at work the harbour bottoms have been of such a nature that it took a lot of

time, but the harbour bottom of Rushoon is composed mostly of mud, and I think that the time required to do the work would be very short, and it would be a very great advantage indeed to the fishermen there. As my colleague has set forth, part of this settlement is in the District of Burin, the northwest side of the harbor belonging to that district.

MR. LeFEUVRE.—Mr. Speaker, I would lik to say a word in favour of this petition. The settlement referred to is not a very large one, but it has the distinction of having five representatives in this House at the present time. The centre of the harbour is the dividing line between the districts of Placentia and St. Mary's and Burin, and on behalf of our constituents I wish to give my hearty support to the petition.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my support to this petition. All that has been said regarding Rushoon is true, and the sending of the dredge down there, as has been pointed out, would be the means of doing a great deal of good, and I trust that the Government will be able to accede to the request of petitioners at an early date.

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

QUESTIONS.

MR. CLIFT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs why the name of Mr. Emanuel Baggs has been removed from the list of Supernumerary Tidewaiters, at Channel, and how long he has been filling such office, also, if during his tenure of office, his duties were satisfactorily performed; also who is now performing said duties.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—I beg to say that this man has only been acting from time to time. He is not permanent, and he is not required during the winter months.

MR. CLIFT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary why the proposed line of Government Telegraphs, from Port aux Basques to Rose Blanche, was abandoned, and what has become of the poles and wire ordered for this work.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I beg to table a reply.

MR. CLIFT asked the Minister of Public Works if any public works have been commenced or completed at Cul de Sac, East, and Ramea, in the District of Burgeo and LaPoile, since last October, and, if so, to state the nature of such work, or works, and the amount allocated therefor, and to whom such allocations were made.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I hope to have this information here tomorrow afternoon.

MR. CLIFT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary why Richard's Harbour and Rencontre, in the District of Burgeo and LaPoile, have been omitted from the schedule of ports of call of the Mail Steamer Portia, on the Western Mail Service.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The ports of Richard's Harbour and Rencontre have not been omitted from the schedule of the ports of call of the Portia. It is true that the Portia has passed these ports without calling on one or two occasions. Messrs. Bowring Brothers were written to in connection with the matter, and they replied that the steamer was unable to enter the ports owing to the stormy weather .

MR. CLIFT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if the Government has made any arrangement with the publishers of the Newfoundland Geography for a supply of same, and, if so, what quantity has been agreed for, what amount has been paid, or is to be paid, for same.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The Government have made no arrangements with the publishers of the

Geography. This matter is entirely in the hands of the Superintendents of Education.

MR. CLIFT asked the Minister of Public Works if any tenders were asked for the erection of a public building at Channel; if so, to lay copy of same on the table of the House; if not (1) who has been awarded the contract; (2) what was the contract price; and (3) when is the building likely to be finished.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I hope to have that information tomorrow afternoon.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, in reference to the geography matter, I notice the Colonial Secretary states that the matter is in the hands of the Superintendents of Education. I would like to have some further statement as to what the Colonial Secretary means. What is it that is in the hands of the Superintendents of Education?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman I would say that as I understand it, the position is this: The publishers agreed to publish this geography at fifty cents a copy. That I think is the price they have charged for the first issue. I understand that the first issue sold readily at that figure. The Superintendents did make an application to the Government to assist them in the way of cheapening the book, but nothing definite has been arrived at in that connection, because the first issue sold so readily at fifty cents that the Govrenment thought it wise to let the matter remain over until we could see how the next issue would get on. The Premier informs me that the School Inspectors are waiting until they see whether they can get a reduction on the next issue.

DR. LLOYD.—Do I understand that there are no negotiations as to purchase, but merely as to the purchase price?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—There are no negotations as to the Government purchasing any. None whatever.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of all monies spent in the District of Bay de Verde from the 30th day of June, 1913, to 1st day of February,1914,giving list of names to-whom monies were sent, and purpose for which it was granted; also, a copy of returns and vouchers connected with the same.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—In reply, I might say that the statement is in course of preparation.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of all monies spent by his department in the District of Bay de Verde, from the 30th day of June, 1913, to the 1st day of February, 1914, giving list of names of the various parties to whom the authorities were sent to expend said monies, and purpose for which same was granted; also, copy of all returns, pay-sheets and vouchers, connected with the same

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—This statement, Mr. Speaker, is in course of preparation.

EXPLOSIVES BILL.

On motion the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapters 40 and 41 of the Consolidated Statutes, respecting the storage and carrying of gunpowder and explosives," was read a third time. It was ordered that this Bill do pass. and be sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking their concurrence in the same.

On motion, the bill entitled "An Act for the Protection and Growth of Partridge Berries," was read a third time, and it was ordered that the Bill do

pass and be sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking their concurrence in the same.

SUPPLY.

Committee of the Whole on Supply.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—

Mr. Chairman,—I have caused hon. members to be furnished with printed copies of the statement of Supplemental Supply for the current year, amounting in all to $244,719.17. I now propose to explain in detail the amounts asked for in Supplemental Supply and to have that explanation printed to-morrow morning so that it will be possible for the Committee to more intelligently consider the votes when next we sit.

Under the head of Civil Government we ask for $29,586.80. Of this the first amount is $1500 for contingencies for the Premier's Office. That sum is made up in the first place of a salary of $600 for the stenographer and assistant clerk, Mr. Harold Moulton; of a similar amount for cablegrams and telegrams; and the other incidentals in connection with that office. I need hardly say, as virtually every member is aware of the fact, that the business done by the Premier's office is steadily increasing, and the correspondence has become enormous; and the requisites for doing work have to be provided accordingly.

For the Colonial Secretary's office we ask a sum of $2,700 for census and vital statistics. The amount of $2,500 for the census is for printing of the Returns in the bound volumes, as usual after every ten years. These are now in course of printing at the Gazette Office, and we require the money to meet the charge when they are completed. The sum of $200 for the vital statistics is the bonus given to clergymen and others who act as registering officers, by the Tuberculosis Association heretofore, on the condition that they send in prompt returns. The Government are continuing the bonus under the same conditions. Hence the provision of this money.

For Marine and Fisheries we ask for salaries and contingencies $3,900, of this sum $300 are required tor salaries; $200 for an increase to Mr. Hutchings, the first clerk, who keeps the accounts of the Lighthouse Department as well; and $100 to Mr. Devine, the second clerk, who has an increased number of duties devolving upon him. The other $3,600 is required for the contingencies of the Department, as these have been burdened the present year with a new telephone system connecting all the offices, at a cost of $725; the salary and expenses $1,200 in all, for Mr. Simonsen, the cod liver oil expert; $400 for the printing of the Marine and Fisheries report; $100 for the compiling of the same, which is paid to Mr. Goodridge, the Deputy Minister; $75 for a directory; and $105 for cleaning the offices; sealing messages for January, February and ten days in March, from Belle Isle and other places, costing $120; foreign fish quotations $200; departmental telegrams $180; office expenses for six months printing, etc., $636.31; and sundry smaller amounts, making up the $3,600.

For Public Works we ask $19,526.80 for contingencies, fuel and light, salaries, etc. Of this amount $1316.80 is required to level up the salaries of the various clerks and officials who were given increases during the year by Order-in-Council. These are Messrs. Pearce and others. in the Public Works Office; the Supt. of Public Buildings, Mr. Churchill and his clerk; the Inspector of Outports, Mr. Bonia, and the District Road Inspectors. Contingencies of the Department to cover the actual normal expenditure to the 30th of June will be $2,650; the fuel and light account for Government House having increas-

ed $250; for the Customs Building $200; for Post offices and Telegraph offices $1,500; for the Museum Building, $300; for the new buildings at Harbour Grace, Bay Roberts, Spaniard's Bay, Grand Falls, Freshwater and Channel, $1,000, making $3,250 in all; and for insurance and keepers for these new buildings, increases representing $600 altogether; while the repairs to public buildings will absorb a further sum of $11,710, making up the total, as already said, of $19,526.80.

The latter requirement—$11,710 for repairs to public buildings—is due to many causes, first, that the appropriation for repairs was short voted by last year $500, although buildings had increased in number, notably outport post offices and telegraph offices, etc.; second, contractors' accounts amounting to $4,532, which should have been charged to the 1911-12 accounts, were not presented until after that year's accounts were closed, and consequently became a charge (unfairly) against the 1912-13 accounts; third, expenditures by order of the Government, which were really not a charge against this vote, but which should come under the head of improvements, were included in it; such as a maple floor for Government House; improvements by the landscape gardener to the Government House grounds, etc. The outstanding Bills at the present time amount to $3,400, and to carry on the work of repairs and upkeep provided for, snow shovelling in the winter and incidentals up to the end of June, will take $3,000 more. The overdraft due to the short vote of last year amounts to $5,310.

For the Government Engineer's office we require $1,960—$200 to pay the salary of Mr. Butler, who has been appointed some time ago as inspector of the mines on Bell Island at $70 a month, and $1,760 for surveys of branch railways, there not having been a sufficient amount appropriated for this purpose originally.

Under the Head of Administration of Justice we ask for $8,369.38. Of this sum $1,017.80 is for police annuities, representing payments to members of the force who have been put on the retired list, in accordance with the schedules of pensions arranged for the police; $300 more for the registration of jurors, as the amount voted for the purpose is insufficient, making for the contingencies a total for the Colonial Secretary's Office, $1,394.38. For the Finance Department we require $1,000 for Supreme Court Contingencies, and $2,000 for the contingencies of the magistrates, the regular votes for these purposes not being sufficient. These amounts are the same as were voted last year. They have been paid out of contingencies heretofore, but from this out will be included in the regular Estimates, we having voted them for 1914-15 last week.

For Public Works we require for the Supreme Court $150, $50 for an increase in the salary of the engineer, Mr. Geo. Buchanan, in the building, and $100 for an increase in salary of the attendant in the Colonial Secretary's and Government Engineer's offices, Mr. Brocklehurst; and for the Penitentiary $325 for additional orderly or keeper, appointed, as I explained in the main Estimates, because it was necessary to have an additional man owing to prisoners being sent out to various public institutions to work; $400 for the increase in the maintenance of the Department generally; $100 for fuel and light, and $3,000 extra cost of materials for the industrial or broom department. I might say that the materials cost $7,000 to $8,000, and the sales of brooms reach $11,000 to $12,000.

Under the heading of Legislation we require $9,919.19. Of this amount $1,036.50 for the Upper House—$82.50

to even up the salaries of pages, $120 each for the sessional pay of Messrs. Ayre and Anderson, though I might say that Mr. Ayre subsequently returned his and it will appear on the other side of the account; and for printing the Debates, Journals and binding, $715, the amount being insufficient. For the Assembly there is a shortage of $1,650 on the Debates account; this, like the previous account, being due to the fact that more outport papers were granted the publishing of the debates in the other House than the vote provided for. We also decided to have the debates for the several sessions of the last assembly hansarded, hon. gentlemen opposite having expressed themselves highly favourable to the idea of having the debates reproduced in book form, and the Daily News received $750 on account of last year's Hansard, having been paid a similar sum for the previous year, and the Herald $1,350 for the Hansards of 1909 and 1910. The accounts for printing bills, papers, etc., amounted to $820 the Anglo-American Tel. Co.'s account, $261; and there were other sundry accounts amounting to $300, the total making $5,224.29; while on account of general legislation there is an amount of $2,842.00 due the Royal Gazette for the gazetting, printing and binding of the Acts, and for the purchase of books for the library, $500, with some smaller accounts amounting to $70, making a total of $3,409.

Under the same head for the Board of Works there is an amount of $250 required for fuel and light, because of the increased cost of coal, the amount provided having been insufficient.

Under the head of Education we require $1,400. As I explained in the main estimates, it has been decided to allow the four superintendents of education and their assistants $200 each for travelling expenses, making $1,200, and the assistants an additional $100 on to their salary making $200, or $1,400 altogether.

Under the head of Public Charities we ask for $51,892. The Department of Relief accounts for $30,000 of that in the following proportions: Extra relief circular No. 2, $4,000, that is the special provision made for cases arising from time to time; for medical attendance of poor, $3,000; and for doctors' salaries in connection therewith, $250; for pauper lunatics, $300; for conveyance of sick poor, $3,000; for extraordinary expenditure, $1,750; for salaries under Public Health Department, $300; and for Public Health in the outports, $5,000; for Labrador, $2,000; sick fishermen from Labrador, $3,000; for the orphanages, $2,000; for smallpox in the outports, $2,200; and for the same in St. John's, $3,200; making in all $30,000, of which the Commissioner of Public Charities says: "These amounts are required to meet the above overdrafts and twice unprovided for in the Estimates, and to meet expenditure until the end of June, 1914."

For the Public Works Department, under the same heading, we require for maintenance and salaries at the Lunatic Asylum, $4,280; and the General Hospital, $8,420; at the Poor Asylum, $2,492; for maintenance at the lighthouses, $4,800, and for maintaining of the Fever Hospital, $1,900, in all $21,892.

At the Lunatic Asylum the Engineer's salary is increased $80; the salary of the Commissioner Mr. Hutchings, who acts as secretary, $200; the maintenance, that is the food supplies, etc., calls for $3,000 more; and the fuel and light accounts for $1,000 more, or $4,280 in all.

At the General Hospital a house surgeon, Dr. Knight, is provided at $1,200, an additional fireman at $480, it being necessary to keep the boilers

going all night, as explained in the main estimates; a head laundress at $120, and a cook at $120, making $1,-920 for salaries, while the maintenance account requires $2,500 more, and the Fuel and Light, $4,000, a total of $8,420.

With regard to the sum of $4,000 for increase in the coal bill at the Hospital, I might explain as I did in the original estimates, that the boilers have to be going all day and all night to provide light, heat, hot water, and special heat for operations, etc, and therefore the outlay is exceptional. I am informed by the Public Works Department, however, that the boiler inspector has effected an improvement in the draft of the furnace recently, which affects a saving of one-third in the consumption of coal.

For the Poor Asylum the increase in maintenance costs $2,000, and fuel and light $400, a total of $2,492; for the Signal Hill Hospital, or lazaretto, where the tuberculosis patients are treated, the increase in maintenance amounts to $4,500, and fuel and light to $300, a total of $4,800; while for the Fever Hospital we require $1,000 for maintenance and $900 for fuel and light.

For Lighthouses we require $13,240. This amount is made up, first, by $200 for block house maintenance, due to the assistant keeper being laid off for nine months with blood poisoning, and a second having to be procured, while there was some outlay in connection with the road there and the removal of rocks. Then $740 is asked for lighthouse salaries as follows:—L. Yetman, Seal Cove, $50; Geo. Head, Jackson's Arm, $50; Joshua Robinson, Seal Cove, $50; D. Jacobs, Western Cove, $80; N. Gillard, Englee, $50; Hugh Patey, St. Anthony, $190; E. Carter, Shoe Cove, $110; J. Loup, Ragged Island, $60. These increases were made on account of improvement in the lights mentioned, causing extra amount of work, as already explained in the main estimates. Next, $12,000 is needed for lighthouse maintenance, the Estimate passed at last session having proved to be short, as hon. members can readily understand, owing to the new lighthouses that have been in operation and the extra cost of fuel and other supplies. Finally, there is $300 on the recommendation of Inspector of Lighthouses, Mr. White, to cover some outstanding bills.

For Marine and Fisheries we ask $16,040 for the Fiona, for the dredge and for the boatman. Of this sum $6,000 is to go for the Fiona and is caused by the usual amount of repairs and the extra cost of upkeep owing to the general increase of all requisites. Then, $10,000 is required for the dredge; due in part to special supply and repairs rendered necessary and required by Lloyds; and I might say that the ship has been now running for over a year with practically no repairs effected, as she has been in the outports, with no chance of doing anything in that respect until she came here. Then we ask $40 for the Harbor Master's boatman, an increase granted to Thos. Dewling, who fills that position.

For roads, bridges and ferries, we ask $1,181, made up of $701 for ferries, as follows: Lance au Loup, new ferry, $50; Loo Cove, increase ferryman's salary, $40; the same for the ferryman from King's Cove to Amherst, $64; for the one for Pool's, Knee's, Brown's and Dyke's Island, $20; for that at Gooseberry Islands, $15; Snook's Hr. to Foster's Point, $20; West Side to Trepassey, $40; Epworth to Path End, $70; End to Farewell's Road, $20; Jersey Hr. to Hr. Breton, $20; Doctor's Hr. to Lally Cove, new ferry, $100; Across Bay du Nord, increase of salary, $30; across La Plant Harbor, $15; Fox Island

River, Port au Port, new ferry, $60; across Barachoix Brook, increase salary, $30; Little River, South to North Side, increase of salaries, $30; Doyle's station, new ferry, $80; in all $704, while retiring allowances are provided for the following ex-ferrymen: Twillingate, John Gillard, $70; Solomon War, Twillingate, $50; Newtown, Edward Hefferton, $80; Tinker's Island, John Winters, $50; Epworth, John Rickson, $100; St. Lawrence, Edward Walsh, $87; Bay du Nord, Michael Byrne, $40; in all $477.

Under Head 12, Postal and Telegraphs, we ask $26,890, for salaries, travelling expenses, subsidies, telegraphs and maintenance. This amount is made up as follows: For the General Post Office, $450, represented by small increases to Messrs. Campbell, Clarke, Kelly and Allen; $1,700 in the St. John's office for increases granted to Messrs. Coady, Young, Atwill, Moore and Collins, and new positions for Messrs. Goobie and Haynes; $2,900 for travelling post offices, represented by increases granted to four mail clerks at Sydney and Port aux Basques, and the placing of two clerks on each cross country mail train; $2,500 for couriers, this being an estimate for twenty-six new and increased roads that have been put in operation.

Under telegraphs there are required for the city offices $4,500, for increases granted to lady operators, the office tenders and Messrs. Bonia, Fraser, W. Mitchell, Hartley, Pike, Wheeler, Lindley, Rees and Coultas, and for new operators for the new lines brought into St. John's. For office allowances $400 has been to cover new offices that have been established this year.

For general maintenance $6,000 is required; this amount being the least that will be needed to carry on the service until the end of June. Under this head $35,000 was expended so far the current year, while $13,000 at least will be required up to the end of June, and the vote is $30,000.

Under the head of Customs we require the sum of $76,200 as follows: To pay supernumeraries in St. John's, $1,500, and contingencies, $10,000; for outport supernumeraries $7,000; offices and office rents, $600; to pay percentages on duties, $3,000; and on light dues $600; for contingencies in the outports, $5,000; and for Labrador $2,500; to pay customs refunds (this amount having been largely increased because of the export of sugar on the one hand and repaying duty on gasolene for fishery purposes on the other) $28,000. The same with regard to coal duties, $17,000, and we give $1,000 to Bell Island for its municipal government, from the coal taxes.

Under the head of General Contingencies we ask $10,000. As many hon. gentlemen are aware, this vote covers all payments that are not properly chargeable in relation to the other Departments. The vote taken each year is $10,000, but it is rarely found adequate, and usually another $10,000 has to be taken in Supplemental Supply. This deals with the Supplemental Supply, and will represent the total amount we will ask for the current fiscal year ending on 30th of June next. This will make an expenditure in all of $3,980,753.58, namely, $3,736,034.41 voted by this House at the last session, and the $244,719.17 I now submit.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, it is most undesirable to be obliged to vote Supplementary Supply for overdrawn accounts, but sometimes such a course is necessary. I would suggest that the details of those accounts be submitted to the Committee when we are next considering Supplementary Supply.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee

of the whole reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

It was orderd that this Report be received and that the Committee have leave to sit again to-morrow.

FISHERY RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions on the question of (a) the cure and cull of fish; (b) the standardization of fish when exported from this Colony; (c) the protection and propogation of lobsters; (d) the protection of the seal fishery; (e) the effect of the prosecution of the whale fishery on our bait supply; (f) the supply of bait; and to stand first on the Order of the Day.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman. In making this motion I should like to crave the indulgence of the House for a brief while with a view to concisely explaining the position in which the various matters stand. In the first place I would like to let the House know exactly how the question of the cull of fish now stands. Under the law at present the culling of fish is regulated by Chap. 103 of the Consolidated Statutes which principally deals with the question of the persons culling fish, and also provides for the taking out of licenses to cull in various settlements round the Island, but as everyone knows this law is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. It is not very easy to determine off-hand what is best to be done for we find purchasers of fish all over the country at variance in their opinions as to whether we should have a strict cull or continue to accept the product as talqual. That is really the issue, because after all we may reasonably assume that the fish brought by the merchant from the fishermen, whether its to be dealt with as talqual or culled, as a whole, realizes the same amount of money. No matter what name it may be called, no matter into how many grades or standards it may be divided, the amount that will ultimately reach the fisher man's pockets will differ very slightly under the present conditions. I suppose that we may assume that in fixing the price paid for talqual, regard is had to what it is going to mean to the purchaser after he classifies and culls the fish for his own purpose. The question has long occupied the minds of the people of the country as to whether we should have a cull or whether we should buy fish talqual as we are doing at present. Upon this question the merchants are divided, and the time has now arrived when we should consider whether a system of better cure and cull of fish should not be adopted in the interests of the merchants, the fishermen and the whole country. This matter embraces the first portion of the motion. The next question is one of standardization which only applies to fish after it has found its place in the merchant's store. We should not really be called upon to enact a law with regard to standardization because it is a matter which affects only a dozen exporters who, if they consided such a plan to be in their interests and in the interests of the whole country should come to some arrangements in the course of an afternoon. It is a very difficult matter to arrive at a satisfactory arrangement for if we go down Water Street or to any of the outports we will not get a half dozen exporters to agree upon a question relating to fisn such as its standardization.

The standardization of its exports of farm products has made Denmark what it is to-day and that of the ex-

port of butter and other products has benefited Ireland immensely; the same applies to Nova Scotia with regard to its apples, and the general standardizing of its agricultural and other articles has made the trade of Canada. All the reports which I have been able to read from foreign merchants, agents and others would lead to one conclusion, which is, that the interests of this country would be better conserved if our products were standardized. By adopting this plan we would be letting the people who buy our products know exactly what they are purchasing, and when articles are marked No. 1 the purchasers would not find among them packages of half a dozen different brands. Close attention is given by Japan, Germany, the States, Britain and other countries, to the standardizing of their products and when we purchase goods from Great Britain we know that they are A1. no matter in what part of the world they find their way. English goods stand first class all over the world. The Englishman is a manufacturer and in his case standardization makes the output of his industry regarded as A1. no matter where it is to be found. We hope to be able to bring about in this country such a proper system of standardization for our products that our fish marked number one will be known to be of the very best quality all over the world, and that purchasers will be certain of its quality, according to its standardization. No 1 will mean the very best, and number 2 will be the next quality, and there will be no doubt on anyone's mind. I presume that the reason we have no cull at present is that we are unable to make up our minds to come to an agreement, and at this very hour we will find men who will tell us that a cull has no value and that it is just as well for the fishermen to bring along their first talqual, and without any improved methods. I do not agree with such a position. I believe that if proper attention is given to every detail in relation to the cure of fish, from the moment it is taken from the trap or hook and if everyone engaged made up his mind to obtain the best results until it arrives in the foreign market, a much more satisfactory condition of affairs would exist than under the present system,and the dawn of a new era for our Country would take place.

If everyone realized that codfish is an article of food in the preparation of which very great care must be taken, then from that moment a new era as regards our main product would have arrived. As a rule our people in this country, do turn out a good article. Go all over the country and you will find the very finest merchantable fish turned out by some of our people; but of late years they have lost interest because they have found that those who gave very little attention to the cure of the article in the fall of the year realized as much and very often more than those who had borne the heat and burden of the day during the spring and summer and who had turned out a good article. Those who are fond of their business and fond of their occupation will give as much care and attention to the cure of the article on the flake as the farmer does to his garden and farm. They will take pleasure in the result of their work and will make an effort to turn every fish into a number one Merchantable. Of course, that would be impossible, because fish, like all other commodities that have to be made in the open and dried is subject to climatic conditions, subject to rain and heat and other accidents, that do not apply to ordinary articles manufactured within doors. Fish is an article that deteriorates quickly and

very often when it is within an ace of being perfect, something occurs—rain, or peculiar atmospheric condi tions, or conditions that bring about dun and in the course of a few hours the work probably of weeks will be destroyed. Notwithstanding all that, a great deal can be accomplished, and much has been accomplished in the preparation and cure of our fish, but I say the main point is that everyone should be brought to realize that codfish is an article of food and that the greatest care and most perfect attention must be given to it from the time it is taken from the hook until it is delivered to the man who is going to eat it—care in the washing, care in the splitting, care in the bleeding, care in the salting, care as regards the selection of proper salt, care in the casking or in whatever way it may be shipped until it reaches its final destination. One has only to read over the Rules and Regulations in force in other countries to see how careful they are In Norway their Department has been for years issuing Bulletins and Rules and Regulations in relation to all the details of the cure, and after it is cured as to the boxing and labelling and marketing of the fish, and it is in this way that the Norwegian and French fish—what is called "lave" has got ahead of us in the Mediterranean markets. It is quite true that in France they have advantages we do not possess in this country for curing fish. Their fish is first cured in salt bulk, and then it is washed out in a beautiful climate, and it is given just enough of salt to cure it,and it is then shipped as it is required into the markets where it is disposed of, but in spite of this we have always held our own, because there is a higher percentage of nutriment in our fish than in any other codfish shipped into these markets. That in itself, ought to be something to inspire every person concerned in this country to make an effort to produce the very best article, but our fishermen all over the country will never be induced to put forth this great effort unless they know that they are going to be fairly dealt with after they have done it. No man is going to bestow great care and attention on his fish and spend weeks and months endeavoring to produce the very best article when he sees a man who gives little or no attention to the article and almost lets it look after itself getting as much for his fish. What we want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to agree upon the main point, and the main point is this, that it is of value to our fishermen to make a good article. In other words, if they do, will they get more for their catch? Now, I have always considered that it was a delusion in this country that people were getting as much for their fish, talqual, as if it had all been well made. It was because they had that idea that people did not trouble to make their fish well. Now, I don't think that that is correct. I think that a merchant will only pay as much for a schooner load of fish talqual as he would if it were weighed out over the culling board. If the cargo was well made and turns out all merchantable then the man will get a higher price. Now, this is where we have to begin. We have got to let the people all over the country know that they will be paid according to the merits of the article. That brings us up to the question of cull. Then we must keep our people informed as to the latest methods of curing fish. Some people, of course, will laugh at the idea of teaching or telling our people how to cure fish. Generally speaking, they do not require to be told, because they have learned it from their earliest days; but it is well that we should learn what is being done

around us; learn from what is being done in other countries, and let the people know every improvement that is effected. Spreading information of this kind will educate the people to the fact that purchasers want a better quality of fish produced, and when this better quality is produced, higher prices will be obtained. A merchant said to me not long ago, that if every fish that left Newfoundland were standardized it would add one dollar a quintal to the whole catch. Now, that may be true or not. It may or may not be an exaggeration, but there may be something in it. I think that we will all admit after we have considered the question that it is of importance that every cargo of fish leaving this country should be properly examined and properly branded at a regular staple standard. As I said, Mr. Speaker, we have to give greater attention to the cure of the article. We cannot be too careful. It was only a few years ago that the great canning industry in Chicago was nearly destroyed (and it is still suffering from the blow) by revelations of the manner in which the industry was carried on. I do not know if they were exaggerated. A similar blow was dealt to us only two or three years ago. A writer came down here from one of the leading magazines in the United States and wrote up a most exaggerated story about the way in which our fish was cured for market. Fortunately for us, our fish has a reputation that an ephemeral article like that could not affect; but such things may have an effect in an age when there is so much competition in foodstuffs the world over. Science has done so much nowadays for the preservation of food that we now meet with competition in warm countries that was never expected or anticipated in the old days, and we have therefore, got to be careful and cautious in relation to our cure.

Now, it is not very long ago that we sent representatives to the Mediterranean in relation to developing our markets there and with a view to advising this country in relation to conditions there. It was only twelve or fourteen years ago and these men made a very interesting report on these matters, and if the hon. members will refer to that report, they will find on nearly every page of it a reference to this question of standardizing. Speaking about the French they say: "'Lave', as the French fish is called, is pleasing to the eye, being clean and white in appearance, and beautifully put up in packages of grass or straw. Great attention is paid to the cull and uniformity of fish, in quality and size, and the receivers know exactly what they are getting, losing practically nothing in weight or inferior fish."

Now speaking about the Labrador fish they say:— "The Labrador fish although showing a slight tendency to improve in quality during the past few years, is still generally inferior to that of former years. It shows evidence of slovenly handling, bad splitting, and is sadly mixed in quality and size."

Now, this is the report from our own Commissioners "We have everywhere met complaints as to the irregularity of cargoes as regards the run. Broken, carelessly split and inferior fish being constantly shipped spoil the outturn very much."

Speaking of Genoa they say:—"Here the receivers complain of the careless cure of our fish, it being dark and broken, badly assorted, and very frequently resembling anything but an article of food. When compared with 'lave' and Iceland products which are both white, bright, properly assorted and arrive regularly, it is easily seen why 'lave' is becoming so popular and

Iceland is taking the place of our Shore."

Referring to Naples, they say:— "The Norwegians obtained their footing in this market by introducing their fish very cheaply and have increased their sales by paying the greatest attention to the requirements of the place. They, as well as the French, have the great advantage of steam communication at regular intervals and are able to sell direct to the retail dealers who could not manage to purchase even a very small Newfoundland cargo. The serious falling off in the sales of Labrador is to a large extent the fault of the Newfoundland shippers who permit inferior and mixed cargoes to be sent. Very strict attention must be paid to the culling of the fish to ensure our holding our own in these markets generally."

Referring to Valencia, they say:— "This has been a good market for Labrador, but owing to the inferior quality shipped, bad cure and splitting and mixed conditions of cargoes has fallen off considerably of late years."

Then again, they say of Alicante:— "Here as in most places we hear a great deal concerning pickled fish, a large quantity of which is constantly shipped. The effects of this on an otherwise good cargo are simply disastrous."

"The total consumption of all fish imported per annum into Spain from all points has fallen over 150,000 qtls. during the past 15 years owing to various causes."

"We then visited Bilbao and Santander in the North of Spain. These markets, which formerly took considerable quantities of Newfoundland fish are now entirely in the hands of Norwegians. Their annual consumption is about 550,000 quintals. Santander taking 150,000."

All shippers seemed to tell the same story. Here is what they say generally:—

"It may perhaps be thought from reading this report that we have laid too much stress on the shortcomings of Newfoundlanders in their handling of fish.

We do not think so. We have seen Norwegian, Iceland and French fish in the various markets, and we have noted their anxiety to please, and consequently the better condition of their produce in the markets generally.

The broken, ragged, pickled, sun and salt burnt fish in a shipment are unnecessary and more than harmful.

The purchaser of Norwegian or French knows exactly what he is getting, the quality and size are as ordered and he loses nothing on cullage or broken."

I think that exporters of fish will admit that this condition of things is still going on. Now this is not fair to the man who takes the fish out of the water, because after all he is the man who suffers in the long run. People wonder why they cannot get a higher price for fish. Well, here is the explanation; and it is not fair to the man who takes the fish off the bultow or out of the trap because he can do nothing as to the proper marketing. All he can do is to catch and cure the fish. The marketing is a matter for the Board of Trade or the consignor, so that in a way the ordinary fisherman is at the mercy of the Board of Trade or the merchant or the Government, or whoever is to blame. I have here a number of reports made recently by men who are now abroad representing the Colony in the foreign fish markets. It would not serve any purpose to delay the House by reading the details of these reports. They are lengthy and voluminous, and deal with the details of these matters, and after reading them

one can only come to the conclusion that we have now reached the point in the history of the country when this matter will have to be taken up and dealt with very seriously. Four or five years ago a Board of Trade was established in this town and I think it will be generally admitted that they have done their utmost since they were established to try and advance the commercial interests of this Colony. All their reports have dealt with this question of standardizing, and with the question of the cure and cull, and if there has not been a standard set by law it has not been their fault, because in the very first legislation asked for, they asked for power and authority to establish a standard, and if I remember rightly to establish a cull; but there has always been such a fear and such a reluctance to leave the beaten track and abandon the old system and go back on the old methods that every Legislature and every Government, and every Administration has been satisfied to go along the old beaten path and no attention has been paid to the recommendation of those who have been moving in this matter. What is true of an individual is true of a country, and of the industries of a country. If we want tomorrow, a first class engineer or a first class doctor we will get a man that has a standard. If we want a first-class engineer we will get him from Scotland with a Board of Trade certificate. If we want a first-class doctor we will get him from London or from Edinburgh or from Dublin. If we want a Professor we will get him from Oxford, or Cambridge or McGill, or from other Universities. What is true of an individual is true of a country. If we want a standard staple article we will go to the country that produces that article and that is why we have got to have our codfish perfect and of a high quality. Now, in arriving at this we must do it gradually, so that there will be no dislocating of trade or commerce and most important of all is to have the people most interested, the fishermen of the country, in sympathy with us in the movement, because if they do not believe we are in earnest, and they do not believe that we are acting in their interests, then all our labor will be labour in vain. We have got to get the fishermen to believe that this is an honest genuine effort on the part of the country, on the part of the Legislature and on the part of the Board of Trade, to improve the cure of fish, and that it will be best improved by a strict cull. Now if that is the decision of the country and of the Legislature and of the Board of Trade, we then come down to the practical part of it, and that is, how are you going to have a cull, what system of cull or standardizing is necessary in this country? We have had a cull in the past, but we all know that in the past the cull varied. I do not, of course, mean to reflect for a moment on anyone, but if you are going to have a proper cull and proper cullers they must be absolutely independent. Of what value is it to have a man sworn as a culler who is at the same time working as a servant on the premises where the fish is being sold. It is not fair to the merchant, not fair to the seller, and infinitely more unfair to the man selling the fish, because no matter how strict or honest the culler may be, there is always a certain amount of doubt in the matter, and that is what we want to remove. "The cull is very strict down at such and such a place," that is a common expression. Why should it be strict at one place more than another. It ought to be the same in every part of the country; it ought to be the same in Catalina as in St. John's, in Placentia as in Bonavista Bay. Some years we have had a strict

cull and some years we have had an easy cull, so that now we are down to a position where we have no cull at all. Now, if we agree on having a cull, if we believe it is in the interest of a good cure, then we will have to work out a system whereby every man who culls the fish will be absolutely independent and will be paid a sufficient sum of money to do his work.

I know there will be some difficulty in working out the system. In the larger centres where there is work all the year round it will be comparatively easy but in the smaller places, where there are only a few days culling throughout the year it will be a more difficult matter. However, I think we shall be able to surmount these difficulties and have a uniform system all over the country. So much for the question of cull.

The question of the standardization is an easier matter, for once the fish is in the exporter's store it is easy to provide that it shall not come out unless it is standardized. This is in fact being done at the present time to some extent by the Board of Trade, for during the past four or five years they have standardized casked fish, and the reports of the Inspector of Fisheries show that it has been found that the system has been working in their interests.

The third point mentioned in my motion is that of the protection of our lobster fishery. I do not propose to go into this matter in detail, for only two years ago I took the matter up very fully and the Official Reports of the House contain all the details of this question. By accident the Minister of Fisheries is not here this evening, and I regret this very much, as I was leaving to him the explanation of these Resolutions. He has been detained at Burin and the House is therefore without his valuable assistance. However, I hope the House will bear with me while I refer generally to our lobster fishery.

Hon. members are no doubt aware of the fact that there has been a great falling off in our lobster fishery, the catch having dropped from 80,000 cases in 1889 to 16,000 cases last year. We exported, I think, in 1889 seventy six thousand cases, not including those caught by the French who had the right at that time, to catch fish on a portion of the shore, where we now operate. It is safe to say, therefore, that in 1889 there were 80,000 cases of lobsters exported from this country. Last year our export amounted to only 16,000 cases. It is true that last year the weather was unusually stormy, and this fishery could not be carried on with usual success; and ice on the coast made the season very late, as the lobster is affected by the temperature. The records here and in Nova Scotia and other places go to show that cold weather was largely to blame for the small catch. However it cannot be claimed that this is true of every year, and we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the fishery has been decreasing gradually year after year.

This is a serious matter to the Colony, for it means the loss of a million and a quarter dollars a year. The industry today is worth $400,000 and we obtain $22 and $23 a case for our lobsters, whereas in 1889 we received only $6. If our catch last year was as great as it was in 1889 we would have received a million and a quarter dollars more than we did. We have lost an industry as valuable as the whole seal fishery by allowing the lobster fishery to go down, as we have done.

The question that we have to ask, and answer, is whether this fishery can be rescued. Can we save what is left? Can we save the lobster from becoming extinct? There are the fig-

ures which show very plainly that there is a falling off year after year of two or three thousand cases. If you read the literature from the Marine and Fisheries Departments in the United States and Canada, and the other countries you will find that they are at work in the propagation of the lobster, and in the protection of the seed lobster. The same can be said of England and Scotland.

I do not know if any member of the House is acquainted with the reports of Mr. Neilson, the fishery expert, who was here from 1885 to 1895, but if any hon. gentleman will read them he will find that they are full of valuable matter concerning this fishery. Mr. Neilson had a hatchery or incubator at Dildo, and he carried on his experiments there under the direction of the Fishery Board, which was presided over by the Hon. A. W. Harvey, who ably supported him and stood by him in his efforts, through thick and thin. However, in those days, there were people who knew everything, and these laughed at his efforts, notwithstanding the fact that scientists from Scotland and other countries came to Dildo, and gave their imprimatur to the work that he was doing there. It became such a standing joke throughout the Colony that eventually the Government of the day, led by Sir William Whiteway, dropped it. Nobody today can read these reports without seeing that Mr. Neilson had the right end of the matter, and that, if he had gone on with his work, we would have more lobsters around our coast than we have today.

The same thing applies to the little incubator that was installed at Murray's Pond, by some private individuals. Ten years ago they took the matter up and brought some rainbow trout from Australia and put them in that pond. How have they got on? Why, to-day there is hardly a pond near the city, where you cannot catch a four or five pound rainbow trout, than which there is no better eating or sportier fish. There is no longer any question about this for it is an absolute scientific fact that our fishes, like the lobster, trout and salmon can be propagated at a cheap rate, and be multiplied by millions.

What is true of the trout is true of the lobster for in the United States along the coast of Maine and other States on the American seaboard, there are scientific hatcheries today, and thousands of dollars are being expended to propagate their fisheries. The same can be said of Nova Scotia.

We are also doing something in this Colony. The lobster inspectors are doing their best, both of them, but the trouble is that they receive no sympathy from the people. The people do not understand it and laugh at it. Yet these men are only following the methods of the best scientific men. If we are to succeed in this undertaking we shall have to regard it as a most serious matter, and it is an unfortunate thing that up to the present time it has not received proper study.

Time and again people sent us petitions for alterations in the salmon and lobster laws, but we had nobody to advise us; we had no Board to direct us. The most important Department in the Colony, the Fisheries Department, has only existed during the past few years. I am making this motion today for the purpose of endeavoring to arrest the attention of this House and the country on the importance of the question. It is not a Government matter, and I shall merely propose a little later on that the whole matter be referred to a Select Committee, fully representative of both sides, and then I shall ask that the Committee be permitted to meet a similar Com-

mittee from the other branch of the Legislature. I trust that out of the deliberations and investigations of this joint Committee there may result measures of lasting beneft to the whole country.

Passing from the question of the lobster fishery we now come to the sealing fishery. Most people are of the opinion that the sealfishery is declining, and that the day is gone when we may expect large catches. Years ago in the fifties, we had as many as 650 vessels prosecuting the fishery, and they brought in 680,000 seals, but now the steamers never bring in more than 300,000 seals at most. In the fifties 130,000 men were engaged and they received half the voyage for their share, while today we have only 4,000 men engaged, and they receive only one third.

Not alone is there a great decrease in the number of men engaged but there has been a great loss to various trades connected with the fishery, to the boat builders, the sailmakers, the laborers and others, for the money that was paid in former days to them is now spent in costly machinery for the big steel ships. The expenses are much greater now, and that is why the men only receive a third, whereas in those days they received a half. Then the industry was worth millions of dollars to the Colony, but now it is worth at the most five or six hundred thousand dollars.

That being the case, the industry is certainly deserving of a little attention and it may be that we shall be able to bring about by careful legislation a return of the old conditions. We may be able by giving the matter our attention to see the day again, when four or five hundred thousand seals will be brought in every year.

Those hon. members who have had an opportunity of reading the Report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries this year must have been struck by the report of Captain Abraham Kean, the Commodore of our sealing fleet. It is a most interesting report, and I have no doubt is most reliable, for probably Captain Kean is as capable a judge of sealing matters as any man who ever went to the icefields. He is a most intelligent and observant man, and in addition to that he has been at the business since he was a boy, and has a record as a captair that is unequalled by any man.

His report, which has been tabled here, is most hopeful, for he says that the fishery is not declining, and that the average catch now brought in is as high as it was since the first introduction of steamships. He contrasts the present time with 1863, when steamers first went to the ice, and from an analysis from the excellent and useful book issued by Mr. L. G. Chafe and by reference to his own records he has come to the conclusion that the fishery is still holding its own. However, he sounds a warning note for he tells us that it is not enough to wait till we are face to face with the extermination of the seal, but that the time may have arrived when we should consider the advisability of having a close season. In other words, we should consider the advisability of giving the harps and the young seals as well as the old seals protection for a year or two, so that the breed may in that way be increased.

In support of this the Captain gives a familiar illustration for he points out that if every year we killed all the calves in the Colony, and allowed the cows to remain, there would be no replenishment of the stock, when the old cattle died out. This is practically what we have been allowing in the seal fishery, for year after year the steamers have gone out and killed

as many as they could of the young seals.

We have been too careful in our legislation as to old seals, perhaps, for it must be remembered that if they are not killed from time to time we practically consign them to the deep, for they die from natural causes. The great difficulty is that it is impossible to know if the old seal is a breeding seal or not. That is a difficult matter, and it is one to which Capt. Kean refers.

I feel that there ought to be no great difficulty with such evidence as that of Capt. Kean and other Captains as well as master watches and members of the crew in coming to a decision on many matters concerning the fishery. If we can obtain that evidence within the next fortnight or three weeks by having these men before us and by asking them questions, we may come to the conclusion that it will be advisable to have a close season every three or four or five years. On the other hand we may come to the conclusion that no close season is necessary at all. It may be found that the consensus of opinion of those who are competent to speak on the matter is that we are quite safe in going along as we are at the present time. But we should determine that question, and we should not wait until the disaster comes. That has been the trouble in this country. It seems to me that this is the time to learn about these matters from authorities like Captain Kean and the other sealing captains, and from experienced men of every rank. These are the men to tell us, and we must get their opinions, for these men are fully qualified to speak upon the subject. We know very little of the habits of the seal. Probably as little as we know of the whale and the great mammals of the deep whose habits cannot be easily observed. We scarcely know where they live or whence they come. It is merely a matter of conjecture that they llve in the far North, and that they come down in September and October only for the purpose of fulfilling a law of Nature and to give birth to their young. In the first days of March, they get on the ice and have their young, and, having had their young, they go back gradually to their homes in the far North, to Greenland and Baffin Bay. Our knowledge of the far North is limited indeed.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter in relation to this motion that I would like to touch upon, and that is the question of bait. For many years this matter has been before the Legislature in one shape or another, but up to the present time little has been accomplished. In the summer time when there is plenty of fish and no bait, the need for Bait Depots is seen, but when we have plenty of bait we let the question stand aside. This matter has been before the House in various forms, and attempts have been made to deal with it. During Sir Jas. Winter's Government an Act was passed giving a guarantee up to a certain amount to any Company that would form frozen bait depots, but nothing came of it. There was one company formed and they established on the West Coast and erected a bait station at Port aux Basques, but it did not last long. In 1903 or 1904, Mr. Wright came down from Montreal and entered into a contract to erect bait depots in every district. He came highly recommended by financial authorities in Canada, and a contract was made with him, but it was never carried out. Later on, in Sir Robert Bond's administration, we passed an Act by which the Government granted a subsidy for the erection of bait depots. The only people who took advantage of it were Messrs. Earle and Hodge of Fogo, and I am told by these gentlemen that they cannot make them pay and are dropping them. Then I

got together a small company here in St. John's, and we erected a cold storage depot at Petty Harbour at a cost of about $8,000.00, but it has now stood unused for years. It had the very best management, but it would not pay. The same is true of Bay Bulls and other places. Later we made a contract with Messrs. Lord and Trefethen, by which they undertook to build bait depots all over the Island. We gave them concessions. At the time it was alleged that our concessions were too attractive, and that we gave them terms which were too favourable. And yet our terms were not sufficiently attractive for them, and they could not get the capital necessary for this cold storage business. I might continue thus and relate the various attempts to erect the bait depots and to deal with the question of the bait supply. At the present time, we are making enquiries as to how they deal with this question in Norway. It will be instructive for us to know whether the fishermen get their bait from steamers which go around and supply the bait, or whether they get it from permanent stores on shore. It is very important to a fishing people that we should know everything in connection with the problem of the supplying of bait. Everything pertaining to new methods of putting up fish must be studied by us, if we are to get the full value from our fisheries. In old days there was a fear that a large catch would mean low prices, and no attempt was made to develop the fisheries; but that day is past. I do not think we will ever again have the low prices of those days. The prices of food are rising, but we have lately had great new markets opened to us. Last year out of our $12,000,000 of exports, nearly $10,000,000 was fishery products. The advance in our fishery methods is beginning. Look at the number of motor boats that have come in in the past five years. Again, look at the great waste of our fishery products that might be utilized. Nearly 25 per cent. of what we take out of the water or off the ice is absolutely wasted. If the 300,000 seal carcasses that we leave on the ice every year could be utilized as fertilizer, their value would be enormous. Then look at the amount of fish offal. The Company at Burnt Islands have expended an enormous sum on ther factory. Last year we heard a good deal of that great curse to the fishermen—the dog-fish. We have found that they could be manufactured into valuable fertilizer. The same is true of the offal of the cod fish. We have now that glue and fertilizer factory running at Burnt Islands, and it needs no stretch of imagination to see that herein we have the foundation of a valuable industry. At the end of the debate I shall propose that a Select Committee be formed from both sides of the House, and that they join with a Committee from the Upper House, so that we may take evidence at once, especially in relation to the sealfishery, and deal if possible with some of these matters and make a report to this House in relation to them. I beg therefore to move the resolutions on the Order Paper.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I don't object to going into Committee; but I think that a matter of such importance should be thoroughly discussed before going into Committee. There is no difference of opinion with regard to this matter; both sides will in the main be agreed on it; but, as this is the first time that we have been informed of the Premier's intention of moving this resolution, I think that it should be deferred a while. I think this is a matter which ought to be discussed very fully, so as to attract the attention of the country. I suggest that we should go into Committee and immediately rise until tomorrow.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Certainly. I beg to move the House into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

The Committee forthwith rose and Mr. Speaker resumed the chair. The chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that the Committee asked leave to sit again to-morrow. On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Committee had leave accordingly.

DENTAL ACT.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council stating that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act further to Amend the Newfoundland Dental Act," without amendment.

SEALING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Coaker, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend 55 Vic., Cap. 2, entitled 'An Act to regulate the prosecution of the Sealfishery.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks on the present Bill. I had to cut short my remarks the last evening, because it was getting late; but I think it is worth my while to resume now. Some will feel ashamed to hear that Newfoundlanders were treated so badly on the sealing steamers. As the food supply is the principle thing, I will give you a short description of it. Let us start on Monday morning. The cook is called at about 2 o'clock and the kettles are put on and breakfast is ready at about 7 or 8 o'clock. For breakfast there is oleo and bread, and for dinner there is the same. At supper we get the same—that was three times in one day. On Tuesday we got the same for breakfast; but for dinner there was pork and duff. The pork was not very bad, but the duffs were certainly hard. On Wednesday, we got oleo and hard bread. On Thursday we would get the privilege of the pork and duff again, and for the other meals it was the same. On Friday and Saturday it would be oleo, bread and tea. On Sunday we expected a change, but we found that the bill of fare was the same as for the other days—bread, tea and oleo. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the men of those days must have had stronger constitutions than the men of to-day—otherwise they would not have endured such conditons. In going over this Bill it has occurred to me that there are some matters that need consideration, and of course they have had some consideration before. One of these things has been referred to by Mr. Downey, in regard to the transfer of sick men from the wooden ships. This is worthy of consideration. We ought to give this matter our attention and see if it cannot be arranged that sick men be transferred to a steel ship, no matter whether it belongs to the same owners as the wooden ship or not. Of course if it is a contagious disease the case is somewhat different, and the captain might be ordered to land him. Furthermore a Captain of a steel ship cannot be expected to go out of his course to take a sick man on board. There is only one other matter, and that is the question of hood seals. Hoods travel in families and when the steel ships get among them they clean them out. The hood stays by its young, and so the young and old are being killed. From what some members have said, it would appear that they thought the Captains of the steel ships would only take the young and leave the hoods for the wooden ships. When the steel ships get among the hoods there is no chance for the wooden ship to get any. I think a close season is the only

remedy. An ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure. If we can protect the hoods by any other means than a close season, all the better, because there are arguments against a close season. One of these is that our oil is being made the subject of competition by a substitute. If we have a close season that substitute will take the place of the oil, and we will be unable to get it back on the market again. Another argument against a close season is that if we have a close season followed by a bad codfishery it would be a calamity for the country. So that all these considerations must be borne in mind before we decide on a close season

The figures for the past two or three years show an average catch of 280,000. If there are 500,000 young in these patches, then an enormous number must escape. The Prime Minister alluded to the fact of killing all our calves and thus ultimately having no breeding animals. That is all right, but in the sealfishery you are not so sure of killing as that, and further than that the old breeding seals are hardest to get. Some are opposed to closing down on old seals because they will die. If they are dying, where do they come from year after year? Many report old seals that are not old seals. The Sagona last year reported for 1,700 old seals. In reality she had 1,450 bedlamers and 63 old harps. She had destroyed 1,450 prospective breeding seals in securing 63 old harps that would ordinarily die. The Newfoundland reported for 1,800 old seals. She had in fact 1,650 bedlamers. In going after the old seals they kill many breeding seals. The old seals are not so easy to get, and it is the breeding seals you get in that case. And it is worth while to protect these breeding seals.

This country is dependent upon her fisheries, and anything that concerns them in any way should meet with our gravest consideration.

MR. WALSH—Just one or two words, Mr. Chairman. The sealfishery is the only industry in this country in which I have not taken a personal part and so I am not in a position, as Mr. Winsor is to give his personal practical experience. But in going through the bill it has seemed to me that a few improvements might be made. Section 1; (c) provides that all ships shall be fitted with portable iron frame beds. I am at a loss to know why an iron bed should be considered more suitable than a wooden one and especially from the standpoint of comfort. I know from my own experience in logging camps that I would not like to have an iron frame bed there. Apart from that, if we put iron beds on these ships we are depriving quite a number of men, carpenters, of a substantial sum of money. These ships would require about five men for a week, to erect these wooden beds, and iron beds would mean a loss of $1,200 to the carpenters and laborers of St. John's. If you put in iron beds you will only need them for a short time. So unless some good reason be shown I see no reason for discarding the wooden bed for an iron one.

In clause (f) of section 2, cooks shall not be employed at other work than cooking. From enquiry which I made from some of the sealing captains, I find that on some of the ships on a fine day practically every member of the crew with the exception of the captain and cooks, are all sent on the ice to kill seals or haul seals. It is a general principle that on these steamers from the captain to the cook, all hands are interested in the success of the voyage. Under the clause the captain has no power to order the cooks to help in clearing the ship or go to the rescue of any of the men on the ice. If a cook goes, a captain is

liable to a fine of $500. So that the captain could hardly be expected to send these cooks to the rescue of the sealers on the ice. There is room, therefore, for improvement in these sections. I had intended to refer to another section but that has, I am glad to say, been covered by Mr. Winsor.

I wish to place myself on record as supporting this measure, as I shall every measure brought forward in the interests of the laboring classes. I am comparatively young in years, but I am old in experience, as regards conditions in the laboring classes. I have worked in practically every branch of industry in the country.

With the improvements that I have suggested, I think this Bill should pass, and I am heartily in accord with its provisions.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member who has just sat down, I may say as regards the question of beds that that provision only applies to steel ships. The wooden ships can still carry wooden beds. In any case, the idea of abolishing wooden beds is to do away with the filth which they accumulate. The advantage of the iron bed is one of clealiness. The owners supply these beds and they do splendid service. The sealers have made no objection.

As to the hon. member's argument in regard to cooks, I can say that there can be no law which will prevent the captain sending a man on the ice to save life. The object of the section is to keep the cooks from going on the ice after seals. No one will dare prosecute a captain for sending a cook to save life.

Mr. Winsor has referred to the want of provision for the transfer of sick men to any steel ship. The reason I have not gone further in this matter is because there is a difference of opinion among the owners on this point. It is hoped that it will not be long before the wooden ships abandon the northern fishery altogether and go to the Gulf. There would be no difficulty in making an arrangement among the owners themselves on this point.

Reference was made to section 8. There is already a law upon the subject of destitute seamen being sent to their homes, which I think would apply, but if the Committee feels that some provision should be made whereby the Company would send the men to their homes, I will draft a section covering the point.

The amendment proposed by Mr. Downey, I have much pleasure in including in the Bill. It is a very reasonable one, and there are reasons which amply justify its inclusion.

My friend, Mr. Higgins, objects to the penalties in section 4. I will have that section amended to cover the suggestions made.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I might suggest that some clause be inserted in regard to section 8, which would in effect mean that the Customs officer shall not clear the vessel until he is satisfied that provision has been made for the men to be sent home.

MR. COAKER—Yes, that would be a good idea.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, made some progress, and asked leave to sit again. It is moved and seconded that this report be received and adopted. It is moved and seconded that when this House rise it do adjourn until to-morrow afternoon at 3 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17th.

The House met at 3 of the clock

in the afternoon, pursuant to adjourn ment.

PETITIONS.

MR. CLIFT—I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Millertown, who are outside of the electoral districts, and therefore have no vote. They wish to be included. This petition is similar to that which I presented yesterday for an amendment of the act to include Millertown and Badger in the Electoral Districts. These people complain that they are debarred from the privileges of voting. As the matter is about to be attended to by the Government, it is not necessary for me to make further .emarks.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr.. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Boyd's Cove. They ask that Boyd's Cove be made a port of call for the 'S. S. Clyde,' and that logging be strictly prohibited on Chapel's Island. With regard to the first request, I ask permission to make a few remarks. They have now been asking that Boyd's Cove be made a port of call, for several years. I know that the 'Clyde' in performing her duties, has all that she can do. But it is suggested that in the first trip she would take in all the ports, while in the next she would call only at the larger ports. In fact, once a week is quite sufficient for calling at those small settlements. I think that their request can be carried out without asking the officers to do more than they can actually perform. The petitioners ask that the wood on Chapel's Island be reserved for fishery purposes. This island is known as a splendid place for timber used by the fishermen. On this island there are splendid fir and birch trees, and a reserve here would be of benefit to all the neighboring settlements. This is a very reasonable request, and I ask that these petitions be referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting that petition. Some years ago a similar petition was presented. I feel confident that there ought not be any objection to the prohibition of logging there. This is not the first petition of its kind; the people have made application before in relation to Thwart Island and other places. I also beg to support the other parts of that petition, in reference to the calling of the 'Clyde' at certain places.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition asking that a sum of $50 be allocated for the construction of a bridge a Hodge's Cove. The place is impassable. The people there have to get across by means of boats. I think that the Government ought to give every consideration to it. I trust that the Government will take it into consideration. I also have another petition from New Perlican that a sum of $40 be allocated for a road.

MR. TARGETT—I have much pleasure in supporting those petitions.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Blackhead in the district of St. John's West in relation to fishery regulations as regards the placing and sinking of codnets. The petitioners in this settlement carry on the fishery in a small way and are not very much interested in the trap fishery. They contend that traps are placed on their grounds by persons not belonging to the place and owing to the present regulations the petitioners are debarred from sinking their nets in deep water, which practically means that unless some new rules are made, they will be obliged to abandon the fishery. The petitioners claim that such a rule would not interfere with the trap men, but would

allow them to carry on their vocation. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. KENNEDY—I have much pleasure in supporting the petition. These people are hardworking and industrious, and it is very hard for them to see others place traps almost before their doors and debar them from carrying on their work. I think that the fishery rules should be altered to meet the wishes of petitioners.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I also have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition, and I agree with the remarks made by my colleagues.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to present a petition from Patrick Long, asking this House to grant him a pension of $180 a year in recognition of his long and faithful services as messenger and doorkeeper of this Assembly. The petition sets forth that Mr. Long has been a servant of this House since 1889, and during that time has discharged his duties in a faithful manner, and to the satisfaction of every hon. member. He is now in his seventieth year, and owing to ill health is unable to get about and earn anything, and were it not for the charity of his friends would be in a lamentable condition. The petition is signed by many members on both sides of the House, and by several prominent members of the community who would like to see some provision made for this old servant to tide him over the few remaining years of his life. I trust that the House will take this matter up in the proper spirit and before the session closes will do something for this deserving servant.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of North Water, Bay Roberts, in the District of Harbor Grace asking for a sum of one hundred dollars to repair a road at North Water. This work requires immediate attention and I trust that the House will see its way clear to meet the wishes of the petitioners.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Job's Cove in the district of Bay de Verde, asking for the sum of five hundred dollars to be expended as follows: The sum of one hundred dollars to repair a dock, and the sum of four hundred dollars to construct a crane at Job's Cove Point. The petitioners also ask for the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars to be expended on Johnson's stage bridge. I trust that due provisions will be made so that these various works will be undertaken. I move that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House then resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CLIFT—I would suggest that the Committee rise so that hon. members may have an opportunity of perusing the report of the Supplementary Estimates which have been placed on our desks only today.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again. The report was received and adopted, and the Committee had leave to sit again on tomorrow.

SEALING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Coaker, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Sealing Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—The amendments proposed to this Bill have not as yet been printed. I would therefore suggest that further discussion be deferred, until the amendments are before us in proper printed form.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Before the Committee rises I would like to suggest to the hon. member who has charge of this Bill, that the sub-section of section 2 which prohibits the cooks from doing any other work should be omitted. While it may be agreed that they have sufficient duties to perform in the direction of cooking,still occasions may arise when their services may be required, such as assisting to release the ship, when endeavoring to force her way through the ice. I do not think that they should be ordered to work about the ship when they should otherwise be engaged in cooking, but they should have the option of performing any other duties, should they be willing so to do. Under this section they are prohibited, under a penalty from doing any kind of work except cooking. I merely make this suggestion, as it may not be in the interests of the cooks themselves, or of the men if the sub-section was allowed to remain in the Bill.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, I should like to say just a few words with regard to the sub-section which has been referred to by the hon. member for Fortune Bay. I quite agree with all the provisions made in this bill or any others that may be inserted with regard to ensuring that the food for the crew shall be sufficient, and that it shall be properly cooked. It seems to me, however, that this sub-section (f) which prohibits cooks from doing any work other than cooking is quite unnecessary, and I would suggest to the hon. the introducer of the measure that he consider whether it ought not to be dropped. I am informed, that in practise the cooks find ample time on certain occasions to do general work, for the good of the voyage, without in anyway interfering with their duties as cooks. I am not concerned with this point, nor with the somewhat sentimental, rather than serious aspect of the section, in that it removes the control of the master over a section of his crew, which might be often a very important matter, especially in connection with our sealing voyage. The point I wish to draw the attention of the introducer of the bill to is what is the necessity of this sub-section in view of the fact that the bill provides for very serious penalties against the master where the cooks do not perform the work prescribed by the various other clauses of section 2. Is it not to be taken for granted that the Captain in his own interest will see the cooks perform their work? And if they perform their work where is the necessity of the sub-section under discussion? I should like to be assured that the crews desire this provision in the bill.

No matter how you view it, it seems to me, that that part of the section could be let go without in any way taking from the interest of the crew.

There is another point that occurs to me and I only mention it in order that it may be explained and that is this; is it correct that there is a desire on the part of the men who prosecute the voyage as cooks that we should restrict them from any other work? I mean is there any method of bringing it home to us that there is a desire on the part of these men to be debarred from prosecuting the voyage in the same way that they have aways done. I think that that whole clause can be safely eliminated because it is always provided for in the previous

sub-sections of section 2, whereby it is enacted that the cooks must make certain provisions for the health and comfort of the crew and must do a certain kind of cooking.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for St. John's East I want to say that this section dealing with the cooks was a section that was put into the sealing agreement at the request of the F. P. U. Convention held three years ago at Greenspond. Now, all the owners that sent out ships signed that agreement with the exception of the Newfoundland Produce Co., and in that agreement was that clause that the cooks should do no other work but cooking. That agreement has been in force two years. There has been no objection to it. No objection has been placed in the hands of the owners by the Captains. It has given entire satisfaction. Before this agreement the cook could be taken from his work and sent to do anything the Captain wished—handling coal, stowing seals, hoisting seals, or any other kind of work. Now if you have a ship with 270 men on board the cook will be fully occupied in cooking for them and should not be put to work doing anything else. The men prosecuting the seal fishery are the ones who have asked for this, and we have had it in the agreement which has been in force for two years and it has given great satisfaction. No objection has ever been placed in the hands of the owners, and yet some hon. members here, simply because they have had a chat with some of the captains who do not see eye to eye with this thing, come in here and raise objections. I could not agree to having this Bill go through the House without this section in connection with the cooks, I would sooner withdraw the whole Bill. As I have said before the men who are cooking for 270 men and who have got to do the work laid down in the schedule to this Bill will have to devote their entire time to cooking. I am surprised at the frivolous objections that have been raised to the different sections to this Bill. We have been going into this matter for four or five years in our Council, and everything that we have done has been submitted to the owners at two or three meetings. It has been suggested that the question of discipline is involved and that you were taking certain authority away from the captain. But is the captain of the 'Prospero' or any ordinary steamer allowed to interfere with the cook, and take him from the galley, and put him at any work he pleases? Is the captain allowed to interfere with the engineers? Certainly not. The cooks on a sealing steamer will have their hands pretty full in attending to the wants of 270 men.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I would like to say to the hon. member that I am not in any way interested in the views of any captain and my views on the matter were not obtained from any captain or any person interested in the seal fishery. I look at the Bill before me fairly, and in looking at it as it reads I make this statement here that certain penalties are put in if certain work is not done, and then I merely suggest to the hon. member that with these penalties there, there is no need of that section with reference to the cooks. Now, with all respect to the hon. member, I would point out to him that the conditions that obtain on ocean going boats are not the same as obtain at the seal fishery. On ocean going boats the cooks are simply paid a certain wage for cooking, but I am informed that the cooks on the sealing steamers are paid just like the other members of the crew, by shares. Now, I have mere-

ly put these questions to the hon. introducer to satisfy myself that in voting for this Bill, I am not doing any injustice to any person engaged in the sealfishery. Now, if it is true that this has been in the sealing agreement,and if it is true that the cooks have done no other work during the past two years, there can be no possible objection to this section. Now, I want to impress upon the hon. member and upon members of this House, that whether it has been in the sealing agreement or not, it is not the practice that has been carried out. In this matter I speak subject to correction. I have been given to understand, however, that this provision as regards the cooks has not been carried out. If, however, the agreement has been carried out and the cooks have not been doing any other work, then there can be no more objection to passing this section than the other sub-sections, that we have already admitted. They have all been passed, I think, because it has been recognized that they have been in practice the past two or three years under the sealing agreement. In the suggestions I made I was merely looking for information, and I wish to assure the hon. member that so far as I am concerned there is absolutely no necessity for him withdrawing his Bill. Some of the objections raised to the Bill seem to the hon. member to be frivolous. Well, that may occur to him, but it appears to me, equally frivolous to have the clause at all, in view of the penalties laid down in the sub-sections under section 2. If the cooks do not perform their work, and if the penalty falls on the Captain he will take good care to see that the cook does not neglect his work, since he has to pay the penalty for the neglect and not the cook.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I beg to support the mover of the Bill in everything he said. I would like to ask him how many cooks would be carried on a vessel with a crew of 200 men.

MR. COAKER—Four or five cooks and an assistant.

MR. HICKMAN—That would mean forty or fifty men for each cook, and it would take him all his time to attend to his duties. It seems to me that the cooks are only taken on board the ships to do the cooking, and that other men are there to do the other work. Now take a cook on a sailing vessel with only four or five men. He does not handle cargo and does not do anything but cook. I think the clause is a necessary clause in the Bill, and that it will give entire satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again. On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Committee had leave to sit again on tomorrow.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill to prevent what is know as the 'White Slave Traffic'; and also, that he would on tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions with reference to the provisions of the Crown Lands Act, relating to sawmills.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rise it to adjourn till tomorrow, Wednesday, Feb. 18th, at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, Feb 18th, 1914

The House met at 3 of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment

PETITIONS.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from

Leading Tickles asking for three or four allocations. One is concerning the placing of a harbour light and another that a sum of $200 be allocated to the repairing of the public road. The petition is signed by the entire inhabitants of the place. I ask that they be referred to the department to which they relate.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I support the prayer of the petitions.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House, a detailed statement of ex penditure in relation to the forest fire at St. Chad's in reply to question of Mr. Coaker of Feb. 6th last.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present petitions from Clark's Beach for a public wharf, for the sending of the dredge there and for Elective Road Boards. The public wharf at Clark's Beach, is not sufficiently long for steamers to load coal. For the people ordering four or five hundred tons of coal at certain seasons of the year, this is very inconvenient. They are now compelled to carry coal in boats, for long distances. I would ask that this wharf be extended. There is a considerable number of people depending upon this wharf. I should say there are 5,000 people there. I trust that the Government will recognize the request. They also ask that the dredge be sent there to dredge out the South River. The boats are often broken up on account of the shallowness of the water, and the fishermen are compelled to beach them. They also ask for elective Road Board. I beg that these petitions be referred to the departments to which they relate.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply to the question of Mr. Halfyard of Feb. 10th last as regards the establishing of elective boards. There is no necessity at present for an alteration in the law. Any locality can obtain an elective board, whenever it is considered desirable. That is the Government's policy, and it has been carried into efect in a number of cases already, for instance Bell Island.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from New Perlican asking that a sum of $60 be allocated for the construction of an agricultural road. This petition is signed by Thomas White and a number of others. I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from Change Islands for the sum of $200.00 for a wharf. They also ask for the erection of a lighthouse at Tickle Point, Change Islands; that the ferrymen at Change Islands be paid $206 instead of $100 and that a surveyor of Weights and Measures be appointed at Change Islands. These requests all come under one general petition, from the representatives of the whole district of Fogo and from this district Council and it shows that people in one part of the district sympathise with those in the other and that they all consider that these matters are necessary for that section of the district. Now with regard to the salary of the ferryman at Change Islands. That matter was discussed in Supply and I hope that the Government will now consider the matter and give him a living wage so that he can devote his whole time to the service of the public. With regard to the surveyor of Weights and Measures, I hope that one will be appointed. These people know what they want and they would not have asked for these things if they were not necessary. I trust that these various requests will be favourably considered by the various departments to which

they are referred.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition from Change Islands. In relation to the Lighthouse I may say for the information of the Premier that in 1908 material was sent for the erection of a lighthouse at Tickle Point. The material was never used. I do not know whether it has been destroyed or taken away. The matter was undertaken in 1908 and it has been in slings ever since. A number of people from Joe Batt's Arm, Tilton Hr., and other parts of the District have been asking for that lighthouse on Tickle Point. It would be a great public convenience The Government might be able to find the material that was sent there and go ahead with the erection of a lighthouse.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Great Paradise in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's with reference to Wharf. They ask the sum of $250 to repair their wharf. The petition is numerously signed and the wharf would be of great convenience. For years it has been out of repair. I trust that the Government will see their way clear to grant this money. I most heartily support the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker. I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Keels in the district of Bonavista asking for the sum of $130 to connect the main road with the harbour road. This road goes through agricultural land and would be a great help to the community. I beg to support the petition and ask that it be referred to the proper Department.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker. I beg to support the petition of the hon member for Bonavista with reference to the allocation of a sum of money to construct a branch road from the main road to the local road in Keels. I know the situation that the petitioners refer to and I think with the expenditure of this small amount of $120, or $130, the road could be constructed this spring and would be a great convenience to the people down there in getting to their gardens. I trust that the Department of Public Works will see its way clear to granting this sum of money.

PATENT BILL.

MR. SPEAKER acquainted the House that the Legislative Council had passed the Patents Amendment Bill with an amendment. The amendment was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister 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. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, when the Committee went into Supplementary Supply yesterday I asked that it be deferred for the reason that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Kent, was not present, because I knew he had some remarks to make in connection with it. Unfortunately Mr. Kent is absent again to-day through illness, and I cannot ask that the Committee wait any longer for him before going on with this measure.

Personally I have very little to say in connection with Supplementary Supply now tabled by the Minister, beyond the fact that I think that the Government should when the Estimates are passing this House in the regular way take such Supply as

would render it unnecessary to come down to this House again for Supplementary Supply. I do not mean to say that this is an unusual thing or confined only to this Government. As long as I have been a member of this House, we have had Supplementary Supply coming in, sometimes for more and sometimes for less than it is to-day; but I say the principle is a bad one, and that votes should be taken in the regular way in the Session and these votes should not be exceeded except in very extraordinary cases.

Now, for instance, take the Supplementary Supply we are now considering. The first item is one of $1,500 for Contingencies for the Premier's office. That we are told is to defray the cost of stenographers and other expenses incidental to the office of the Premier. I am not objecting to that amount, because I know there is a great deal of work in that office, the more so now because the Premier has a separate Department to himself. During the late Administration the work of the Premier was done in the Colonial Secretary's Office, and before that the Premier was Minister of Justice, and he had at his disposal clerks sufficient to do the work of his office, whereas today the Premier is not holding any Departmental Office and naturally he must have considerable incidental expenses in connection with this office. What I object to, Mr. Chairman, is this, that when we were sitting here in the last session of the House, it must have been in the knowledge of the Minister and of the Government that this expenditure would naturally come up during the year, and it should have been provided for in the last Estimates.

The same thing applies to the vote of $2,700 for the Colonial Secretary's Office in connection with the Census. The Colonial Secretary should have been able to estimate what his expenses would have been in connection with these various matters and should have come down here at the last session of the House and asked for a vote to cover these amounts.

The same thing applies to the next item—Marine & Fisheries, Salaries and Contingencies—These salaries and these contingencies that we are now asking for should have been applied for at the last session of the House, and should have gone into the regular Estimates, and they should not have been included in what is known as Supplementary Supply.

The Public Works Department asked for the sum of $19,526.80 to cover salaries, contingencies, fuel and light, insurance, keepers and repairs. There is nothing, I submit, Mr. Chairman, in these items that could not have been foreseen when this House was last in Session and that could not have been included in the Estimates that were then submitted.

In the Government Engineer's Department we are asked for a vote of $1,960.00 to cover contingencies. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the same remarks apply to this vote. These things should have been foreseen and should have been provided for in the regular way.

I might go through the whole list with very few exceptions and claim that the various items should have been taken last year in the regular Estimates. During the past five years the various Supplementary Supplies amount to a very large sum of money. I should estimate that it would be over one million and a half dollars. A great deal of this money should have been voted in the regular way, and should not have come down in this form. There should be no such thing, really as Supplemetary Supply, except in cases of emergency that

could not possibly be foreseen, and I hope that the Minister will endeavour to so bring in his Estimates as to avoid the necessity for Supplementary Supply for such things as salaries and contingencies in the various Departments. The practice is not a good one. It is bad in many ways because it opens the way to various Departments or for the Government to make expenditures which would not have been voted in this House, and to make expenditures upon executive responsibility, and that is a system which should not, I think, be encouraged to any extent. If the Minister comes down and takes Supply for the contingencies of various Departments, for the salaries of officials in the various Departments, or for any other expenses in connection with the various Departments, that should be sufficient and the Government should endeavour to so arrange their affairs as to keep within the bounds of the amount that is being voted by this Legislature. The fact that it had been done in that way would enable the Government, at any time, to say we have expended the amount, and now we must do without this thing until the House next meets when we can take a vote in the regular way for any necessary increase that may be made in the various Departments. Now, as to the item of $76,000 for refunds. Of course, I can understand that that is an item that cannot be estimated with any accuracy, at the time the Estimates are going through. That item in itself was merely a formal one. Certain refunds have to be made upon coal duties and other things by the Government, and it is impossible for the Minister in charge to say exactly what that amount will be. That item in itself is one that I have no objection to, because I can see that it is impossible to estimate exactly what it would be.

The items for contingencies and for supernumeraries are things that might have been foreseen. My principal objection then, Mr. Chairman, is to the principle of Supplementary Supply at all. It ought not to be encouraged and full provision ought to be made in the regular estimates.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I wish first of all to thank the Government for the consideration that they have given to our proposals with regard to the expenditures of money by the local Boards in the different outports. Now, I hope that there will not be any misunderstanding with regard to this matter because it is a very important matter. What we have been asking for and what we expect, is that there shall be a Road Board elected every two years, that a Justice of the Peace or a Magistrate . will preside over the elections and that the accounts for the two preceding years shall be audited at that meeting. An account of all the money received and expended shall be laid before the meeting. I do not mean what the Premier thought I meant, that marine grants and all large amounts like that should be allocated per capita. I agree with him that it would be impossible to carry on any large public works if that were done. But in the past a lot of public moneys have been handed over to individuals and very often wasted. Down in Bonavista we have had Elected Boards, but I do not think that more than three per cent. of these Boards have had anything to do with the spending of money other than local money, which amounted to twenty-nine or thirty cents per capita a year. The rest of the moneys were handed over to friends of the Government representatives. For example, John Rowsell expended $1,983 as a Commissioner. That money should have been expended by the Board. The people went to

a lot of trouble in electing that Board. They had a public meeting in a large hall, and a lot of people attended. I understand that the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Abbott, has been a Chairman of that Board,and from the way he has taken up his public duties here we may feel sure that any money that was expended by the Board while he was there was expended well. When we can get men like him to take these positions we can feel sure that good returns will be given for all moneys expended. Nevertheless, we find that the Bonavista Board was overlooked by the person that sent the money, and nearly two thousand dollars was given to Mr. Rowsell to spend. I know other cases where the Boards were overlooked and the money sent to individuals. Captain Dan Green, of Newton, was sent $7,300. Lawrence Moors, Plate Cove, was given $690; Captain Geo. Hann $8,019.50; Captain J. Winsor $999, and other individuals got other amounts. Now, the people of Bonavista District objected to these things, and these are the things that made the people feel so strongly against the Government Representatives, and I am sure the Premier will be delighted that we on this side of the House are beginning to get him out of his trouble. I do not want to have any more of this business, and I am sure that when you allow the people to spend the money through their own Boards, composed of good, reliable men, there will be no further trouble. At present all the responsibility is thrown over on the Government.

Bonavista had been in Opposition for twenty years, and during that time the party had gained, of course, some very strong supporters in the District. When the party came into power these men of course, expected to receive something as they had two members in the Executive. Of twenty strong supporters two would get all the grants, and the remaining eighteen received nothing. These men then kicked up their heels and the result was that the Government lost their support. I have sympathized with the members for the District during the last four years, for they could not do impossibilities. As a matter of fact I thought they did all they could, and I told the people that they never had a Government that did so much for them. They spent two millions of dollars on a branch railway, and I thought the people would be thankful to the Government but they said that they did not thank the Government but the people of the Colony and they put the members out. It is said that the 'new gospel' defeated the Government in Bonavista, and, if that is so, all I have to say is that the 'new gospel' must have tremendous power behind it. Not only is it inoculated in those people who have already heard it, but it is spreading west and the people there are anxiously waiting to receive the glad tidings.

I hope the Government does not misunderstand our position as to the Municipal Boards. We want all the moneys that go to the districts with the exception of grants of large expenditures for breakwaters, and other public works for which the assistance of the Government Engineer, and for which tenders are called, to go to the Boards. Some of these large expenditures might be undertaken by the Boards, but some, of course, will have to be taken up by the Government.

As to Supplemental Supply, I think that this ought to be the last time that we should be asked to vote such a sum as $244,000 for Supplemental Supply. There is an excuse to some extent for some extra expenditure for last year was election year, and the Government did its best to be re-

turned. They spent a lot of money in order to be sure of keeping their friends. While I do not imply that they gave the money away, I know that there were many small grants, and increases in salary which would not have been given if it had not been election year. $214,000 is a very large amount to vote for Supplementary Supply in a small Colony like Newfoundland with a revenue of about four million dollars, and the Government certainly ought to have been able to calculate Supply within at least fifty thousand dollars. Nobody will object if owing to unforeseen contingencies the Government has to seek Supplemental Supply, but they should not have to look for any such sum as is now asked for. In the present case I should say that two thirds of the amount could have been foreseen.

Let us take the vote for legislation which is $9,919, of which the vote for this House alone is $5,224. It is not surprising to see such a large vote as this for one Chamber when no less than $2,400 is spent on stationery alone. That is a very great amount for stationery for one chamber; in fact, I would have said that even $500 would be a very large sum. There are but thirty six members here, and if they required $2,400 for stationery, somebody must have written a great many letters. I am half inclined to think that the newspapers supporting the Government took advantage of the fact that it was election year and, believing that the Government would not be returned to office, they came to the conclusion that it would be just as well for them to take all they could from the public monies and not leave anything in the way of supplies of stationery to the newspapers that would receive the patronage of another Government.

Refunds, $76,000. I think a great amount of that must have been incurred by taking off the duty on tea. When the House opened last year there was a duty on tea and there was a lot of it imported on which duty had been paid. When the duty was taken off the merchants knew that they would not be able to compete with the prices of those who got it in duty free, so they sent it back to Halifax and brought it in again, received a rebate of 33 per cent. That was all right for the people in St. John's who had large stocks, but there were many in the outports with ten or fifteen packages of tea, which they had purchased in the previous fall, and they were unable to send it back like men in St. John's could.

The Union Stores lost $260 by the Government taking off the duty on sugar and tea.

If the Government had been more considerate, and announced that after the first of July tea and sugar would be admitted duty free, the Colony would have saved a great deal of this refund, and made a nice little revenue. The people would have been just as well pleased if they announced it in that way and many a poor man would not have lost the duty while the big men were able to save it by exporting tea to Halifax.

The Department of Finance is asking for $10,000 for General Contingencies. This is a large sum to be asked for without more explanation than we have received. The contingent fund is a nice fund to run to, and it would be nice to know how some of the votes out of this fund are spent. It would be delightful to some people outside this House to know how much went to friends of the Government for work that could be left over this year.

$25,000 ought to be the limit of this whole vote and I think the Minister ought to be able to do with that

amount in the future. I know that the vote has been increasing from Government to Government and that it has been asked for by the wise and the unwise. Every season there is a large supplemental vote asked for money that has been spent without legislative authority. It is not much good finding fault now for the money has been spent, but I hope that in the future the Government will turn over a new leaf and that they will do what is right.

HON MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman. Just a word in reply to my hon. friend, the member for Bonavista. I think he will find if he looks up the records of this House that ever since we have had Responsible Government in this Colony the Minister of Finance has had to come down at the end of each session and ask for money that was not voted in the Estimates of the previous year.

We are quite right in coming here to-day and asking for this amount and after my hon. friend is dead and gone Receivers-General will come here and ask for Supplemental Supply and members in the Opposition will denounce them for doing so. It is the business of the Opposition to do so and I cannot blame them for raising catch cries. The money will not be coming into the pockets of the members of the Government, but it will be spent in public works around the island. The people are paying so much money for public works that are unforeseen and the money will be returned to them again in the shape of public works.

When we took the vote for the dredge last year we did not know just how much it would cost, but we know to-day. Last year the dredge was working all the year round for last winter it was at work on the West Coast. We had to keep the dredge at Grand Bank and Fortune, and this cost money, but it was absolutely necessary to the people there for there are at least fifty vessels sailing out of these ports. During the summer the dredge was sent to several places and although we have had the dredge only two years, she has been sent to every district in the island. She was rushed around from place to place, but this year the Government has decided to close down her work on the 1st December because we have found that a paying amount of work could not be got out of the dredge from November to April, owing to the storms which prevail during these months. While we voted $15,000.00 in the past, that sum was not sufficient for the whole twelve months. Now we come in and say that the dredge will be worked only in the summer and early fall and it is easy to see that we are more likely to expend no more than $15,000.00 than we were in the past.

We come next to the amount of $76,000.00 for Customs rebates. The Commitee will remember that, as my hon. friend has stated, we took off the duty on sugar, tea and pork There were considerable stocks held in the city, on which duty had been paid, and according to the Revenue Act the owners had permission to ship these articles away and then reimport them. That was the position and on that we were asked to pay $15,000.00 last year. Another amount that is asked for in Supplemental Supply is the drawback on gasoline used by the fishermen. We cannot estimate the exact amount of gasoline to be used for the rebate has only been in force for eighteen months.

The vote of $20,000.00 to the "Fiona" is nothing when compared with the money which that steamer saves the Colony. It is impossible to estimate what work has been done by the

Fiona and Inspector O'Rielly, but we have only to compare the small amount of smuggling which goes on to-day to the great amount carried on ten years ago to form some idea of the value of her services to the Colony. If you place that to the credit of the steamer you will not blame the Receiver-General for asking for $15,000.00 in supplemental supply for her.

My hon. friend referred to other votes but he evidently did not consider them of very great importance. Fault was found with the vote of $2700.00 for work in connection with the Census. We could not estimate the amount last year because certain returns had not been completed. However, the work will be finished within a few months at a cost of a further $1000.00.

I have no objection to giving any information as to what has been spent by the Government for this is the right place to have all expenditures discussed and the Government has no desire to do anything behind closed doors. We shall not be through Supply for three or four days and any hon. member, who wishes to make any observations, will be given every opportunity to discuss any of the votes.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honorable gentleman, I think that the present system in relation to gasolene is a poor one. At present a fisherman does not get the rebate when he buys gasolene. There is a lot of 'Red Tape' about the whole affair. I think that, instead of taking gasolene and then giving a rebate to fishermen, you should place a head-tax on all motors other than fishermen's and allow gasoline to come in free.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, it is very easy to say that; but it is a different matter to do it. We are protecting the fishermen and we tax men who drive motor boats for other purposes. There is no other way. As you admitted the fishermen are getting into that system and it will be easy in future. There is such a very great difference in the amount of gasoline used by different motors that I think it would be impossible and unfair to have such a tax as is suggested. By the present system, every man is taxed on what he actually uses, and there is no unfairness.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that some days ago a statement was made in the House by the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, that the resident physician of the Hospital, Dr. Keegan, was obtaining supplies for the General Hospital for his own use supplies of a nature that were not allowed to him. That matter has led to correspondence between the Colonial Secretary in whose department that work belongs and Dr. Keegan. The matter still forms the subject of enquiry; but it is only fair to Dr. Keegan to say that he claims the right to use the articles referred to by the hon. member. The Government is corresponding with him on the matter and I have no doubt that it will very soon be disposed of; and I shall be glad to inform the House of its termination, no doubt long before the House adjourns. I have a few observations to make in relation to various matters referred to by the hon. member, Mr. Coaker. First of all I want to say something about the Road Boards. For the last 50 or 60 years since the granting of Responsible Government, there have been Road Boards. These Boards are appointed in each settlement that requires a Road Board. There are three classes of Road grants. First there is the Main Line Grant, for main roads which go through the country, some-

times through three or four districts, for instance the grant from here to Grate's Cove. There are parts of that road miles and miles away from any settlement. In the past it has been found necessary to have that grant spent by special Commissioners, so that the ordinary work of the Road Boards would not interfere with the expenditure of it.

Then there is the special grant. This grant is expended by commissioners also, because generally the special grant is not spent in the settlement where the Road Board is; but is often required for such works as the building of bridges or the extension of roads. There are also special marine grants spent under the supervision of commissioners. Thirdly the local grant which is spent in relation to public works under the jurisdiction of the Road Board. A system has come up during the last 50 or 60 years by which the Road Boards spend the local moneys and then there were special commissioners appointed to undertake special works. Very often moneys are spent at a great distance from Road Boards and where it would be impossible for the Road Boards to superintend the work. Now my hon. friend Mr. Coaker and other honorable members on the Opposition side of the House have alleged that Supplemental Supply covered expenditures for election purposes, especially the rebates arising from reduced taxation. Certain people do not seem able to get rid of the idea that anyone going in for an election must spend money correctly. This taking off of duties was most emphatically not an election dodge, but the fulfilment of a solemn pledge to the country. It may reasonably be said, why should we wait five years to do it, and throw ourselves open to this charge? The answer is, because it was not the only promise the government had to carry out. When we came in we found a deficit of $150,000 or $160,000, and first of all we had to clear that off. Then we had railways, telegraphs, lighthouses, dredging. We had promised Old Age Pensions, and all these and other public reforms promised by us had to be attended to without delay. We wanted to deal first with these things that called for immediate attention—public works and public requirements. We had to be just before we were generous. We have added $100,000 to the educational vote, and have provided the interest on $6,000,000 for railways. We have built our Branch Railways and light houses. We have provided Old Age Pensions and the Dredge. Last year we at length found ourselves in a position to remove these duties and we did so. Session after session we were asked why we did not remove them. Sir R. Bond asked why we did not remove these duties and I told him that we were not ready, that we had other obligations to carry out first of all. When four years were over and the opportunity arose, we removed these duties. Had we removed the duties on all articles, it would not have made a bit of difference, the Government would still meet with bitter critcism and abuse. I have been here nearly 30 years and I do not remember a session in which there was not a very large supplemental supply. That will go on, because it is almost impossible to closely estimate the requirements for the public service. There are all sorts of things cropping up every day. No matter how careful and economical the head of a department may be, there are always certain expenses which cannot be accurately estimated, when the supply Bill is going through the House. There are all sorts of things that you cannot possibly estimate and that is why

we have these various special votes. Moreover by voting only the bare amount necessary and then voting for extras next year, the House retains a control over the expenditure. If a large sum was voted to cover all possible contingencies in a Department, it would be spent and would lead to waste and extravagance. The question of the Dredge has been already answered and there is no need for me to refer to it again.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I have several question to ask. First of all, I would like to know whether there is a law to prevent a doctor from charging an exorbitant fee. There is a case in point which I will relate. A man in the logging camps received a cut in his foot and there was no resident doctor nearer than Botwoodville or Twillingate. The doctor who was sent for charged $35. The man said that was all he had and told him to take it. He sent for Mr. Coaker who got him to the Hospital. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that if a doctor can charge such exorbitant fees, there is no law. I know of several cases in which unreasonable fees were charged by doctors.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I may say that there are no charges fixed by law for doctors The Hospital is free and the treatment is given free. Moreover, the services of the district surgeons are given free of charge. With regard to the question asked by the honourable member, I think that the Medical Society has laid down some scale of fees. If the matter had been referred to them, I think redress would have been given, if the doctor had charged an extortionate fee.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this charge of $35, I think that it is a matter of great discredit to us to know that we have a doctor who could do such a thing. There are many doctors of this kind in the country.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, on the question of roads we have had before us this afternoon some reference to the control of monies going to the districts and the suggestion has been made that something be done so that Municipal boards may be elected. We have heard from the Prime Minister how the present system has been carried on for fifty years. There has been a lot of dissatisfaction in regard to the distribution of these monies, and evidence has been adduced by the representatives here as well as from others outside the House, showing the need for reform in this respect. I think the matter should receive consideration on the part of the Government because it is well known that this dissatisfaction is well grounded. The present mode of dealing with these moneys is directly contrary to the wishes of the people. The Prime Minister pointed out that some of the moneys are expended in places over which the road boards could not exercise supervision. That does not alter the position because these places are few and are open to the same objection in the case of appointed Boards. There have been several cases in Port de Grave where money has been given to individuals for expending and it has been squandered to the great dissatisfaction of the people. Wells have been dug in places which are of no convenience. Slips have been made for boats simply to be a convenience to one or two people and other things have been done of a like nature. The people contend that they contribute to the revenue and they do not want their money distributed simply and solely for the aggrandisement of a few individuals who are only responsible to the members for the Districts. If the Government

provide for the election of Road Boards and for the expenditure of all moneys belonging to the Districts by these Boards they would merit every consideration at the hands of the people. People at present come to the members for a grant of $50 for a road or well, and it is given out without consideration as to the necessity or otherwise. This has a bad effect upon the electorate. It is looked upon as a bribe and is having a most deteriorating effect upon the political honesty of the people.

I think this question of local control of moneys by elected boards merits every consideration at the hands of the Government.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman, I just wish to make a few observations on the question of elective Road Boards. I have in my possession at the present time 89 letters all speaking about the outports, and they all want elective Road Boards. I think the Government should take the matter up, and I think they will do so. The F.P.U. embodied this matter in some resolutions at their convention, and sent them up to the Government, and the Prime Minister has promised that the matter will be considered. I hope that this will be done, because the people in every locality are against the present system. I believe the impression is that a great deal of time is being consumed by members on this side of the House in Supplemental Supply. I believe if things were being done right there would be no complaint.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I wish to be quite clear on this question of Road Boards, so that there may be no misunderstanding. It is quite correct that wherever and whenever it was asked the Government has granted election of Road Boards. But I want it to be clear that this is no new policy. There has been no case in which an elective Road Board has been asked and declined. We granted 30 or 40 in St. George's District. We granted one in St. Lawrence.

In the old days the Road Boards were appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the sitting member, because he was supposed to know more about the matter. In 1890 there was an Elective Road Board Act passed, but it did not work out well. We can understand that when you want an election there must be some machinery whereby the Board is elected, and the drawback was the difficulty in arranging the machinery for nomination and proper election. However, the matter was thought out, and a scheme was devised whereby the Magistrate or J. P., was asked to hold a meeting of the public and there elect a Road Board. But there as will be seen, it was necessary to have it conclusive, and public and legally constituted, and notices would have to be sent out, and they would need to have a regular place of meeting.

There are a lot of little details that have to be considered and in many cases it will be found impossible to carry out.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it is not very consoling to the members on this side of the House if they understand the Prime Minister as I understand him. He is simply granting something that is not new, and he has avoided the issue by explaining Road Boards. We do not want to hear anything about that system. What we want to hear is whether it is the Government's intention to allow Municipal or Road Boards elected for a locality to control all the money allocated to that community. If that is his intention, then it is satisfactory. But if there is nothing new in what the Premier proposes——

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is exactly what I say. There is

nothing new.

MR. HALFYARD—It has been pointed out that where they are elected now they have the spending of nothing but the ordinary grants. There are a swarm of hungry hangers-on getting $50 and $25 to spend for their own convenience.

What we want now is to get down to the bottom of the matter. We know the money now sent to the elective boards is not all the money due to the District. The people want that money to be spent as they direct. You will find one man a Commissioner honest enough,but there are numerous cases where they spend the money for their own personal convenience.

We have already stated that this sending of money to indivduals was the chief factor in defeating the Government in the Districts which they lost.

I have known cases where petitions have been sent to the Department of Public Works for money to dig a well. Fifty dollars has been sent for it. But who dug the well? Why, some man who owed an account to the man to whom the money was sent. I have an instance in my mind where money was sent to dig a well but there was no water where it was dug. When the member came to visit the District he went to see the well, and they had to put salt water in it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Can you give me the date when that happened?

MR. HALFYARD—Some time between 1890 and 1913.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That shows that it is pure imagination. If you give me the date and name, I will prosecute the offender.

MR. HALFYARD—It is a fact. I am not going to give the name, because the man would suffer when he is nothing more than the victim of a vicious system.

The Rt. Hon. Premier told us that they were doing nothing different from other Governments in connection with Supplemental Supply. That is the only excuse that has been given during the past five years, that you are going along the same road as other Governments. Everything new is brushed aside, while they go on spending money in the same extravagant way.

This is the curse of our politics, and we will never have good Government as long as it exists. No good Government can be carried on until it is remedied. But the trend of public opinion is changing. I trust that in the future the Government will do something new, something on their own responsibility without shifting it on to the shoulders of their predecssors.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman, just a few more words in relation to elective Road Boards. I can quote an instance in connection with Burin District. Two or three days after the election $1,000 was sent up there to be spent by the Elective Board. As far as I can understand the Board had no control over it at all. Before it was spent they knew nothing whatever about it. What is the use of an elective board if they have not control over the public moneys. In regard to the instance of the salt water quoted by Mr. Halfyard, I am prepared to give the name of the place where it happened. But I will not name the man.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up much of your time on this matter. The fact is, what we are against principally are those special grants, and we want the elective boards to have control of all the moneys belonging to the District.

In reply to certain questions, I find in one place in Twillingate, namely. at Exploits, there were twenty of

these special grants to individuals. I am not going to say anything about the expenditure of them, because I do not know, but I do know of four grants sent to the neighborhood in which I live, and the men said nothing about it, and we knew nothing about it until I got it in the public accounts. I know further that no returns have been made for these grants, some of which were sent out as long ago as last April. I am going to tell the name of one man, and his name is Mark Rideout. He got two grants, one of $50 for a well, and another of $50 for the main road There are no returns in for that money, and I think I am safe in saying that no one in the neighborhood knew that he had that money, until the statement was published in the Advocate, and it went down there. That is what we want to stop. We want the boards to spend the money, and let them be responsible to the people. And all the money belonging to the locality should be handed and spent by them.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Chairman, just one or two words in reference to Mr. Stone's allusion to Burin. That money to which he referred was sent down for the construction of a new connecting road at St. Lawrence, and was arranged for early last year. The road was part of the scheme for the completion of the main line, which was built under the direction of Captain Bonia the Road Inspector. It had therefore no connection with, and did not come under the control of the Road Board. I know, of course, where the opposition to this expenditure comes from, but I am not afraid to go to St. Lawrence and put the matter to the people there, and get their unanimous support in the matter, even though I had nothing whatever to do with it, as the arrangements were completed long before I had any connection with the District.

On the matter of Elective Road Boards, I am not sure that they are a panacea for all the ills complained of. They have all of the troubles that fall to an ordinary road board appointed by the Government. I think it will be found that even the Elective idea will not satisfy everybody.

We have a place, for instance, in the district of Burin where they have a Road Board, and I have evidence in my possession that some of the people want a Commissioner to do the work, instead of the Board. In another place they ask for a Commissioner from outside the District. These people do not want any kind of Road Boards because they claim that the members of the Board distribute the money amongst their friends. This, of course, I believe to be mere imagination. Personally, I see no objection to a Commissioner provided he was a capable and experienced man, because generally he would have nobody to look after, and would in many cases get the best results out of the grants. The personal grants referred to by hon. members opposite may have some objectionable features, but these will not be all wiped out by the Elective system, and I believe that when the whole matter has been tested such will be the experience of the hon. gentlemen who are now so anxious to have Elective Road Boards.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for Burin, I may say that the information which I have derived in connection with this $1,000 grant, came direct from the Road Board. As far as I can understand, Captain Bonia had nothing whatever to do with the matter, and it was a road in St. Lawrence.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Chairman, I may say that the amount involved was not $1,000 but $400, and it was spent after the election.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Burin assures us that a Commissionership, in his experience, would be preferable to elective Road Boards, but by the time he has served four years as representative for the district of Burin, I have no doubt he will have altered his opinion. His experience, after all, is not very great. He has not been associated with politics for a very long period, and he has not perhaps, had very much to do with Road Boards. Now, we have had years of experience in connection with this matter, and we know exactly how the thing worked out. The Premier does not know what happens in connection with these road grants. He could not be expected to know how every fifty cent piece was spent. He would not tolerate it if he did, and he cannot understand how any representative would permit it in his district. Very often the representatives are not to blame. They really believe that the money is going to be spent properly. Certainly, I would not suppose for a moment that in Trinity Bay, for instance, a man like Mr. Squires would have permitted any wrong-doing, in connection with public moneys. We know what happens, because we are amongst the people day after day, and we see it everywhere we go. A representative who spends a couple or three weeks in his District every year, could not be expected to actually know what takes place. If he did know he would be as strongly opposed to the present system as we are. But I can tell the Committee that in the northern Districts, there is no end of money wasted. Now, I received a letter today from Lewisporte, about two grants in the vicinity of that place—one of $75, to a Mr. Harris, and another of $100 to a Mr. Budden, and the writer states that the people there know nothing whatever about these grants. We know of grants that have been in people's hands since as far back as last April, and so far as anyone knows the money has not been spent, and no returns have been sent in. Now, the trouble is that the system is all wrong, and the only way to make it right, and to bring things down to a normal condition again is elective Road Boards. We do not want the Boards elected in the way in which they are elected now, because what happens now is that the Chairman calls a meeting in his house, perhaps, and manages things in such a way that he gets the Board that he wants. Now, we don't want that. We want a meeting called over which a Justice of the Peace or Magistrate will preside. A Magistrate could go around from place to place and appoint a date for a meeting, and everything could be done in a legal way and the Board that the people wants elected, and every cent of money that goes to the community should be spent by that Board. We want no Commissioners. Do away with that. I make the statement here that if we have elective Road Boards, and if any money in any community or district is sent to Commissioners, from that moment we cease to take any interest in affairs, so far as the Boards are concerned. There must be no Commissioners. Give the Board the money and then at the end of two years make them give an account of every cent that has come into their hands, and let their accounts be open to the examination of the public. You will find that you will get plenty of people to do the work without payment, and that you will get full value for the money spent. You won't have men getting fifty dollars to dig a well when twenty-five would do the work. I know the people of the North. They want to know how every five cent piece is spent. I have seen people north take off their coats over five cents road

money, and what Mr. Halfyard said about the expenditure of road moneys having been the means of putting governments out of power is perfectly true. It is no good to stand up and talk about the policy of the Government when somebody says: Didn't you give Tom Jones fifty dollars to make a road to his garden? I have been at meetings myself when first-class politicians like Mr. Morison have been on the platform and questions have been asked about roads and bridges. Candidates have had at times to face a considerable amount of trouble because one man got fifty cents more road money than another. It sometimes makes a wonderful difference how these matters are handled, and I think, as I said before, that the hon. member for Burin will alter his opinion after three or four years experience. Now, we have had a lot of experience; we have been amongst the people, and the universal cry is: Give us Elective Road Boards. As Mr. Jennings has said, it is no good to send money down to the various settlements unless it goes into the hands of Road Boards elected in this way. I have a great deal of faith in the consideration given to this matter by the Government. As I have said, we cannot blame the Government for the manner in which things have been handled and we cannot altogether blame the representatives. The fault is with the system under which we have been working.

As regards this St. Lawrence matter, I can tell the hon. member that there is a big fuss in St. Lawrence over this affair, and if he went there tomorrow and stated what he stated here this afternoon he would find things pretty warm. I have never been up there, but I have had correspondence with certain parties there. We have a Council there, and in that Council are supporters of the Government as well as supporters of the Opposition, and they are all very strong on this matter. They wanted me to ask the Government certain questions relating to it, but I did not want to do it.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay the House in connection with this matter, but I hope to get down to St. Lawrence in a very few months and to be able to satisfy the people there on this point. As regards the hon. member's reference to men fighting over five-cents road money, I think that is one of the difficulties that even Elective Road Boards will be up against. There is an opinion abroad that every man should get his share of road money. Every man has the idea that a certain amount of money is allocated for him personally,and if he does not get it he wants to know the reason why, and as I have said, Elective Boards will not be free from this the same difficulty. As the Prime Minister has pointed out, this Elective Road Board idea is not a new one.

In 1898 an Act was passed providing for Elective Road Boards, under which the Boards were supposed to be elected at a public meeting called by a Magistrate. Such Elected Boards were expected to call a public meeting each year and submit their accounts, and at the end of two years another election was to take place. I think, however, that that Act has been honored more in the breach than in the observance; but if you could bring the provisions of that Act into effect you would do more to purify your Road Board system than anything else I know of. In that matter I am entirely in accord with the hon. member. Now, with regard to Commissioners, the mere fact that one man perpetrates a fraud is no proof that the system is wrong. Likewise, if you allocate $50 to be expended in digging a well, and

that money is not properly spent, that is not the fault of the Government, and I think that if the matter were brought to the attention of the Government by the people interested, the guilty party would be prosecuted for fraud. I do not think that the reflections cast on the Commissioners are at all justifiable.

MR. JENNINGS—How about the people not knowing anything about the grant?

MR. CURRIE—I cannot understand how that could occur. The point I want to make is that the mere fact that a thing is done wrong by an individual is no proof that the system is wrong. For instance, the Fishermen's Union has a system of co-operative stores throughout the country. Well, if through the carelessness or neglect or ignorance of its Manager, one of those stores should fail, would that prove that the system of stores was wrong? And the same principle applies to this case. I hold that in very many cases a commissionership would be superior even to the elective Road Board system, because on your Boards you are going to have men on both sides of politics, and there will be a continual squabble, and unless you can get your Boards to agree to a certain line of action, you will not have any work done at all. As far as the principle is concerned, I would heartily welcome it, because it would relieve to a large extent the responsibility from the shoulders of the representatives of the various districts, but when you come to put it into practice, I doubt if it will prove that panacea now intimated.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

SEALING BILL.

On motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled: "An Act to Amend 55 Vict., Cap. 2, entitled, 'An Act to Regulate the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman, before proceeding any further with this Bill, I would wish to say a few words in reference to it. I do not wish to criticize the Bill, but to my mind the provisions of Section 1, dealing with the food to be supplied seamers, is of very little benefit to the owner, the master or the crew. You will find, I think, that the steel ships have been doing practically what is required of them under these sections for the last four or five years, with the exception of iron frame berths, and the prohibition of the steel ships from carrying guns. The owners have done what they thought would tend to the success of the fishery and the protection of the men. As regards sub-section (f) of section 1—"A room shall be supplied for the accomodation of sick and disabled men"—I am perfectly in accord with that. I think a hospital should be prepared for any men amongst the crew who should become ill, and I am perfectly satisfied that no owner and no captain would wish any sick man to suffer unnecessarily if he could prevent it. But it was usually impossible to obtain doctors to go. I agree with giving the men the best food possible; but I was told by one of my cooks that it was difficult to cook fish brewse in such large quantities. It is burnt at the bottom before the top is warm. In any case all these foods have in fact, been supplied voluntarily, for years past, and there was little need of legislation. Cooks ought not to be prohibited from other work. For one thing it is very bad for discipline to limit the Captain's authority. For another, if there were five cooks on

board, and the dinner was put to boil, why should not three of them go out and strap seals instead of watching it, which is quite unnecesary? As to Mr. Coaker's statement that it was part of the sealing agreement that cooks should not work, it was never in the agreement with my Company, the Newfoundland Produce Company. The cooks desired to work for the good of the voyage, and have done so on most or all ships, and they are entitled to do so; and their work was very useful. Let them work when their services are not required at cooking. Mr. Coaker read figures showing the large increase of food used on board the ships. But he forgot to mention that the big ships are now carrying 270 men instead of 203. Of course, they eat more, and it is not surprising.

The standard of living in this country is improving, and the men want more and better food, and enjoy it, and I agree that they should have it. They are a fine type of men. It is not the good men who are kicking; it is the useless ones. Owners seems to agree as to the dates of sailing here proposed, namely the 12th of March for wooden ships, 13th for steel, from St. John's and Southern ports, and 14th for Northern outports. I do not think that the landing of part crews should be allowed. I think that disturbances might arise from it, and the men ought to stand to what they signed for.

Cooks on foreign going vessels do all sorts of work when they are asked, and often stand watch, though Mr. Coaker said that they did cooking only, and there is no reason why sealing cooks should not do the same. I agree that the purchaser of seals in this Colony caught by a foreign ship should be liable for the shares of the men.

My Company refused to sign the sealing agreement because I knew that it would never be carried out, and it was not carried out; one of Job's ship brought in hundreds of hood seals, the year it was agreed not to do so.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The chairman from the committee of the whole reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow

On motion this report was received and adopted and the committee had leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining orders of the day stood deferred.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr Jennings gave notice of question

Mr Stone gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rise it adjourn till to-morrow at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, Feb. 19th. 1911.

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

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table returns in relation to expenditure at Dildo asked for by Mr. Stone; also a statement of the expenditure of grants in the district of Carbonear, asked for by Mr. Targett; also replies to several questions of Mr. Clift; also to Mr. Jennings in relation to a breakwater at Cat Harbour; this does not belong to my department.

QUESTIONS.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all monies spent on the breakwater at Port de Grave, and the

names of the persons to whom the money was paid.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I beg to table the information asked for.

MR. CLIFT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all expenditure to date, in connection with the new Public Building at Hr. Grace; also, if said building has yet been taken over by the Government.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The statement is being prepared.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House (a) a statement showing the amounts paid for the conveyance of the mail in Goose Bay, and to whom paid; (b) the amounts paid for Post Office hire in Goose Bay, and to whom paid.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to table the information.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House copies of returns of all special grants issued by his department to Goose Bay, B.B., during the year 1913, and to whom sent.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The statement asked for is being prepared.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House copies of returns of expenditures of four allocations made to W. J. Scott of Twillingate, in 1911 and 1912, amounting in all to $670.00; also, for returns of expenditure for the sum of $140.00, allocated in 1912 and 1913, to the same W.J. Scott.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I beg to table the information asked for.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the number of Fishery Wardens employed on the Labrador, and the amount of salary paid each, for the years 1912 and 1913.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I beg to say that this statement is being prepared.

PETITIONS.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Port de Grave and other place in that vicinity. They ask for the allocation of a sum of money for the repair of wharf there and for its extension and they also ask that the dredge be sent there. I might say that at Port de Grave it is difficult to get a schooner into the harbour as the water is very shallow and the schooner has to run off to some nearby place. This means a serious inconvenience to the fishermen owing to the delay that is caused. The sum of $6,000.00 was spent by the Government on the breakwater there but unfortunately it was put in the wrong place and was swept away by the first storm. They now ask that $1000 be allocated for the purpose of building another breakwater and the dredge be sent there. If this is done it will make the harbour as safe as any place in the bay. I hope the Government will see the necessity for granting the prayer of the petition and I ask that it be referred to the proper department.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

On motion the vote of $244,719.17 for Supplemental Supply was read a first and second time and concurred in.

PATENTS BILL.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Council's Amendment of the Patents Bill was read a second time and concurred in and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council informing them that the amendment had been concurred in.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of 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. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking for an explanation of the vote of $20,000.00 for Agriculture. According to the statement furnished us the sum of $40 00? allocated last year was spent before the 2nd day of January and, as a matter of fact,$36,000.00 was spent before Nomination Day. In view of the fact that this amount was spent in one third of a year it seems to be a problem to go through the whole of next year with half of the sum voted last year. We have been told already that the Government proposes to drop the supply of seed and stock, but that does not meet the whole case and the committee should have a clear understanding as to how the amount is to be allocated.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the information desired by the hon. member for Trinity is very proper and reasonable, but I thought that earlier in the session I had made it clear how the money would be allocated. However, I have no objection to pointing it out again. In the first place it will be seen from the nature of the service that nearly all the expenditure under this head takes place during three or four months. As a rule in the late autumn and winter there are no expenditures and that accounts for the fact that the greater portion of the vote was spent early in the financial year. As regards the vote of $20,000.00 I may point out that there are certain fixed annual charges to be met, such as the vote of $7000.00 to the Agricultural Societies and the salaries of the Commisioners. These are an annual charge to which the Board is committed. The expenses are very small, probably a little more than $300.00. If my hon. friend will refer to the accounts he will find that last year there was a very large expenditure for exhibitions, but it is not proposed to hold any of these next year Therefore, the balance between the fixed annual expenses and the $20,000.00 voted, which will amount to eight or ten thousand dollars, will be expended in stock and seeds.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman. Referring to the statement of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister it appears to me that if the Agricultural policy of the Government, is to be of any effect at all (and I do not admit that it has accomplished anything in the interests of the farmers), more money should be spent on it. In some places there has been some growth in the farming industry but it has been a natural growth quite independent of any encouragement derived from this grant. Still, if they have any hope at all more money must be spent on it for I look upon cutting the vote in two and at the same time continuing the policy as simply throwing away $20.-000.00.

Hon. members will remember that year after year since the policy was inaugurated there was always an over-expenditure of the amount voted. Last year there was an over expenditure and the year before. The year before that there was a sum of $10,000 spent over and above the amount allocated and this was held over until the opening of the next year's accounts. In fact, it was not until the House opened that we were aware of this.

In spite of the fact that the policy is to go on and the vote to be cut in two there is to be no curtailment of the expenses of the department. It will be conducted on the same lines as it is at the present conducted. If

we take the figures as we have them. the general expenses and the salaries of the commissioners alone will take at least $4500.00. Then there are the ordinary grants to the Agricultural Societies, which at the very least will be $7,600.00 This means $12,000.00 out of the $20,000.00 that we are asked to vote Furthermore, if hon gentlemen will look through the accounts since the inauguration of the Societies, they will find that for stock and seeds from ten to twelve thousand dollars more were spent If, say, $8,000.00 is spent this year for stock, seeds and implements, the whole of the $20,000.00 will be spent without anything being appointed for ordinary expenses. I think the time has come when this matter of Agriculture ought to be taken more seriously, for it is one of our great industries and we have great hopes of it in the future. This method of backing and filling is one of the ways in which agriculture is retarded all over the world. The same method was in vogue in Canada up to twenty-five years ago when they settled down to a progressive system which embraces all three modern ways of developing farming. The Agricultural Department of Canada then started the system of experimental stations and model farms, the distribution of stock and Agricultural Societies. They also had the establishment of homesteads. All these systems were worked hand in hand by the Department.

I do not say that we can do all this for we have neither the capital nor the means, but I think that as long as the present system is in force we cannot expect any agricultural future for the Colony. Every expert who has come here from abroad, and we have had a number during the past few years, was quite enthusiastic over our agricultural possibilities and all were surprised that we had not advanced further and that we did not produce enough even to satisfy our own local requirements. I pointed out the other day that we were even going back and that there was an increase in our imports over our own products. The margin is growing greater every year. Under these circumstances it is very difficult to understand why half this vote is being dropped while the department will be conducted on the same lines as heretofore. There is one matter in connection with this vote that I would also like to refer to and that is the vote for last year. In reply to my learned friend. Dr. Lloyd, the Hon. Minister of Finance explained that the reason there was no Supplemental Supply for Agriculture was that he would meet the requirements by a transfer from other amounts in the Department. I submit that this idea of transferring accounts is not right and this is particularly the case when the Legislature is sitting. If during the year owing to any emergency there is a transfer from an allied vote, for example, a transfer from roads to bridges, there is some justification. What the Minister is doing, however, is transferring a balance from one department to another for really in this case there are two distinct departments under one head. The vote for Agriculture has been overdrawn and there has been a transfer made to meet it. What account will the money be drawn from? If hon. gentlemen will look down the list they will find it difficult to say. If my recollection is right these votes have been overdrawn in many cases. From one vote, that for the exploration of coal areas, nothing has been drawn for the past three or four years, but this year it will probably be expended owing to the visit of Prof. Dunstan. If he does not come before the end of the fiscal year, the vote should not be touched for it is

wrong for the Department to come in here and ask for $15,000.00 for the exploration of coal areas and then to have the amount transferred to another account without any ratification by this House. Such a procedure is contrary to the Audit Act and, if the Auditor General has permitted it to be done in the past, he has no authority to do it. This Act appears to be one which is honoured more in the breach than in the observance, for it expressly states that all balances at the end of the year shall lapse and shall be written off. Another section states that money voted shall be expended on the object for which it is voted and no other. This system of transferring ought to be stopped and particularly so when the Legislature is in session. If any Minister of a Department wants a certain vote his proper duty is to come in here and ask for it and state why it is required. In that way the Legislature will be in a position to know what is required and to provide the money necessary. I certainly think that this practice of transferring accounts from one Department to another is wrong and should be discontinued.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the explanation of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, but I consider it was highly unsatisfactory. Practically his explanation was that by means of reducing the number of exhibitions and curtailing the expenditure on seeds and stock the vote could be reduced to $20,000 and that this amount would be sufficient. We ought to know what the estimate for the present year is. We know that more than $40,000 has already been spent, and we don't know how the expenses of the present year will be covered. Nothing is shown as to how the Department is going to be carried on at all. All we know is that something in the neighborhood of $55,000 will be required for this Department during the year. $10,000 is to be cut out next year because no exhibitions will be held—that brings you down to $45,000. How are you going to meet that with $20,000? Then, there is another question—what is going to be done with the machinery which is kept? What about the Commissioners and their expenses? The pay of the Secretary goes on and his expenses and his stationery account still continues. What about the grants to the Societies? The Leader of the Government says that the grant of $7,000 for the Societies will go on; but in addition there is the pay of the Secretaries; that will be another $2,000. Each Commissioner will receive $1,500 that makes $3,000; or in all, $12,000. Then the pay of the Secretary will amount to $1,400 with travelling expenses,and $600 for stationery. So that $14,000 out of the $20,000 will be spent merely in salaries. Your machinery is going to cost you $15,000, and you by means of it, are going to hand out $5,000 worth of seeds and stock. If that is not a remarkable proposition, I don't know what is.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, just one or two words in reply to my hon. friend Dr. Lloyd. It is generally understood, I believe, that lawyers can argue wrong right and right wrong, but here are the real facts of the case. Dr. Lloyd wants to know how we are going to make this vote last through the whole year. There is nothing to be done with it from January until May. You cannot spend a cent on Agriculture between January and the end of April. We came down last year and spent say $40,000. Today you state here that we will want more. We spent $36,000 in six months. What will we do during the remaining six months? My answer is, that our work is finished after our crops are up. The Govern-

ment proposes to cut out the exhibitions, so that reduces the vote down to $30,000. One Commissioner dropped out in the last two years. That will reduce that vote by $1,500. We are in a better position today to carry out this Agricultural policy than in the past two years. You say that we will have nothing left after the salaries are paid. That is not so. We are dropping the exhibitions around the Island and other expenses. That gives us $15.000 to pay out in seed. Now, the Leader of the Opposition is alarmed because we need that same vote in the Agriculture and Mines Department. He has said that it is not regular to take from one account to pay off the expenses of the other. We were criticized yesterday for spending a little money and bringing down Supplemental Supply, and today there is another tirade of ciriticism because we are not spending enough. Hon. members come down here and criticize, but they are not sincere in their criticisms Anyone who says that the Agricultural policy has not been successful is not stating the facts. The Government have done their best. We know when we come down with our Estimates that we are going to meet with criticism. We heard the other day that everything we did was going to be criticized. Even if we come in with a perfect policy, gentlemen on the Opposition side would get up and criticize that policy. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the people of this Colony have sufficient confidence in the present Government to know that when they say that they have $30,000 or $40,000 to spend on the Agricultural policy or on any other policy, the money will be well and wisely spent.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, the explanation of the hon. gentleman has simply made confusion worse confounded, because we have come to the extraordinary position that he is in May to have some $15,000 to spend in seed. That is no answer at all, because the money is not going to be available until the first of July. The Minister of Finance is going to have $15,000 to spend on seed and stock next May. I would like to know where he is going to get it, because he had only $40,000 on the beginning of July last, and in January last he had almost nothing left. He may say that it is all right, but that does not mean $15,000 to the good. Even if he takes $15,000 and turns it into seed, and stock, he would be a remarkable man, he would be an Agricultural wizard. Before that time comes, all of his $15,000 will be gone.

Since the grant was overdrawn on January 2nd, the Commissioners have not been living on air. They have been drawing their salaries and money for expenses. The Minister has to find the money somewhere or other. In any case he will have to find the half of $3,000 for the Commissioners and their expenses.

He will have to find half the salary of the Secretary and the running expenses for the next six months. Even if he does nothing else, that amount must cut deeply into his $15,000. The Minister attempted to show that he will have $15,000. Of course he will have $20,000 on the first of July. Out of that $20,000 he has to pay the expenses and salaries of the Commissioners. He has got to find $2,000 for the Secretaries of the Agricultural Societies. When he has paid all these amounts how will he save $15,000 out of the $20,000. That is what I would like to have the Finance Minister explain. Is the Minister going down on Water St. to spend $15,000 in July, when he is going to have his Estimate overdrawn by $10,000. Instead of asking for a vote of $20,000 he should ask for a vote of $30,000 at least. I predict that next session we

will find that not $20,000 but nearly $40,000 has been spent.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, the learned doctor made the statement that for the first six months we had spent $40,000 and we have nothing left, and the question he asked the Committee is, how we are going to carry on the next. six months. He forgot that the agricultural industry of this country is not like that of other countries. Here it is only carried on for four or five months, in other countries it goes on all the year round. We spend practically the whole vote in that short period. And when the learned gentleman made that statement he forgot that fact. My argument is that very little money is necessary to carry on this policy from January to June. Practically we need only the money for salaries. The vote of $40,000 is spent within a period of about six months in distributing stock and seeds. There is no money necessary for the Societies during the present season except for salaries.

When the learned doctor came to the $20,000 vote of this year he tried to explain that when the year begins we will only have $5,000 left. I am prepared to show that we will have $15,000.

Ever since the House opened hon. members have been attacking the Commissioners of Agriculture. They have been bally ragging them day after day. Do they not earn their salaries?

MR CLIFT—It is questionable.

HON. MIN FINANCE & CUSTOMS—The hon. member did not earn his when he was there. The hon. member always had a reputation of getting other people to do his work. If it were not for Mr. Coaker he would not be in the position in which he is today.

MR. CLIFT—Go on, it is very easy to be insulting.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I do not consider it insulting to tell the truth. The hon. member brought it on himself.

But to get back to the agricultural policy. We have held this House up for three days to accomodate the Opposition, and when they come down on the fourth day this is all they can say. And if they have nothing more important to say then it does not amount to very much.

Now, in regard to the $20,000. In the first place we drop off $10,000 which was expended in exhibitions round the Island. A further $1.500 is not expended owing to the death of the late Mr. Seymour. Considerable stock has been going out from that Department. We are going to give that stock a chance to multiply and watch results. The same applies to seeds. Are we to close up the Agricultural Policy altogether. The people throughout the Island who have benefitted by it do not think so. We have had thrown across the floors of this House various complaints about the kind of stock that has been distributed. But we have heard nothing about the good that has been done the last few years. And everyone knows that considerable help has been given by the seeds and stock that have been handed out. I am prepared to listen to a certain amount of real criticism, but I am not prepared to take all that has been said. I have listened attentively to the criticisms of the Supplemental Supply, but from my experience of twenty years, I know that it is not meant. I know how matters are arranged by the various members down in the Opposition Room day after day as to who shall speak and what shall be said.

MR. CLAPP—That is not so.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—It happened when I was in Opposition.

MR. CLAPP—It is different today.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I am glad to know that the hon. members have turned over a new leaf.

As I said before we are going to give the work that has been done during the last two or three years a chance, and not spend so much on the policy this coming year. There is no reason why we should not make a change from time to time. If we find that we have spent enough money we need not spend so much in the future. We think there is no necessity to ask for more at the present moment.

DR. LLOYD—One would imagine from the hon. Minister's remarks that all the sincerity was on the other side of the House. I want to point out that I do not stand up in the House and make remarks that I do not believe in. I make my statements honestly. I quote figures and the figures I quote are those supplied by the Hon. Minister's Department. If they tell a lie, then it is a lie of his own Department, and it is a lie of the Head of the Department. I may be wrong, I do not claim infallibility but I do claim to be sincere in my remarks. The Minister of Finance has been here for three weeks, and he will be here another three weeks if he goes on as he is at present. If he thinks he can run this House he is mistaken. I am not prepared to tolerate it. He does not know what he is talking about. He was privileged in being allowed to put through Supplemental Supply in one day by an extension of courtesy. He now points out that he deferred the vote on Agriculture at my instance. I thank him for the courtesy, but I would point out that while I thank him for the courtesy I could have demanded it as a right. When I asked to have it deferred I did so, not on account of my convenience, but owing to the laxity of the Department which the other side of the House controls. The Opposition asked that certain information be supplied, and when we were here last that information was not before the House. It has been deferred because of the extraordinary attitude of the Government in regard to that Department.

I do not blame the Minister of Finance and Customs. He does not know the Department about which he is talking. He is laboring under difficulties because there is no Head to that Department, and he is not conversant with the details of the Department, or he would not have made the statements that he made this afternoon. No one was talking about the general policy of the Government. I did not say one word condemning that policy. I confined my criticism to the expenditures of the Department, not the general policy. I will go further, and say that I have nothing against the policy of agricultural societies. I said nothing about the distribution of stock and seed. I did not condemn that but I now say that this vote ought to be condemned, because as has been pointed out he purposes next year to spend $15,000 to run machinery that ought not to cost more than $5,000. He wants to allow the machinery to stand although it would have nothing to do. If he wanted to curtail expenditure why did he not do it last year. They knew they had only $40,000.

The Minister of Finance has brought up the matter of our asking for the postponement of this vote. And while I acknowledge his courtesy in acceding to our request. I do say that we were accorded nothing that we were not fully entitled to as of right, because the information that we asked for was delayed owing to the laxity of the Department. Now, what did we ask for? We asked for information in reference to the expenditure on railway awards in connection with

this Department since July the first, last. We asked for it day after day and the answer we got from the Leader of the Government was that it was being copied, and that because it was so long the clerks could not get it done before. And when we got that statement we found that it was so long that the clerks in the office added up the first page or two and then gave it up as too long a job to add up the rest.

The Government evidently thought that somebody else was to succeed them. They did not care how the money went, because they did not expect to come back. Fortunately for us, however, they have to saddle their own load, and find money to pay for their extravagance. Now, take the arbitration awards. We find that in six months $176,000 was spent for awards and fees. In January past, up to the 17th or 18th they had paid out $16,000. In December, $8,000, and in November, $10,000. It will be noticed that these are the months immediately following the election. During the three months immediately preceding the election they spent, in July $25,000; in August $29,000; and in Septmber $30,000.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—What had that got to do with the election?

DR. LLOYD—The Minister asks what had that to do with the election? That is a mystery, is it not? That during these three months extraordinary sums were spent as compared with the three months following the election. During the month of October the Government spent $53,000 in connection with these awards and fees.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The hon. member will pardon me. If he will go back to the year before the election he will find that as much money was spent in this connection as was spent in election year. The payment of those awards had nothing whatever to do with the election and nobody knows that better than the hon. member.

DR. LLOYD—By reference to the accounts, I find that during the previous year the amount spent was $100,000. During six months of the election year the amount was $176,000, of which $140,000 was spent just before polling day. These are the facts, are they not?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—No.

DR. LLOYD—Yes. As a matter of fact, the reason that we asked that this vote be deferred was that we wanted to gather these figures and the Government were good enough to accede to our request. Again, take the agricultural vote. Of the $40,000 voted $20,000 was spent before nomination. The same applies in connection with every other vote. The point I want to make is this, that an enormous amount of money was expended by the Government just before the election. Why, the expenditure last year was something abnormal, and I will have something further to say on it at a later date. I want to assert that your supplemental estimates are not by any means sincere and I will be able to show, I think, that if there was any sincerity it was on this side of the House.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Just one word, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member. His desire, I think, was to show to the Committee that we expended large sums of money for election purposes. If he will go back two years he will find that more money was paid in connection with railway awards than was paid last year, the reason being that the contractor built more railroads two years ago, than he did last year. These amounts that have been referred to by the hon. member

as having been used for political purposes had nothing whatever to do with the election. The position is this: Arbitrators are appointed by the Government to value the lands along the line of railway according as they are taken from time to time by the contractor, and the lands are paid for in accordance with their valuation. If the hon. member will compare the amounts which have been paid during the years since we started building railroads, he will find that no more money was paid out last summer for this purpose than was paid out any other summer. There is nothing in his contention at all. The railways had to be built. The Government had been instructed by the people to build them and in order to build them certain lands had to be taken. These lands were taken and the people who owned them were paid in accordance with the valuation placed upon them by the arbitrators. How could that affect the election? The hon. member spoke as if we had spent $50,000 last September for election purposes. Is that complimentary, I ask, to the arbitrators who valued those lands? or is it not a suggestion that the arbitrators acted with a view to the forthcoming election rather than with a desire to deal fairly with the parties concerned. I do not like to put that construction on the hon. member's statement, but the outsider who heard the statement must certainly view it in that light. I am sure that in justice to the parties concerned, the hon. member will gladly contradict the impression he has made.

DR. LLOYD—The Minister of Finance has thrown out a challenge. He states that quite as much money was spent during the months of July, August and September of previous years as was spent during the same three months of last year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The statement is this: that during the three years of railway work—I don't care what months the amounts were paid in—just as much money was paid in connection with railways awards, if not a larger amount in each year as was paid last year. For instance, take the line to Bonavista. That was built in 1909-1910. Now, if you take the amounts of the awards of these years—I don't know in just what months the various amounts were paid in—but if you will take them in globo, you will find that the amount will be as large as was paid last year, and the same thing will apply in connection with the line along the Southern Shore. That is the statement which I made. The hon. member's contention is that an abnormal amount was paid last year for political purposes. Surely, he does not mean that. The arbitrators appointed by the Government were really a Court appointed to sit in judgment on the land from time to time and not to influence the people into voting for the Government. As a matter of fact, in very many cases, the arbitrators really worked against the Government, because in nine cases out of ten the people were dissatisfied with the amounts paid them. The people in my own district came to me and complained about the manner in which they had been treated in connection with those arbitrations. They contended that they should have got double the amounts which they actually did get for their lands. I, of course, told them that it was a matter with which I had nothing whatever to do, and that it was entirely in the hands of the arbitrators. I stated before, and I state again, that the amounts paid last year for railway awards had nothing to do with the election. The whole matter worked rather to destroy the Government than to help them to win.

DR. LLOYD—Well, the destruction was hardly complete, because the hon. member is in the House and the three members from Placentia are also here so that the Government was not destroyed to any extent. Now, going back to the original statement, the Hon. Minister of Finance has shifted his position very much. He gave the House to understand that in the fall of 1912 quite as much was paid in arbitration awards as in the fall of 1913, and he practically says that the same thing applies to 1910 and 1911. Now, I challenge him to bring here tomorrow figures to prove his statement.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I can place them here now.

DR. LLOYD—Well, place them here. The statement I made was that $140,000 was spent in the months of July, August and September, 1913 for awards and fees. Before I go any further, I want to disabuse the hon member's mind that I have anything to say against the arbitrators or any body else who had anything to do with this work. It was an exceedingly fortunate thing for them, and I congratulate Mr. Goodison, and the lucky gentlemen who made such nice little hauls out of it. I have nothing whatever against their honesty. All I am concerned with is the peculiar coincidence that the Government paid these large amounts during the three months which preceded the election.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Oh! there is nothing in that.

DR. LLOYD—I think there is a great deal in it. And now to come back to the challenge. The other day a statement was tabled showing railway awards for the twelve months from July 1912, to July 1913. That document shows that the amount of the railway award for that year was —How much? If the Hon. Minister was right, it must surely amount to something over $140,000, because that amount was spent during the three months to which I have referred. But to show that the Minister is absolutely out in his calculations, the whole payment for the year does not amount to half $140,000. During the whole of that year the amount expended was $57,716, not one-half the amount was spent during the three months prior to the election.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The point I want to make is that the amount has nothing at all to do with it. The railway work started in this country in 1910-1911. During those years the road was built to Bonavista.

DR. LLOYD—Do you know the amount which was paid for that?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Not from memory. I am only interested in the principle of the thing. You stated that certain moneys were paid for political purposes. I want to convince this Committee that that is wrong. The position is that when we started to build the railroads this land had to be taken and arbitrators had to be appointed to value the land. As soon as the arbitrators went out and arbitrated on a certain piece of land, and fixed the amount which was to be paid for it, the owner received his money. Well, that happened in Bonavista district three years ago. The people there were paid within six months after the land was taken. Had that anything to do with the election of last year? Supposing we paid out $50.000 in Bonavista district in 1910-11, what had that got to do with the election of last fall? And the same thing applies to Ferryland district. You stated that the amount was spent for political purposes.

DR. LLOYD—I stated that it was a coincidence.

HON. MIN FINANCE—Your statement to the Committee and to the country through the Reporter's Box was that $50,000 was spent last October for political purposes, and that for the three months preceding the election nearly $150,000 was spent for election purpose. But you know better than that. You know that these amounts were paid to owners of land, and that the claims were just, and I do not think that you should permit the statement which you have made to go broadcast.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, we have heard quite a lot this afternoon about the payment of arbitrations, and while I think the Minister of Finance has on the whole defended the policy of the Government very well, yet I am sorry that for a moment he forgot himself and spoke as he did to Mr. Clift, because Mr. Clift did not deserve the remark. Now, there is not the slightest doubt but that a lot of the things that the Government have done are wrong, and it is useless to try and justify them. Of course, everybody makes mistakes, and the Government has made a lot of them, and what they should say now is: Yes, we have done some things which have been wrong, but in the future, if the Opposition will help us, we will try and do right. They will not hurt themselves one iota by making such a statement as that. What does surprise me is that the Minister put up such a defence. Some of the mistakes which the Government have committed they would probably not commit if they had their time over again. The other evening we had something to say about Gardiner, and we were told that Gardiner was not asked by the Government to return the money which he received by mistake. I understand that Gardiner has been asked to return that money. Gardiner states that his tender was accepted and that he is able to justify the position he has taken to-morrow if it came into court. He claims that he should be paid up to the end of the year.

As regards arbitrations in connection with the railways, I know of one property in Bonavista that was really paid for twice. In the first place, the Government paid the wrong man, and then the right man came along and they had to pay him, too. I don't know whether the party that was paid for it first has been asked to return the money. The learned Doctor did not have anything to say regarding what has been done by the arbitrators. Well, I have got something to say about it. The Ryans were paid $6,000 for the property that was taken belonging to them. If I were an arbitrator they would not have been paid one-third of that amount. I understand that they only paid $7,000 for the whole property, and yet they got $6,000 for allowing the railway to pass through it. It was an outrageous case, and if we were to make political capital out of it, would ruin you for ever in the Northern districts, if not in the Southern. If the arbitrators are in the right, let them justify this payment of $6,000 to the Ryans for the property which was taken at Trinity. Let us hear what it was done for. If the whole property was only worth $7,000, why was $6,000 paid the owners for permission to run the railway through it—in other words, for making it 100 times more valuable than it was before? Another case was that of Templeman of Bonavista. I understand that a large sum was paid him for the property that was taken for railway extension, or at least that he is claiming a large sum. I hope that the arbitrators—I think the Hon. Mr. Goodison is one and Mr. Milley another—if they have not already paid Templeman, will see that he does not get more than fair

value for the land which has been taken belonging to him. It is the payment of claims like those that have done the Government so much damage.

I am sorry to see things a little bit rough. We are not used to it. Personally, I think that if things were done quietly we would get through more work. We want to finish business and get out of here by the first week in March, if possible—certainly not later than the 10th. We have plenty of work to do, and we should not waste any time. It is no advantage to me to stay here any longer than is absolutely necessary.

Another matter to which I would wish to refer is, that, last evening, the hon. member for Bay de Verde took occasion to deliberately insult me, without any possible provocation. I had made no remark whatever during that session which could possibly call for such unwarranted behaviour, and I believed at the time that it would be better to let it pass unnoticed out of respect for this House. We are serious in our manner of viewing the fishery propositions, for we know it is of vital importance to the welfare of this Colony. And while we formerly regarded with a favourable eye the movements in this direction made by the Government, we now feel ourselves compelled to rise and make known the decision of a meeting of the F.P.U., held this very day in consideration of the matter, which is that as long as the present member for Bay de Verde remains in his present position in this House, we shall not lend to the Government that support, without which it can ill carry out the intentions in view. We will not be insulted. Nor will we condescend to reply to the hon. member in question. We look for the righting of this matter at the hands of the Premier, and until then we withhold our support.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to say much just now, but merely rise to make a few remarks, which I consider relevant to the matter under discussion. I must take exception to the charge made by the Minister of Finance that in the Opposition Room we were ordered by our leader to attack hon. members of this House. Since I have had a seat in this House no man has driven me to do anything or to vote for any measure contrary to the dictates of my conscience. Neither Mr. Kent nor Mr. Coaker, nor anyone else has attempted to drive me or any other member of this Opposition, as stated by the Finance Minister. It is a great pity that hon. members on this side of the House cannot rise in their places to continue a debate without being insulted by certain members on the other side of the House. It would be far better for all concerned if the business of the country could be carried on smoothly and in a decorous manner. We are here to criticise when we think it is judicious. This is our right as an Opposition. For myself I am independent of every man, but I might say that it is my open opinion that no one yet in the history of this Colony has accomplished as much for the fishermen of this country as he has. Show me the Premier whose record is as high as Coaker's. It does not matter as far as the fishermen are concerned, who raised the price of fish, as long as the increased money goes in the pockets of the fishermen. As regards the elective boards, I am thoroughly in accord with them. We gain everything by experience, and this system ought to attain the highest state of perfection in a short time. If the magistrate assembles the public and a certain man is elected, then that man has the right to control the money of that District by virtue of popular vote. This will efface the petty practices

now unhappily in vogue in so many of these places, such as the nursing of money until the year previous to the general election. I would like to ask why some of the road moneys were expended on the Labrador. Why, we with our six hundred and fifty miles of coast line should go to Labrador for participants in our road boards, is rather difficult to understand. This money was not fairly distributed. Liberals told me that they received absolutely nothing. I had intended to say very little when I rose, and even now I find I have said little or nothing to the actual matter before the Chair, but I may state here that I will demand that the District I have the honour to represent receive its full share in matters such as I have just referred to.

MR. STONE--Mr. Chairman, I may say that as far as the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance, that we were not sincere in our criticisms of the Agricultural Policy, is concerned, I would impress upon him the fact that I was thoroughly sincere and well-meaning in my criticisms of that policy. I am sincere, too, when I say that I wish to endorse the statements made by Doctor Lloyd this afternoon relating to this matter. I am thoroughly in accord, too, with the remarks of Mr. Coaker. The best thing we can do is to follow his advice and settle down to immediate business. The hon. Minister said in connection with some of the members on this side of the House that we premeditated an attack upon certain members of the Government. This is incorrect, and Dr. Lloyd, I may say, is not in the habit of backbiting any of the members facing us. If the hon. Minister was not sincere in this statement, he should not have said it. When it was said that the members in the back row would learn after a while, the truth was spoken, and we have now learnt enough to stand up and say we will not have these insults heaped upon us in this way, and that we are going to stand upon our dignity.

The other day I referred to the dismissal of the mail carrier, Gardiner, and I now find that he has been asked to refund the sum of one hundred and five dollars and fifteen cents, which amount is alleged to have been paid him by mistake. Why was this amount paid to the man, I want to ask the hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House copies of the correspondence in connection with this affair. If as I understand, a petition was got up to remove Gardiner, I venture to say that another petition more numerously signed can be got up in his favor.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I thought I had given the hon. member all information in reference to this Gardiner affair, and had told him that an error had been made by a clerk in the Post Office Department in paying the money. A petition for his removal was sent to the Postmaster-General from the people of Ireland's Eye.

MR. STONE.—I may say I have all the correspondence.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—If Mr. Gardiner was aware that he had received monies by mistake, he would, if he were an honourable man, return it to the Department. He must have been aware of this. Had he made twenty-four trips, numbered 22, 23 and 24. These were by mistake added together as 69 trips, and he was paid for 69 trips. He could not help knowing that that was wrong. Representations were made by the Society of United Fishermen at Ireland's Eye, stating that there had been delays in his work, which should not have occurred. He had wasted time and missed connections, and they asked for a change.

MR. STONE.—There were more

people in favor of Gardiner than against him. The thing was done through the influence of the late Colonial Secretary. As to getting the money back, probably the man has not got it now.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Gardiner had received instructions from the Postmaster-General in the autumn to continue the service, and under these circumstances I fail to see how the money can be recovered. This man Gardiner was a Union man, and the petition against him is signed by a number of people who are opposed to the Union. I hope the Government will be fair and have a full investigation into this matter, and if they find that Mr. Gardiner did not carry the mail and do his work as he should, then it is alright to dismiss him. But on the other hand if he did his work and was given the appointment, and perhaps went to some expense or gave up other employment, you will have to make a thorough investigation to satisfy the people. I am not going to back Gardiner; I am not going to back anyone who deserves punishment. I am not going to back him up if he did not do his duty, but if he did his duty I contend that you have done wrong in dismissing him from his position. Getting the mail over from British Hr. to Ireland's Eye is sometimes a very difficult job. The Arm is very often filled with slob ice and it is a couple of miles from the mainland. If there was bad weather it might not be possible to get across for two or three weeks. But if there was good weather and he did not bring the mail, you did perfectly right in dismissing him.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The point I want to make about this man Gardiner is that he did not act straight. He was well aware that he did not make any more than twenty-four trips, for which he was entitled to $2.35 a trip. Mr. LeMessurier paid him for 69 trips and he accepted that money. Of course Mr. Gardiner may be entitled to a year's wages. If he is, he has a regular way to get it. He can get it through the courts. In accepting that money he did not accept it as a year's wages. He knew it was not for a year, and in accepting the money he was not acting as an honourable man would do. He did not know but Mr. LeMessurier would have had to pay it up out of his own pocket. A man who will accept money that he is not entitled to, I do not call an honest man. I am not condoning the action of the Government in dismissing him. I was not in office at the time and do not know the circumstances. Probably Mr. Watson would know a great deal more, because it was a matter in his district and he would know the circumstances surrounding the whole case. I merely look at the facts as I find them. The petition from the S.U.F. stated that he neglected to bring the mails although the weather was fine. I presume those in authority investigated and found these statements were correct and acted accordingly. But the point I wish to make is, that he accepted this money from Mr. LeMessurier although he must have known that he was paid the amount in error and that he was not entitled to it. For him to take money for 69 trips when he knew he was only entitled to 25, was not the act of an honest man.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, I very much regret the attitude of the Colonial Secretary in reference to this matter. I particularly regret that a man in such a responsible position, who after disclosing the fact that he knew nothing about the matter except from some correspondence that he had, should have offered an insult to an old servant of the Colony with-

out knowing what he was talking about.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I can read.

MR. LLOYD.—I mean to show, you knew nothing about the matter in making such a statement.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I make no statement that is not absolutely true.

MR. LLOYD.—You are trying to burke the question, but I will take care that you will not burke it, and don't you make any mistake about it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I burke nothing, and I do not intend to.

MR. LLOYD.—Well, do not talk about others burking it. The hon. gentleman is not in possession of all the virtues. He prides himself on being a straight and honest man, and I honor him for his pride, but I do not honor him for insulting other men and throwing across the floors of this House the statement that we were burking the question. Any burking that has been done has been done by the Government, and I am surprised that a man in the position of Colonial Secretary should get up and hurl insults across at men who are merely looking out for the rights of their constituents. Now the Colonial Secretary merely said that "he presumed" certain things.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I said that I do not know the whole details of the case.

MR. LLOYD.—Let me tell the hon. gentleman what he said. He points out that a petition from the S.U.F. was before the Postmaster General, and he "presumes" that he did make an inquiry and as a result of that inquiry Mr. Gardiner was dismissed. Now the presumption is what—that the inquiry was made. But the Colonial Secretary does not know whether it was or not. Now then comes the question of honesty which has been raised and the question of burking which has been raised. I should like to know who is doing the burking. If the Government enters a contract with a man in January to carry a mail from January to December, and he is dismissed in February, who does the burking? The Postmaster-General enters into a contract with Gardiner to carry the mail from January to December and dismissed him in February. Who burks the contract, Gardiner or the Government? Was it Gardiner that broke the contract? If he had broken the contract and not carried out his work, would he have gone to the Government and got his money? Gardiner had a right to look for redress and we have a right to see that justice is done him, and we did not burke this matter, and it is an unfortunate and regrettable incident that the man who is now head of the Department and who knows nothing about the case, should so far forget himself as to get up and accuse a man of dishonesty because he gets part of what is due him.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The hon. member for Trinity is evidently angry. I did not think that any remarks that I let fall from my lips would bring forth such a tremendous tirade as he has been good enough to throw at my head. I did not say that the Department did or did not investigate the case. I said I presumed they investigated the questions which arose out of the statements made in the petitions made by the S.U.F., and that as a result they dismissed him. I did not say that Mr. Gardiner was dishonest, but I said his action in accepting money that he knew did not belong to him and that he had not earned, put a doubt in my mind as to his honesty or dishonesty. I also said that I knew nothing about the case except the documentary evidence that I have, and which I presume is correct. Gardiner has never

denied that the payment made to him was three times as much as he was entitled to. I presume if Mr. Gardiner had a claim against the Government for a year's services he would have presented it. He could not have taken that money for that reason. It was after Mr. LeMessurier had made e payment that he saw that instead of paying Mr. Gardiner for 24 trips, he added the total, 22, 23 and 24, and had paid for 69 trips. Mr. Gardiner knew that this was wrong and should have asked for an expanation. As regards burking the question, I did not burk it. The matter will be before the Court and Mr. Gardiner will have a chance to vindicate himself. I do not take back anything I said about the man. If he acted honestly he will have an opportunity to prove it, and if he acted otherwise he will have an opportunity of paying back the money.

MR. LLOYD.—The Colonial Secretary had no right to make any accusation against this man without a full knowledge of all the facts. It is quite clear that the Colonial Secretary does not know whether any investigation was held, and he does not know whether any charges were ever put to Mr. Gardiner or if he had a chance to say whether the statement made about him was true or untrue. If Mr. Gardiner had been given an opportunity to reply, the correspondence would have been produced, and there would not have been any need of 'presumption.' In the absence of any correspondence the presumption is that the Government is in the wrong and not Gardiner.

MR. COAKER.—As the Colonial Secretary has stated that Mr. Gardiner will have an opportunity in the Court to vindicate himself, I presume that he is going to be taken into Court to try and make him refund this money. If this is done I hope the Government will also take into court men who have been paid money for railway awards they were not entitled to. I know of cases in Bonavista Bay where two men have been paid for the same piece of land. I shall be pleased to give the Government lists of these awards if they want them. If any man has received money that he is not entitled to, he should be made to pay it back. I hope the Government will investigate these matters and let us know all about them.

MR. JENNINGS.—Just a few remarks regarding the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Finance and Customs. He said during his remarks that criticisms from the members of this side of the House were insincere, that they did not believe what they were saying and they were merely getting up here as a matter of form. Now if there is one thing I do value in my own character it is sincerity.

HON. MIN. FINANCE & CUSTOMS —I did not mean you.

MR. JENNINGS—You made no distinction.

HON. MIN OF FIN. & CUSTOMS— I do now.

MR. JENNINGS—I wish to say that any remarks that I made in this House I certainly believe and with regard to that agricultural policy that has been so much debated, I was sincere when I said and I repeat the statement, that I never heard any good remark concerning it to come here and repeat. I am at a loss to know why. It may be that we in Twillingate are not getting our share of the good things. I know of no results down there. Another thing I am very sorry occurred and that is the remarks that were directed to my learned friend Mr. Clift. I certainly believe that was unfair and undeserved. Right through the district of Twillingate, Sir, amongst political friends and political foes Mr. Clift is known as a gentleman and I do not

think that anyone can say anything against him. Another remark was made about members getting corrupted in this House. Well that is a very poor advertisement for the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and if that is the result of coming here we had better throw it up as a bad job. I am not going to get corrupt if I know it. There was another remark made to the effect that down in the Opposition room we get orders to come up here and make certain criticisms against the other side. Whatever may have been the practice when the hon. gentleman was in Opposition, I have not come up against anything like that. Mr. Kent or no one else has ever told me to come up here and get up and criticise the Government. I have never got any orders of that kind or do not expect them, and I would not carry them out. Anything I have said here I am personally responsible for and I do not come here to insult anyone on the Government side or be insulted by them.

MR. KENT—I just want to say a word or two with reference to the remarks of Hon. Minister Finance and Customs with reference to members on this side of the House, and had other members of the House made them I certainly would have resented them at the time, but the Minister of Finance and Customs has been given rather a latitude in these matters and from year to year he has made practically the same speech that he has made this afternoon. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is time that this thing should be stopped. Imputing insincerity or wrong intentions or any corrupt object to members in this Legislature should cease. Now I have attended other Legislatures and I always saw the Chairman of the Committee or the Speaker of the House, if any member on any side of the House imputed to any other member any dishonourable motive or any insincerity, call him at once to order. He was then and there compelled by the chair either to prove the insincerity he charged or withdraw the accusation. We have not in force that rule here and I think it is a pity we do not. I am not referring to one side of the House, not referring to the present members or any members in particular, but I think if we were to enforce that rule as it is in force in other Legislatures of the world it would be a good thing.

Now, it would appear, Mr. Speaker, as if we on this side of the House were on trial for our sincerity this afternoon. Well speaking for myself. I can say this that whenever I have come in here to criticise the actions of the Government I have done so with all the ability I could bring to bear and with all the sincerity I can bring to hear. I can say this also, that when I approach a measure of the Government that is brought in here I approach it with one object only, and that is, to see if it is the best I could suggest in the interest of the people of the country. If it is not, I am prepared to criticise it here. Evidence of that, Sir, is before the House and before every member. Measures have been brought in here by the Government that I have got up and agreed with it in every line. If I were actuated by insincere motives of criticising the Government, I might have found some points in them that I could criticise. Now I want to say, speaking for members on this side of the House, that I have been closely associated with them day by day for six or seven weeks and I would never ask to be associated with more sincere men. Some of them have had experience in this House and others are new men coming in for the first time. I think

that every member of the House must admit and those who have watched the actions of the Opposition and of the new members in particular must admit that they have given an example of sincerity and public spirit that everybody must admire. Now I believe that the Minister of Finance and Customs when doing his work in the interest of the Colony is as sincere as any man in this House. I believe also that he is a man who in debate will hit hard. I do not mind being hit hard myself. I am prepared to take hard blows as well as anybody else. Sometimes the Minister does not perhaps use the right word to express exactly what he means and misunderstandings consequently arise; but I think, Sir, it is due to ourselves and to the country and to the dignity of the legislative body of the country that we members of it—and I do not distinguish between any members—ought to try and keep ourselves from making charges or accusations or imputing wrong motives. I think we will get along better and that the country and those who observe these things will have more respect for it.

It being now 6.30 p.m., Mr. Parsons left the Chair of Committee till 8 o'clock.

MR. PARSONS resumed the Chair of Committee at 8 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the whole reported that the committee had considered the matter to them referred and made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow On motion, the report was received and adopted.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the RT. HON THE PRIME MINISTER the House resolved itself into Committee of the whole on the Fishery Resolutions.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of committee

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—When I moved the House into Committee of the whole on these Resolutions a few evenings ago I stated to the committee what my own views were on the matter and I do not propose further to deal with the matter, but to submit to the committee the following Resolutions:

RESOLVED, that it is the opinion of this Committee that it is desirable that an enquiry should be made forthwith, and evidence taken on oath if necessary, to ascertain the best means of

(a) Encouraging the cure of fish, whether by establishing a cull or standard in the purchase of the same, or otherwise;

(b) Standardizing or branding all fish when exported from Newfoundland or Labrador.

(c) Protection and propagation of lobsters;

(d) Protection of the Seal Fishery by the establishment of a close season if found necessary, or otherwise;

(e) Conserving our bait fishes.

(f) Ascertaining if the prosecution of the Whale Fishery tends to injure the fishery.

(g) Preserving for our fishermen bait fishes.

RESOLVED, that it is the opinion of this Committee that the matters referred to in the foregoing Resolution be referred to a joint select Committee of this House and the Honourable the Legislative Council.

In other words, what I propose is that when the Committee has discussed the Resolutions, as I hope they will, we shall refer the various matters contained in them to a committee representative of both the Government and Opposition parties and we shall also ask the Upper Chamber

to associate themselves with us by doing likewise. That joint committee will take all the matters into consideration and I trust that as a result of the deliberations of the committee we may be in a position to proceed more safely to deal with all matters in relation to our fisheries.

The great difficulty in the past has been to get all those interested, the fishermen, the planters and merchants, to agree on matters that are in the interests of all. I do not know any better way in which to arrive at a definite conclusion than what I now propose and I am following the precedents set by the Legislature in the past. All important matters in connection with our fisheries, such as the French Shore Question, have always been regarded as above party and it is entirely with that in view that I have brought these matters forward in the way that I have. I feel certain that no matter what our political views may be we are all as one that the matters referred to are the most important that we can consider. Therefore, it is with very much pleasure that I submit these Resolutions to the consideration of the Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in connection with the Resolutions now before the Chair The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has gone very fully into the question of the establishment of a cull of our fish, and I fully agree that the time has now come wher some means should be adopted whereby a cull will be established. The quality of fish that the merchants are now receiving is not what it should be, but the sellers are not altogether to blame for this, for the blame should be placed on the buyers just as much as on them. The present quality of our fish is due to a certain extent to the manner in which it is cured. Three years ago the merchants made contracts early in the season and rather than face an action for damages for breach of their contracts owing to being unable to fill them they went to the outports and bought half cured fish and then cured it by artificial means in order that they might fill their contracts. This system of buying fish talqual has continued and fishermen have been able to dispose of fish only partially made at as good a price as if it were well cured. It is needless to say that this system has helped very much to bring about the present cure.

Another matter that has been responsible is the credit system, for when a fisherman takes $200.00 or $300.00 on credit and proceeds to the fishery, if at the end of the season he has fish enough partially cured to pay his account, the merchant will not refuse to take it. The fish is put to the credit of the person supplied and this means that that party is not going to take any pains to cure it better when he is allowed no more than the man who has it only partially cured.

Another reason for the present bad cure is the carelessness and laziness on the part of certain men. I have seen some fish from a settlement that was in every way fine fish, while another man from the same place and under precisely the same conditions will send in fish of a much poorer quality because he has not taken the same care to cure it.

The matter is now becoming a serious one and something should be done to establish a uniform cull. I agree that the only way in which this can be done is to submit the matter to a committee or a commission who shall take it up from every standpoint and find out what are the necessary measures to be adopted to satisfy both the fishermen and the exporters.

The Board of Trade has been grappling with the matter for some time and they do not seem to have arrived at any conclusion as to what should be done. They have wanted to control the cull themselves, if it was introduced, but I do not think it could be controlled by that body because it consists principally of exporters and they might establish rules that would not be approved of by the fishermen. Neither would it be advisable to place the matter under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries because it might be made a political business in the future and party supporters put in the position of fish cullers. That would be very unsatisfactory and would do our fisheries very great injury.

The only way that in my opinion can be adopted is to put the matter under the control of the Magistrate's Court and I submit that if a commission is appointed the Judge of the Magistrate's Court should be the Chairman of it. If the matter is placed under the control of this Court it will be non-political and this is certainly a matter in which politics should play no part. No party and no government should take the credit or the blame of establishing a cull of our fish.

The present grades of our fish have been established for a hundred years and there is no necessity for continuing the names that are now used because they do not apply to the grades of fish to-day. A hundred years ago the bulk of our fish was merchantable quality; the next quality was madeira and the lowest quality was called cullage or West India a name derived from the place where it was shipped. These names should be continued no longer and we should have our fish graded.

It is interesting to know that over a hundred years ago a cull was established by law, and it was under the control of the Court. I have before me an extract from the Royal Gazette issued on July 28th, 1808, that is nearly a hundred and six years ago, dealing fully with the matter. It appears from this extract that we then had a better system of culling fish than we have at the present time, and the cullers had to find security that they would do their work faithfully. This would be necessary if the cull was established at the present time.

I also have before me the law of Iceland in connection with the cull of fish and parts of it may be of use.

Any system which you may introduce must be non-political. It must not be under the control of a department where it can be connected with politics.

We have heard a great deal of discussion regarding the culling of fish in the outports. I should think that would be quite as simple as culling fish in St. John's. You could have head cullers who would have charge of certain districts, one man say from here to Carbonear, another man from Carbonear around to Old Perlican, and so on. These men could have other cullers under them. The men best fitted for those positions would be men who are used to discipline, ex-policemen, if you wish. You will find that an ex-policeman would attend to his duty in a right manner. Now, most of our policemen have been fishermen, and they could be very easily taught to cull fish. These men could also be used for other purposes. At the present time we have no statistics whereby we can ascertain the catch of fish in this country. During the fishing season, we get reports, but they are mostly very unreliable, with the result that the exporters estimate that a certain quantity of fish has been caught, and they base their price on

that. Then, as the season advances, they find that a great deal more fish arrives than was expected and the result is that the price drops suddenly. In other years, they find that the catch is smaller than was anticipated and the price suddenly jumps from $5.00 to $6.00. In the meantime, three-quarters of our catch has been marketed, at $1.00 less than it should have been and the trade loses three-quarters of a million dollars. This, of course, is because of the fact that we have nothing definite to go on. There is no reason why an official should not give us these statistics of the catch. Every boat which fishes in this country should be licensed and numbered and the owners should be compelled by law to report each day's catch of fish. During the fishing season in Norway, the catch of fish is cabled out here each week. The people of Norway know just how much fish they will have to dispose of at the end of the season and they regulate the price accordingly. There is no reason why we should not do the same thing in this country. There are lots of Government officials in every settlement who have nothing to do half the time, and they could be made do this work. I feel that it would be a means of great saving to the country.

Now, as to the standardization of fish for export, I think that is a matter which does not require very much consideration. That will take care of itself, in a way. We cannot at the present time lay down any standards to markets which have been taking our fish for the last hundred years. The standards have been laid down long ago, and we have to comply with what they require. If a market wants Merchantable fish, we cannot give them anything else. We have an experience of that at the present time. Certain markets want some of our first-class fish, and they are willing to pay a high price for it. We have not got the fish to give them and we cannot supply any other quality except at a low price—too low down, in fact. As I have said ,these standards have been laid down and we have to comply with them. The Board of Trade some years ago established a cull and employed one or two cullers. They sent them around to the exporting houses, and to those who wanted to have their fish standardized for export. I do not think, though, that the experiment was very successful, because the mere fact that there is a Board of Trade certificate or any other certificate on a package of fish is no proof that the buyer is going to accept it. I know a case where 400 qtls. of fish which had the Board of Trade certificate on it was sent to Italy. It was refused by the buyers because it was not up to the quality required. At that time, one of the men interested was in Italy and he called in to see this fish. He conscientiously had to make the buyers an allowance of $2.50 a quintal because the fish was not up to a standard. I merely quote this to prove that this matter of standardization does not need as much consideration as the cull of fish when taken from the fishermen. Of course, one drawback at the present time is the fact that these standards were laid down a long time ago ,when fish was a very much better quality than it is at the present time. We have not been able to keep up to these standards and therefore we cannot supply these markets with the quality which they need. There is not very much difference in the taste of the fish. It is only the appearance, and what the people have become accustomed to. In one market they want white fish. In another, they want brown fish and if you send the brown fish to the market which wants the white fish, they will not take it, although it is just as good a food. Dif-

ferent markets want different grades and they will take nothing but those grades.

The Premier, in speaking on this matter a few days ago, said that the value of our fish exports was somewhere in the neighborhood of ten million dollars. Well, I claim that our fish is worth more than that. The Customs export entries are not properly valued. The real value of our fish is much greater than is usually estimated. Some means should be introduced whereby a proper value could be put on our fish, and the country get the credit for the real value of the fish exported.

In reference to the commission which was sent to the fish markets some years ago, and to which the Premier referred the other day, I do not think I ever saw a copy of their report. I understood there never was a report. I don't think, however, that that commission had much influence or brought about the opening up of any new markets.

Now, there are a great many kinds of fish in this country which are thrown away which are really good fish for food, and could be used if put up in the proper manner. When I was in Italy some years ago, I wanted to get some fish cooked in the way in which they cooked it there, and asked one day that this be done. When the dish was put before me, it consisted of a lot of vegetables, garlic and tomatoes with a piece of fish put in the centre as a flavour. It was a very small piece. Now, we have here flat fish and other fish of that kind which, if properly treated, should be just as good for flavoring purposes as codfish and should bring in good returns. There is also the matter of tinning fish and putting it up in other ways to which some attention ought to be given. The Americans take away our fish and put it up in this manner, and sell it, and there is no reason why we should not do the same and reap the profits which the Americans make. The Canadian markets, to which the Premier referred the other day, are not of very much importance to us. None of our fish is consumed in the Canadian markets. The Canadians buy it from us and export it again, so that they really enter into competition with us in foreign markets.

The Premier has taken a step in the right direction in introducing these resolutions and I think that the appointing of a Committee to investigate the whole matter, will meet with the approval of all concerned.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, the resolutions which are before the Committee relate to matters of the very utmost importance to this country. I think that no matter how we may differ as to methods or as to political questions, we are as one on any measure which is a bona fide and honest effort to improve the condition of our fisheries, and in connection with such a measure there will be no division of parties in this House, or I believe in the country. When we think, Mr. Chairman, what the fisheries mean to this country, we must be convinced that we have not given to them the study, care and attention which they deserve. The fisheries bear to Newfoundland a predominant attitude in relation to its commercial life, its social life and every other phase of its life. Now, if we consider the attention which is given by every other country to its predominant industry, and compare it with what we have done here for our main industry, we will find that we are very much behind the times. In other countries, industries which are of minor importance, compared with their large industries, receive at the hands of the public authorities very much greater

care and attention than we devote to our fisheries. The figures which have been tabled here show how important this industry is. If we compare, for instance, our exports of fish with the exports of our other industries during the last two years, we will find that our fishery exports averaged between ten and ten and a half million dollars, while all the other exports put together averaged between three and three and a half million dollars. When we consider the conditions which exist in regard to the value of our fishery exports, I do not think that we as a Colony can claim much credit for the increase in the value of these products. What I mean by that is this: That the export value of these fishery products has been created by conditions which operate outside the Colony and over which we have no control. If you take codfish, for instance, you will find that for the last twenty years, with very little variation from year to year, the catch has been practically the same, but the value of the product has gone up. Now, take the year 1896. The number of quintals of codfish exported that year was one million, four hundred and thirty-six thousand and eighty-three, of a value of four million, two hundred and ninety-seven thousand, six hundred and ninety-nine dollars, or an average value of $2.99 a quintal. In 1902 the number of quintals exported was 1,278,955, valued at $5,509,720, or an average of $4.30 a quintal. That is, of course, taking the price all round. In 1912 the export was 1,388,178 quintals, valued at $7,995,905, or an average of $5.76 a quintal. Now, from 1896 to 1902, the value increased from $2.99 to $4.30, or an increase of $1.31. From 1902 to 1912 the value increased from $4.30 to $5.76, or an increase of $1.46. From 1896 to 1912 the value thus increased $2.77, or, in other words, taking the general average the value of a quintal of codfish is worth to-day almost twice as much as it was worth in 1896. Now, Mr. Chairman, when we bear in mind the value of our fisheries and we look at present conditions, the need for some improvement must be apparent. I think, Sir, that one of the first places where reform is necessary is in the department of Marine and Fisheries. The Department of Marine and Fisheries in this country does not do the work which a department of that kind should do in a fishing country like Newfoundland. We spend money on other matters which are not nearly as important as that department. We want, Sir, to have that Department run by modern methods, and we want to have the science of the preservation of our fisheries, the habits and natural history and every other factor relating to the fish which surrounds our coast enquired into, and the department of Marine and Fisheries made a Bureau from which information in relation to these subjects can be obtained. If we are dealing with legislation on this matter, we have no place to-day to make enquiries. We have no place where we can get definite information about any subject in relation to our fisheries. The Department is not filling the office for which it was intended. If you will refer to the Statute upon which it was founded, you will find that its authority is large, and the subjects which are given to it are large. One of the defects in the Department is that it has no organization. For instance, I think that the Department of Fisheries should deal with the fisheries pure and simple—the fishes themselves, the manner in which they are caught, in which they are handled, in which they are sold and in which they are marketed. Matters marine should be handled separately. I do not say that there should be two separate departments, but that the Department

ought to be divided into two branches, each branch handling exclusively the particular work coming under its control. It may be that that would cost money, but I do not think that money which is spent in the proper organization of the Marine and Fisheries department will be wasted, if it is properly spent. I do not think that you can invest money in better use than in taking care of the fisheries by having your fishery Department properly organized. The various matters which are referred to in the resolutions all require to be carefully examined. The awakening of interest in these matters is due to the feeling which is abroad that the fisheries have not been receiving due attention, and I think, Sir, that when you come to examine the cause for that feeling it must be put down to the fact that you have in existence in this country to-day an organization of fishermen who are looking out for their own interests and who are going to see that proper attention is given to fishery matters. We have their representatives here in the House, men who are here to see that the interests of the fishermen get proper attention. These resolutions, Mr. Chairman, are one of the results of their agitation. I think it is generally admitted that if you do not have a proper standard of fish as between the seller and buyer in the local market, you cannot hold out any inducement to the fishermen to put up their fish better. The only way to improve our fish is to have a standard cull established by law, and there is no use in establishing a cull unless you have some means of carrying it out, and see that the cull prevails throughout the whole industry. The cullers must be independent. If they are dependent upon the purchasers, then it is no good. They have to decide between the purchaser and the seller, and it is just as necessary that he should be independent of the parties concerned as a Judge of the Supreme Court. If you are going to have a standardization in the cull of fish, then it must be above suspicion. At the present time the culling of fish is carried on more by a standard made and changed from time to time, and is made frequently to suit the conditions of the particular sale that is in view. That is wrong. At the same time I see one difficulty in regard to a standard cull, and that is that there may be conditions in a particular trade where we may not be able to apply it. That will of course be a matter upon which this House or a Commission would need information. As to the standardization of fish for export, this is a matter upon which there are differences of opinion. In any case it is a different matter than the standardising of fish as between buyer and seller in the local market. We make up the article to go abroad into different markets, in different ways and under different conditions, and this would be a matter of grading the fish for export. There should be some cull or regulated standard of fish for export so that the articles going abroad would have some authoritative stamp that would give the purchasers in the foreign market a certain amount of confidence in the article that he buys. Reference was made to Scotch herring, and it was pointed out how the enforcement of a brand on this fish had increased its commercial value. The Prime Minister I think, pointed out that in the course of 40 or 50 years the export of Scotch herring had increased from £200,000 to something like £3,000,000 a year, and he read to this House extracts from the opinion of men interested in the Scotch herring industry, showing that this result was largely due to the fact that the herring was branded and that the brand was a certificate that it was a good article. If we can secure a reputation for the

brands of fish we send out we will secure our footing in the foreign markets and drive away all competition by the good name of the article which Newfoundland sends out. The next article that it is proposed this Committee should consider is the protection and propagation of lobsters. Two years ago the Prime Minister introduced resolutions in connection with the Lobster industry. The matter attracted a good deal of attention and it was hoped that some good results would follow. The evidence that we have here to-day would lead us to lose confidence in what was done then. Whether it was due to conditions that were unpreventable or whether to circumstances that should have been foreseen, I am not in a position to say. But the fact remains that the lobster pack last year was only 16,000 cases. Fortunately the price of lobsters has gone up of recent years. There are a good many opinions expressed regarding the lobster fishery. I do not know very much about it, but I have heard the matter discussed, and it seems very few agree in their opinion. This difference of opinion is one of the justifications for the resolutions. Take the question of a close season. Some are of opinion that the close season should be from April to July. These are two diametrically opposed opinions. I have heard each of them expressed by several people. Some people think that a fall pack of lobsters is an advantage, and that it does no injury to the industry. Others hold that it would do untold injury because it kills out the female lobster. These are the opinions of men who are largely interested in the lobster fishery. It shows how imperfect is the knowledge of these matters, and of the need for some such information as will probably be elicited by this Committee which it is proposed to appoint. The other matters are the protection of the sealfishery by the establishment of a close season if found necessary. That, of course, is a matter for scientific knowledge and practical experience, and of course the Committee will have the benefit of the experience of the sealing captains and mercantile community. They should, I think, also avail of the knowledge of and information of the ordinary sealer, who on a matter of this kind is probably as capable of giving an opinion as the sealing masters, and whose opinion would be guided only by a desire to benefit the industry itself. That the number of seals caught annually is falling off, is evident. The Prime Minister pointed out that at one time the catch was 600,000 seals. Now, if we get 270,000 we are doing well. This may be due to the conditions under which we now operate It may be due to the falling off in the number of seals or it may be due to the small number of sealing steamers used. I cannot speak with any knowledge on such a subject, but I hope that before we legislate we will have all the information that it is possible to get. We must have knowledge before we legislate.

A matter to which I would like to refer to is the absence in this country of any statistical information regarding the fisheries. The information that we have is very unreliable. In other countries that information is very reliable and trustworthy. The work is done and kept systematically Everyone is sure that the figures from a public department are reliable. Take for instance the question of the amount of capital that is invested in our fisheries. I do not mean the capital of the mercantile firms, but go through the country and see the various boats, traps, nets and other implements in the fishery. What value are these. I do not believe that anyone in the country has any accurate idea. It is all a matter of speculation It can be ascertainel by organised ei-

fort and it ought to be ascertained. The census is taken every ten years. But even that is not an accurate estimate of its value. I have here the average earnings of the fishery pop ulations of the provinces. No one in this country can state with any certainty even the approximate average earning of the fishing population in this country. It is unknown and is purely a matter of speculation. I have here authoritative figures quoted in the commons at Ottawa by Mr. Sinclair. His figures are taken from the public Blue Book. He says the average earnings of the fishing populations in the various provinces are as follows:

In Nova Scotia	$322
In New Brunswick	338
In Prince Ed. Island	327
In Quebec	183
In Ontario	594
In Manitoba, Saskatchewan Alberta	373

He does not give the average for British Columbia or the Western provinces. But it shows that they keep in touch with matters statistical. It is a most important matter to know the capital value of the money invested in our industries, the average earnings and other such figures. We know the capitalisation of our commercial institutions and generally the state of our commerce, but we cannot get along without this other additional information. In conclusion I would like to impress upon the committee the value of our fishery to the general trade conditions. We have got the most valuable fishery in the world. If we compare it with the Provinces we will find that it equals that of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia put together. It equals the fishery of Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario together. It equals the total fisheries of New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. These countries have other industries. The farming industry is their staple industry. But the attention which they give to farming is based upon scientific knowledge in every department. Different departments are based upon modern methods and the consequence is that the industry is going ahead in quantity and value. All have resources in the sea that we have not touched as yet. Take up the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries where he talks of the various possibilities of the fisheries. Everyone of these possibilities could be made pay if properly handled. They would mean $100,000 a year to the country if commercial methods were applied to them. But they never have been made of commercial use. It may be said that mercantile men are not going into these matters. If not, if any effort of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is wanted to introduce it then it should be made. If any encouragement can be given to create any industry in connection with our fisheries it is the duty of that Minister to give that encouragement as far as he is able. But as I see it the Minister is not performing his functions in a way in which he should. Take for instance the fact that the Prime Minister is here this evening in charge of these resolutions. What is the Head of the fisheries department for? It is his place to take charge of resolutions such as these. They concern no department but his and he is the one responsible to this House and to the country for that department. The Prime Minister has taken it upon himself to take charge of these resolutions. It is all very well for him to do so, but I know the only reason for it is that the head of that department is not able to do it himself.

I think this committee will do

great good if its investigations are full and if it takes every means to obtain full and accurate knowledge of all the subjects, and if it is not limited in its enquiries to any particular section of the various industries comprised in it, so that every class in the community will have confidence in its findings. If it carries out its work along the lines that it should there will be no doubt but that it will be a move in the direction of improvement in our fisheries.

RT. HON THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Speaker, just one word in reply in regard to the Minister of Fisheries. I may say that I fully discussed the matter with the Minister and indeed he had hoped to have been here to have taken a part in the discussion of the resolutions.

At first sight it might appear to be incumbent on him to present these resolutions to the House. But when you consider them I think it will be agreed that they are hardly de partmental work, they are more a question of somewhat larger scope, a question of policy and because of that he asked me to take charge of them. Otherwise I am sure he would have been only too glad to have been here and to assume the responsibility of putting them before the House. I could have wished that he had assumed the responsibility because he is far more able to do it than I. And his abundant experience in the practical side of the fisheries would have enabled him to supply to the committee facts and figures. The office of introduction is more the formal part of laying a matter before the committee with a view to its being thoroughly argued and enquired into. I must congratulate the hon. member on the interest shown by him in the debate. It should be, as he says, a matter above party. Personally, I have no concern whatever as to what side a suggestion comes from or who proposes it, if it appear to be of value. My only object is to see that the matter is fully and freely discussed by the members on both sides of the House. Even if no other good comes of this debate than the arresting of the people's attention upon this most important matter, it will be most useful and valuable to the country.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Chairman, I am in entire accord with the spirit and the letter of the Resolutions before the Chair. I hope that a large amount of good will accrue to the country from the Resolutions and I feel confident that much valuable evidence will be obtained by the select committee. I am fully aware of the large amount of good that may accrue to the country from the standardizing of our fish and the conserving of our Lobster fishery. I have had a deal of experience in the lobster industry and I am perfectly familiar with the state of the Lobster Fishery in this country. I know of nothing that would yield such a large measure of profit as the shipping of large lobsters to the United States. The average size of lobsters packed in this country is small in comparison with that of the lobsters packed in the United States and Canada. At present, after the first few weeks, you can procure few lobsters that will average 10½ inches, and thus permit their export to the United States. After the first two or three weeks, the number of lobsters secured of 10½ inches diminishes to 5 or 6 per cent. and therefore it requires some enactment of law to protect the fishery for a few years and thus eventually improve the size of the lobsters and the value of the fishery. There is only one state in the United States where 9 inch lobsters are admitted—that is Rhode Island.

For the others, 10½ in. lobsters are necessary. The Nova Scotians are first in that business. A Protective Law has enabled them to get from 20 to 25 per cent of their fish of the required size. It seems reasonable to think that similar restrictions or other measures would tend to give us the same results as obtained in Nova Scotia from the lobster fishing regulations enforced for the past 15 years. Their enforcement might cost a trifling sum, but the large amount of profit that must accrue to the country would more than make up for any loss at first. This fresh lobster export would be far more profitable than the export of tinned lobsters. I heartily approve of the resolutions for the conserving of our bait fishes I can assure the committee that I know of no fish that this country produces which is so valuable in foreign markets as our caplin. On one occasion, I secured 4 or 5 barrels of caplin and after some delay I shipped them to the New York market and I was astonished at the price they fetched. They received 18c. a pound, and for a month afterwards, I was simply deluged with letters and telegrams asking for further shipments in the largest possible quantities. I merely refer to this matter as an instance of what may be accomplished in this direction. I think it would be a proper subject for discussion by the Committee and I trust they will give it serious consideration. I trust that they will ascertain the sources from which they may obtain the best prices and the best way to suit the requirements of the markets. I am referring to these matters briefly at present, but at a later date I may go a little further into their discussion I shall have something to say with regard to the securing and increasing of our markets and the putting up of our fish in new and attractive forms. It is a singular fact that for many years we have not obtained a single new market for our fish. For a long time I have been convinced that it is possible to do a great deal in connection with the putting up of our fish. When I had the honour to reply to the opening speech in the House in 1909, I referred to this matter, as may be seen in the debates of that day.

The Panama Canal is now almost completed and here we have a chance to secure new markets for our fish in Peru and other western countries of South America. By the opening of this Canal, the whole of the west coast of South America will become accessible, and I think we should be able to place our fish there at an increased cost of only 17 or 18 cents per quintal, including canal dues. I think that enquiries should be made by the Commission with a view to opening new markets in that region. The herring fishery is another fishery to which I would like the committee to give their attention. It is not generally known that for the past two years many packers are putting up our herring according to Scotch Pack in Green Bay and Bay of Islands. These fish are realizing from $9.50 to $10.50 a barrel in the American markets. These are unheard of prices in connection with this fishery in Newfoundland. There are two or three other features of this fishery that presented themselves to me, and I see no reason why our herring should not compete with the Scotch herring if properly packed.

In 1909 I asked to be authorized to approach some of the chief American buyers on the question of forcing our pickled fish into the U.S. market, despite the tariff. I only succeeded however, in inducing one company the Gorton Pew Fisheries Co. to take up the matter. The first year they bought a little fish only, the se-

cond year considerably more; the third year a very large quantity. Last year they fell off a little, because they found a good deal of fish not properly salted, a matter which is entirely our own fault. They themselves say that I was the means of bringing them down to this country. Now if we could do that much, surely we could do more.

I should like to mention that some thing happened a few months ago which cast a light on the depths of depravity and political dishonesty to which certain persons in politics can descend for the sake of making political capital. I have the correspondence. A certain person wrote a letter saying that the Gorton Pew Company had not been introduced into this country through me, and submitted it to the Manager of that company to be signed with a view to discrediting me politically. But the company would not do so and informed me of the matter. However I will not further occupy the time of the House at present; on a later occasion I may have more to say on this subject.

MR. MOULTON.—I would like to say a few words upon the cure and cull of fish and other matters contained in those Resolutions. I think that this matter is so far reaching in its consequences as affecting the best interests of this country, that every consideration should be given to the subject. We can hardly realize what this subject in its entirety means to this country, and the fullest deliberation should be given to every matter contained in the resolutions. While I believe that the culling and standardizing of fish would be of great benefit to the whole country. I cannot but realize, that unless it is brought about in a proper manner great dissatisfaction amongst the fishermen, will result. I have had considerable experience in the culling of fish in this country, and it seems to me that of late years the fish is not dried sufficiently or properly, and that is one of the reasons why trouble may result if we decide upon a strict cull. It may be very easy here in St. John's to have a strict cull carried out, but it will be far different in hundreds of Outports where the services of sworn cullers cannot be obtained.

In other countries the cure of fish is superior to ours, for the reason that more care and attention is given to the matter. In Norway, the United States, Nova Scotia, Quebec and other countries, the fish is delivered to the merchants in a green state, who afterwards have it cured in various forms to suit the different markets. The majority of the fish in this country is cured by the fishermen. In Nova Scotia a great deal more salt is used but in Gaspe the fish is light salted and cured much harder than ours. chiefly suitable for the Southern Brazilian market. We have good fish, but as a rule it is very lightly salted, and not sufficiently dried, with the result that when it reaches a hot climate, many thousands of quintals are sometimes lost. Some years ago the different firms of Burgeo shipped nearly all their fish to the United States in a heavily salted and pickled condition, with three days sundrying, and obtained five and six dollars per quintal for it. Afterwards the duty was imposed on our fish going to the American market, but we continued sending it there for some time, and realized seven and seven and a half dollars a quintal. The people of the United States were really paying that duty. I am glad to know that our fish now goes into that country free of duty. We discontinued shipping at that time owing to the fact that that market was flooded with bounty fed

French fish, and owing to this bounty the French could undersell us in that market. If our fishermen would dry the product sufficiently it would stand the climate of Southern Brazil, and we would then be able to ship to that country just as Halifax is doing at the present time. The standardizing of fish will be difficult to be carried out in the Outports, and it will not be an easy matter to grade a bulk cargo in quantities of different qualities for different markets. The grade of fish which would suit one market may not do for another, hence a great deal of trouble will be experienced by the cullers throughout the country in endeavouring to bring about a uniform standard such as would exist in St. John's. Traders also would be obliged to have a sworn culler on board each schooner. This would be a very difficult matter, and would probably create great dissatisfaction amongst the fishermen. The hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman, gave us a very interesting address and told us how fish had been treated fifty and a hundred years ago, but we want to know the best way of dealing with this matter so as to meet the requirements of the present age. I was always of the opinion that if our codfish was put up in a boneless and attractive form, a large quantity could be sold throughout Canada and the United States. The Nova Scotians do not put up large quantities in a boneless form, but the Americans supply the Canadian market with a great deal of boneless fish. The United States people purchase from Canada a large amount of codfish which they reship into Canada in packages of boneless fish, and in other various attractive forms. The hon. member for St. George's, Mr. Downey, had stated that a very profitable business could be derived from the exporting of live lobsters. I quite agree with him, for the Orr Company last year made some very successful experiments in this connection. I firmly believe that a good business could be done if some means were devised for shipping the live lobsters direct, for great difficulty will be experienced in transporting them under our present shipping conditions. I have had a considerable experience in packing lobsters in this country and outside of this country. Thirty-seven years ago I first went into this business, which probably entitles me to the distinction of being engaged in it before any hon. member in this House. My operations in this respect were not confined to this country but were also carried on in New Brunswick where the lobsters were more plentiful at that time than in Newfoundland. I have known fishermen in those days to get only thirteen cents a hundred weight for lobsters in New Brunswick, but the crustaceans were so plentiful that they would get a half dozen to the one secured by our fishermen, and even at that rate would make good wages. In this country my experience is that the lobsters get scarcer as we go North, and on the Canadian Labrador the fish do not seem to hold out in the same way as they do in the Maritime Provinces and it therefore behoves us to do all we can to protect the spawning lobsters. I was always a strong believer in the hatcheries, and was very sorry when they ceased operations, for I believe, that by proper and skillful management this particular fishery can be maintained and kept up by the carrying out of the plans and instructions of the late Mr. Neilsen. We should endeavour to do all we can to protect the lobsters and if necessary have a close time of one year in different parts of the whole country. A close time could be made to apply to the

North one year and to the West another year. The same thing must apply to the seal fishery which also requires a close season. All these matters must be taken up by the Select Committee and thoroughly investigated, and I trust that when their report will be brought before this House for consideration, it will contain many valuable suggestions for the improvement and well being of our fisheries.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman. These resolutions embrace matters which are of even greater importance than those relating to agriculture. A great deal has been said from time to time about the preparation of our fish for the market. There is of course a great deal of difference between the home and foreign markets, and a greater distinction than ought to be. is made between the standardizing of fish and our present methods of dealing with that article. There must be an affinity between the standardization and the cull, and if the cull is to be strict the standardization must be particularly so, and the method for culling of fish should also be the authority for standardization. If we have a Board of Trade making one standard of our products, and the Government making another a diversity of opinion will be caused throughout the country. If the Government has the courage to act upon the recommendation of the Committee in relation to the best standard of cull presupposing that they (the committee) will recommend a government standard, it will be one of the best measures passed by this House for many years.

The lowering of the standard of quality is to be deplored as it is evident that the prices have to a great extent been affected by this unfortunate laxity, on the part of those vitally interested.

It is not the result of anything that the fishermen did, but it was the result of the competition among the merchants to obtain the fish. I bear in mind the year after the crash when the fishermen of Trinity Bay and fishermen generally were asked by the merchants to put up a superior article. The fish put up in the previous year could not be sold in the Mediterranean for any money and the merchants were told that they could not sell it unless it was better put up. Circulars were sent round the island asking the people to put up their fish in a better way and to be more particular in salting and curing it. In one place, Scilly Cove, thousands of quintals were made in a splendid way, the men even taking off the "black" according to the Norwegian method. The fishermen could not have put up their fish in a better way and when they brought it on to St. John's in the fall they expected very naturally to receive fifty cents or a dollar more than those who did not make it up well, but they did not get it and since that time in any bay in the colony they (the fishermen) will laugh at you if you suggest that they put it up better because of the way in which the merchants treated the fishermen in that year. What encouragement have the fishermen received ever since to make better fish? None whatever. We have had the talqual system for the past ten years, a system which was not introduced by the fishermen, but by the merchants. This system will ultimately do great harm to both the fisherman and the merchant and I do not think there can be anything more injurious to the standard quality of our fish than a lack of proper cull. We cannot blame the fisherman if he does not take care in making his fish when he does not gain anything by doing so.

We have drifted into this system, but it is still possible to cull codfish to-day. This being so is it not proper that such Resolutions as are before us should be introduced to enable the people, the men who go down to the sea and catch the fish, to obtain information in every particular. If the committee can during the coming year inquire into this matter, the House will be able to see what is best to be done and the Government will be able to bring in a measure to rectify all these matters and to show that it is indeed the fishermen's Government.

I know there will be difficulties in establishing a standard cull of codfish and this will be particularly the case with the Labrador output, for there is such a variety of codfish there and such a difference between the codfish caught on one section of the coast and that caught on another. This difference is not only in the salting and splitting but in the quality itself. On some sections of the coast there is a very thin and small fish while on another section the fish is thicker and fatter and takes more salt. Here is a difficulty and it will be necessary to instruct the splitter, the salter, the curer or master to put up the fish in such a way as to suit the culler. There are so many things to be done (and done properly) before the fish is placed on the culling board and on the proper carrying out of these things depends the quality of our fish in the Foreign markets.

I hope the work of the committee of the Legislature will meet with success for they will be engaged on work that is worthy of the best attention for it must never be forgotten that the fishery is our staple industry and on it our welfare depends. If we meddle with the fishery laws and regulations without the most careful consideration, if we place men on the committee who do not understand the business, if we allow men with prejudices as to the curing of fish to control our legislation, we may make a mistake for which there may be no remedy for many years and which may cost the fishermen of the colony tens of thousands of dollars. The hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman, has shown how easy it is to lose a hundred thousand dollars unseemingly and unwittingly in the marketting of fish.

There is another aspect of this question that we must not overlook, and that is that a large portion of our fish goes to the Mediterranean, especially of what is called 'pickled' fish The difference between 'pickled' fish and 'salt bulk' fish is so great that the people there (the cullers), will not touch a pickled fish without a remark of severe comment. It is a singular thing that in any of the great towns on the other side, in Portugal, Spain Italy or Greece you will find cullers who can tell you a Straits fish from a shore fish, or from a Southern Shore fish, and so on. They take the very greatest precaution in all matters pertaining to codfish and their cullers are very properly trained and fully instructed. Furthermore, they are free and independent, such men as I hope we shall have if we have cullers appointed under a statute. That is one of the reasons why our fish is so well culled over there, and why it is that my hon. friend has said that we have to keep up to their standard, because they have a standard, and they cull fish very severely in three grades. These cullers are sworn and they go to the Customs House every morning before they touch a fish. They have a badge of office that is distinct from any other, and as they are officials of the state or municipality, they are as independent of the merchant as

they are of the party selling the fish. The scales of the weighers are tested every morning and both parties are given every protection. However, the trouble has been that our fish is never up to the standard and is only sought for when there is a scarcity of fish in the Mediterranean ports. Then our fish realizes a big price, as it has all other good qualities except cure.

We make up our fish so badly that we are unable to enter into competition with other countries, and, if we are not careful we shall fall behind, because of new competitors. Iceland for example, was hardly known twenty five years ago in the Mediterranean markets, but today in Malaga, Naples, Genoa, Leghorn, and other ports her fish has the first place. This is not the fault of fish itself or our fishermen, nor is it because they catch a better class of fish in Iceland, but it is the fault of the merchants here who do not export fish to these ports up to the standard required.

In the selection of our cullers we must be very particular for it requires some knowledge to be able to distinguish a 'salt bulk' fish from a 'pickled' fish. Many who handle fish are un able to do it properly, but there are others who can. In warmer countries it is easier to distinguish them, for the 'pickled' codfish turns black and is never dry and hard, whereas the 'salt bulk' fish retains its color and hardness. One of the first things that should be enacted when the Committee presents its report is, that there shall be no 'pickled' fish allowed for exportation, unless it be stated as such on packages.

I realize that it will be a difficult matter to standardize fish at the present time, because it cannot be winked out of sight that since the Government came into power, the price has been so high every year that it was never thought necessary or wise to interfere with the manner in which fish was marketed. Previous to 1908, when we came into power, the price fluctuated between four and five dollars, but since we took control of the colony there has been a uniform price for fish, and there have been abnormal prices. It is stated that next year the price will be seven or eight dollars, and if that be so, there will be a great responsibility on the men who will form the Committee to enquire into the matters referred to in these Resolutions. However, if we can place a law on the Statute Book that will make our product realize a quarter of a million dollars more next year as a result of the labours of the Committee I, for one, am in sympathy with them and I hope their report will be up to expectations.

If you place the imprimatur of the Government on the head of every drum or cask it must have an effect on the foreign buyers and cullers, about whom I have just told you, and in itself it will have the effect of raising the price of fish in the Mediterranean and other ports.

With regard to the lobster fishery, it is a sad fact that fifteen years ago seventy thousand cases were exported, whereas today we export only sixteen thousand. I can remember a good many large factories. It seemed to many that this industry would grow and become more profitable, until one day the late Hon. A. W. Harvey made a very important speech in the Upper House and the lesson of it was, "Take care." He dealt with the way in which the lobster fishery was treated, and he pointed out that, although the industry was then worth thousands of dollars, unless more care was taken in protecting the lobster, in ten years we would have none. His words were almost prophetic. The matter is worthy of the closest attention of those who will look into it, but I wish

to say with regard to the possible closing down of this fishery for any length of time that there will have to be great consideration shown to those of our people who depend on the fishery for their support. The district which I have the honor to represent is with one exception only, the most concerned, for the catch there is the largest, but one, in the Colony. Five years ago when the matter was first mooted, I went to the trouble of finding out the value of the outfit and gear used in the lobster fishery in the district, and I found that in lobster traps alone there was invested the sum of $22,000. These were all in the hands of comparatively poor men. It is a peculiarity of the lobster fishery in our district, that it commences late in March and extends only over April and May, and this is the very time of the year when these people need most a barrel of flour, a gallon of molasses, or a pound of tea. Hon. members will see that the closing down of the lobster fishery even for a season would mean a great loss to these poor men, and their families, and I trust that if anything is done with regard to closing down the fishery, it will not be until the matter has received in every detail the most careful consideration. If you close the fishery down for two or three years, I, as the representative of the people of Placentia and St. Mary's will have to ask this House for some compensation for these men, before you take away from them one of the principal means which they have to enable them to earn a livelihood. I say this now, so that some may not be able to say a year hence that I did not understand the importance of the Resolutions now before us.

As the hon. member for St. George's has pointed out, there are many other fisheries that might be taken up by our people more than at the present time. For instance, the herring fishery ought to be universal and not confined to one or two sections of the coast, as it is at the present time. Another fish that is not caught by our people is the eel, of which there are millions. Thousands of cases of this delicacy could be exported annually to the advantage of our fishermen.

I do not desire to say very much concerning the seal fishery, for unfortunately the people South have not as much material interest in it as they ought to have. We did have at one time, a great interest in it, but of late years the prosecution of the fishery has been centralized in certain portions of the Colony, and, although I know it is my duty to do all I can for all portions of the Colony, nevertheless conditions have changed so much that I cannot help touching on the matter in the way that I am about to do. Twenty-five years ago we had hundreds of men from the South and from the city going to the icefields, but today there are none. It is not for me to say why this is so, but if the fishermen of the country have a common interest and the suppliers have a common interest with the men, it is only natural that the men from Placentia and St. Mary's and other districts South, desire to have an opportunity of participating in this industry, with which have been associated and which has produced such fine, clever men, as Capts. Jackman, Mullowney, Hallern, Ryan. The Southern districts have been deprived of an opportunity of participating in the seal fishery, and although I can obtain men well able to man five of the best steamers, and although Placentia and St. Mary's is the largest fishermen's district in the Island, I find it almost impossible to get a berth to the ice for a man in the dis-

trict, no matter how good or how great his experience may be.

However, I do not wish to say anything that may disparage the seal fishery, for I realize that it is a national asset. I do think that an enquiry into the seal fishery is more necessary than an enquiry into the cod fishery, because it has not been apparent that the cod fishery has been decreasing to any appreciable extent. The catch of seals is decreasing and it is our duty to do as much as possible to preserve the industry. In bringing these Resolutions before the House, the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister impressed upon the House the importance of immediate steps being taken to investigate these matters, and I know no better way in which it can be taken up than that which he has suggested. I trust that out of the deliberations of the Committee will come much beneficial results, and that a measure may be introduced that will help to preserve the seal fishery and other fisheries referred to in the Resolutions.

It has been said here that our sealers have had hard times in the past. That is true, but is it not also true that every 'fisherman' has had a hard time? It was stated here that at one time the sealers received hard tack for their meals eighteen times a week, and that may be correct, but it must be remembered that at the time referred to, the country as a whole was poorly fed. It is only in recent years that people have had an opportunity of living in comparative ease and comfort, and it is unfair to make assertions here that our people were dealt harshly with, when the conditions referred to existed not later than fifteen years ago. I do not wish to be misunderstood in the matter, for I am in favour of the men being fed as well as possible, and I shall support any measure having that in view. What I object to is the unfair manner in which it was placed before this House for conditions throughout the colony at the time referred to, and conditions today are as different as the sun from the moon. There has been a great improvement in the food of the men during recent years, and this has been brought about by the general prosperity of the Colony, and the general intelligence that is now quite evident among our people. Our people now have a higher standard of living, and we are glad of it. The men require better food because they know that conditions now existing warrant them in demanding it. and no captain can get a man now unless he is prepared to feed him properly. The result is that the men on the sealing steamers are living just as well there as they live in their own homes. General prosperity has brought this about, for their is oppor tunity for work on land and on sea. Look at the work in the Mines, in the lumber camps and on the railway. The men will not go to the icefields now under the conditions that they went fifteen years ago, and the result is that they receive food that is as good as they receive in their homes, but no better than they deserve to get.

I have much pleasure, Mr. Chairman in giving my hearty support to the Resolutions, and I reserve any further remarks on the subject until the Report of the Commission is brought before a Committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred, and passed certain Resolutions.

On motion the said Resolutions were read and concurred in.

It was ordered, that a message be sent to the Honourable the Legislative Council, requesting them to appoint a

Committee of their body to confer with the Select Committee of this House on the said subjects.

It was ordered that the Select Committee of this House do consist of the following:—

The Prime Minister, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Kent, the Minister of Finance and Customs, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Hickman, and Mr. Speaker.

Committee of the Whole on Seal Fishery Bill.

On motion of Mr. Coaker, it was ordered that this stand deferred.

Second reading of Bill, An Act to Amend the "Workmen's Compensation Act."

On motion of Mr. Coaker, it was ordered that this stand deferred.

Second reading of Bill to regulate the employment, food and lodging of men in logging camps.

On motion of Mr. Coaker it was ordered that this stand deferred.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister the Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend title I. chap. 2, of the Consolidate Statutes, entitled 'of Representation in the House of Assembly, and the Powers and Privileges thereof,'" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled, "An Act to Povide for the investigation of Combines and Monopolies," was read a second time and ordered to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the suppression of the White Slave Traffic" was read a second time and ordered to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. HALFYARD gave Notice of Question.

MR. ABBOTT gave Notice of Question.

MR. STONE gave Notice of Question.

MR. JENNINGS gave Notice of Question.

MR. KENT gave Notice of Question.

MR. GRIMES gave Notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rise it adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, Feb. 20th, at 3 of the clock in the afternoon. The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, Feb. 20.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. PARSONS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Harbour Grace, signed by 120 men, who are accustomed to hauling wood. They ask that a sum of $50 or $60 be allocated for the making of a path, and those who are using horses will especially appreciate the benefit of having a good path. Trusting that the Government will consider the matter, I ask that the petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. STONE.—I ask leave to present a petition from Port Rexton. They require a sum of money to finish a road there, which was started in 1898. They have been receiving small allocations which have not been sufficient to complete the work. They now ask that a sum of money be granted, which will be sufficient to finish the construction of that road which runs through some agricultural land. I trust that the Government will give it every consideration. I ask leave to present another petition from Port Rexton for the services of the dredge. There are many vessels there which cannot be moored in certain parts on

account of the shallowness of the water. I trust it will be given every consideration. I ask that these petitions be referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support both petitions. I think that attention should be given to them.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Arnold's Cove in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, requesting that a sum of $250 be granted for the repair of the railway connecting road. This road is very much used by the people of the locality. The people around the settlement are much interested in the petition. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition.

MR. F. J. MORRIS.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition presented by Mr. Devereaux. I know the locality. The road is, at present, in a very bad state of repair. It is some 20 years since a vote was granted for the upkeep of these railroad roads. They were built at a great cost, and since then they have never had a grant for their maintenance. Since this road was built, there was never a dollar spent in its upkeep. The railway is of no earthly good to that section of Placentia Bay at present, whereas if we had a good road there could be carriages plying between the settlements and the railway. It is high time for this Legislature to see that this state of things is remedied. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Tilt Cove, Caplin Cove and Shoe Cove, in the District of Twillingate, for a bridge and repairs to a road. The bridge between Tilt Cove and Shoe Cove is in a bad state, and has become unsafe for people to pass over, and should be replaced by a new one. I have much pleasure in presenting this petition, because I believe there is a great need for the bridge to be repaired. I shall ask that the petition be referred to the Minister of Public Works and trust that he will give it his early and favourable consideration. While speaking on this subject, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I can sympathize to a great extent with the honourable member who presented the last petition. He spoke of the condition of many of the main lines of road in his District. I can get information of that in the District that I represent, where the main roads are in a very similar condition. Sufficient money is not spent for their upkeep, and the consequence is that many of the roads are impassable. I wish to call attention of the House to the fact that during the past 2 or 3 years very large sums of money have been granted for roads and bridges and for cable connection, and it is time that some needed repairs were made in many of the public works in the District of Twillingate. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in endorsing the remarks of and the petition presented by my hon. friend, Mr. Clift. As regards the subject matter of that petition, I may say that a few years ago I had occasion to travel that road, and I think it is one of the worst roads in the country. I trust that the petition will be granted, and that they will get a sufficiently large amount to make the road passable.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Northern Bay, asking for some small sums of money for various public matters. I beg to support the petition and I trust that it will have the consideration of the Department of Public Works.

QUESTIONS.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the

table a detailed account of all moneys spent in connection with the repairing and painting of the Court House at Holyrood, from July, 1912, to Sept., 1913.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I beg to say that I tabled that report, but I do not know whether it reached the hands of the hon. member. If necessary, I shall prepare another.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing in details all amounts paid or allocated in the electoral district of Harbour Main out of ordinary, special or surplus trust grants, during the years 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913, giving the dates of such allocations, the names of the parties to whom allocated, and also, the purpose for which allocations were made.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—The statement is in course of preparation.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House an itemized statement showing goods, prices and amounts paid Bishop & Sons and J. Whiteway, on account of goods sent to Bonavista for fire sufferers in 1912; also, a statement showing what amount was paid the Newfoundland Produce Company for delivering said goods.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table that information.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table a statement showing the amount of money, other than local expended by his department at St. Lawrence, and by whom spent, from January 1913, to date.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—That is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the amount of money, other than local, expended at St. Lawrence, and by whom spent, from January 1913 to date.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The answer to the question asked by the honorable member is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to lay on the table of the House a statement of all timber areas on which rentals are due, showing the names of parties by whom said areas are held, and the amount due.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That will be tabled at the next sitting of the House.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a copy of the returns of expenditure on the breakwater at Back Harbour, Twillingate.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The returns for the expenditure amount to $1,288.77. I beg to table copy of them.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House copies of returns of expenditure for the following allocations—$100 to C. Budden, of Michael's Harbor, for repairs of road to light house, and $50 to Charles Hodder of Lewisporte for repairs and cleaning up the mail path from Lewisporte to Salt Pond, Maron's Cove, and Little Burnt Bay.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS—That information is being prepared.

MR. KENT asked the Minister of Public Works for a detailed statement of all payments from Main Line and special grants at Chapel's Cove in Harbour Main District giving names of parties, amounts, and purposes of each payment.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—That is also being prepared.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement showing the names of the parties and the amount paid to each for the sum of $6041.50, spent by T. A. Hall, Government Engineer, on the breakwater at Port de Grave.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg to table the information asked for.

MR. HALFYARD—With regard to the question asked by me, the Minister is partly out. The statement purported to be the answer to a question asked by me on Feb. 9th. I want to know the amounts from July 1912 to Sept. 1913.

I also wish to call the attention of the Colonial Secretary to a question asked on February 9th concerning the material sent to Fogo for the building of a Post Office.

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the honourable member, I may say that I understood that the question had been answered. However if not I will have it tabled to-morrow.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, in reference to the answer given by the Minister of Finance and Customs, with regard to the returns of the money for the bridge at Twillingate, I wish to say a word or two. Some time ago, there was an allocation sent down there and the Minister said the returns were not yet received by the Department. I am sure that the money was spent and I will ask that a telegram be sent, so that we may have the returns promptly.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I shall take a note of it.

SUPPLY RESOLUTION.

The Chairman from the committee of the Whole on Supply reported a Resolution which was read a first time as follows—

Agriculture and Mines, $36,200.

It was moved and seconded that the Resolution be read a second time.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I desire move an amendment. There is no need for me now to elaborate on the reasons for this amendment, as I have already done so at length. Members of the House will recall that in Committee I moved as an amendment to defer consideration of the vote in relation to the department of Agricultural and Mines, until a Minister was appointed to the Department and could take his place in this House

Without further comment, I beg to move the amendment to this resolution:—

"That the said resolution be not "read a second time until a Minister "of Agriculture and Mines shall have "been appointed by the Governor in "Council pursuant to Departmental "Act 1898 either permanently or un- "der an acting appointment and shall "have taken his seat in this House."

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting and seconding the Amendment of the honorable member, Mr. Kent. I think, Sir, that from the exhibition that we had in this House on yesterday afternoon the sooner a Minister of Agriculture and Mines is appointed to take charge of his estimates the better. They should not be left in the hands of one who is not familiar with the details of that vote. I have much pleasure therefore in supporting this amendment.

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared for the amendment:—Messrs. Kent, Cift, Lloyd, Clapp, Hickman, Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Jennings, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Grimes (13); and against it, Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, C.H. Emerson, J.C. Crosbie,

Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereux, Downey, M.J. Kennedy, F. J. Morris, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, LeFeuvre, Currie, Higgins, G. Kennedy, Young, Walsh (18); so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion for adoption of the Resolution was put. and there appeared in favor of it—Rt Hon. Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, C.H. Emerson, J.C. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works,Messrs. Devereaux, Downey, M.J. Kennedy,F. J. Morris, Moore, Moulton, Parsons, LeFeuvre, Currie, Higgins, C. Kennedy Young, Walsh (18); and against it Messrs. Kent, Clift, Lloyd, Clapp,Hickman, Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Jennings, Targett, Winsor, Abbott Grimes (13); so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

SUPPLY.

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.

The Honorable the Speaker leaves the Chair and Mr. Parsons takes the Chair of Committees.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer to a matter in connection with our Railways and Railway Roads When on my canvass in Trinity last autumn I arrived one night at Come-By-Chance. One of the difficulties was to get accomodation for the night. Through the courtesy of the telegraph operator, I found accomodation for the night. Whilst there, he drew my attention to the state of affairs at the station. He pointed out that there was no accomodation there, either for freight or passengers. My hon friend Mr. Morris has represented that the connecting roads are impassable; but not only is the connecting road bad here, but there is no place for shelter from the weather and no accomodation for the freight. There was a shed about two thirds the size of the table—for the freight. I think that the Government should do something in this matter. I was much struck with the stations and accommodations provided on the new branches. But that only accentuates the necessity for better accommodation on the old track. This is particularly so on the Isthmus between Trinity and Placentia Bays. And while people must have the advantages provided for on the branch lines attention must be called to the accomodation on the old track. In the case I have mentioned there is no accomodation for protection of passengers from the weather and no accomodation for freights. This applies also to Northern Bight. I merely draw attention to the matter so that the Government will be able to see that provision is made in the near future.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the hon. member as to what he has said regarding the so called station at Come By Chance. It is on the Ithmus between the bays and was used in former years by the people of Bay Bulls Arm and Come By Chance. I have received during the session several communications in connection with the matter and I hope that the matter will be taken into consideration. While the learned Doctor was speaking favorably of the Bonavista line we have had some improvement made on the old line. At Arnold's Cove there is a very fine station with a telegraph office and other conveniences. As to the road to the station this was repaired by the Morris Government and is now in reality a main line, and there is no statutory grant for its upkeep. While on this matter I think I may say that connecting roads as a whole are in

poor condition. At Little Harbor is this particularly so. There is about three miles of road and it has been opened for 20 years and there has been no grant made for it. Consequently the road is impassable so that the people are compelled to go to Arnold's Cove to get to St. John's. I hope the petition I presented to-day will receive the consideration of the government. I hope that the question of connecting roads will be taken up and reports made whenever possible. Long Harbor Crossing is a road built 33 years ago, some 5½ miles long, and no money has been spent on it except now and again $50 or $100.
I feel under an obligation to the learned doctor for bringing the matter befor the House and I hope it will receive the earnest consideration of the Government at an early date.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in supporting my colleague, Dr. Lloyd and my friend Mr. Devereaux in this matter. On one or two occasions I have had to pay visits to these places and the stations are really very bad. I was caught at one of them at 11 o'clock at night in a snowstorm and had to walk to Cat Harbor. I hope the Government will consider such a long felt want. I congratulate the learned gentlemen for bringing the matter before the House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to look into this matter and bring it before the Company. I think the stations referred to are what is known as flag stations, and there is no regular station or operator there. There are quite a number of those in the country, and it would be a matter that will have to be considered, and whether regular stations can be substituted will depend upon the traffic that goes through. There are a number that would justify a regular station and telegraph office. During the last five or six years in the late administration a great many of these stations were done away with and regular stations were constructed. I will bring the matter before the Company, and have a report made and see if the matter can be dealt with.

As regards the providing special grants for roads, that has been coming up for the last 30 years. It is a very large question, and when taken up it will mean a very large expenditure. I cannot say off-hand how many roads have been opened up since the first vote on main lines, but those at present must be at least a hundred. These have been kept up by special grants, additional grants and surplus grants. For the last five years there have been large surpluses, and these have been divided up among the districts in marine grants and road grants. It is a great hardship to have railway connecting roads, agricultural roads and other important roads going into disrepair for want of grants. One of the things they are suffering from particularly in the agricultural portion of the country, is the want of good roads for horses, cattle, etc. It is no small matter. And it will have to be considered at an early date, and if possible something will be done. Some districts have less need than others. Those who know the history of roads in this country will know that large sums of money have been spent on capital account on the construction of main lines in some parts of the country, while other districts have never had a dollar. Only two years ago I went down to St. Barbe. The few roads they have there were built by the economy of the representatives in the expenditure of ordinary grants. Take Burgeo. There is not a road from Channel to the eastern boundary of the district. In other districts there are miles and miles of road. Then you have to consider the size of

various districts. Compare Carbonear and then take St. Barbe with 700 miles of coast line, and St. George's with practically 500 miles of coast line, so that there are very important matters to be considered in going into this question. But I think the matter will have to be taken up and considered in the near future.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that this matter has come up. If any steps are to be taken I would suggest to the Government to vote a sum of money for the construction of a road from Bonne Bay to Port Saunders, which is a magnificent tract of land for agriculture. It would be an encouragement to the people to start agriculture. In his report several years ago, Mr. Blackall spoke of this magnificent tract of land. It is equal to Prince Edward Island, and has tracts of wild grass standing 4½ feet high. I hope the matter will receive the earnest consideration of the Government, and I assure the Committee that the people will welcome such an undertaking.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, in regard to the question of the propagation of lobsters. Mr. Dee in his report states that in the last year the falling off in the catch has amounted to 21,000,000 lobsters. These figures are very serious and require a great deal of attention and consideration, which I trust they will receive when the matter comes before the Committee appointed last night. Mr. Dee supplies a great deal of information, and although I do not agree with a great deal that he has done, I must congratulate him on this report. I believe he has devoted quite a lot of time in preparing it. He says that in the District of St. George's it took 281 lobsters to fill a case. I make bold to say that the figure approached nearer 400. A great many of these lobster packers do not take the trouble to keep tally of the number of lobsters packed, and there are some who would not report it. I am satisfied that in St. George's the figure was very near 400 to the case. He says in Fortune Bay it took 307. There is no district in the country has smaller lobsters than Fortune Bay. The fishery has been overworked, so I think that 307 does not come within 100 of the truth. Twillingate is marked as 179 for the average. In its best years it took 150 on an average. And I think that now 250 is probably near it.

I started lobster packing 26 years ago in Green Bay. I went down there at the age of 16. We often took 20,000 in a day, and we used to pay about 60 cents a hundred, and out of that 20,000 we often threw away 15,000. I have seen as high as 14,000 dumped out at one time. This was a serious matter, and a lot of people did report it, but no action was taken. Saturday was the day we took large quantities of lobsters. It happened this way. All the week the fishermen would go around catching them. There was no trouble about it. All they had to do then was to hook them. Then twenty skiffs would arrive on Saturday with lobsters. So that in one day as many as 20,000 would come from a radius of ten miles. There was tremendous waste of this valuable wealth of the country. And no steps were taken to stop it. Now we are waking up to find the lobster fishery gone, and we are too late. What can we do? How can we make these things better? Mr. Dee tries to make out that these things can even now be remedied. I have no doubt that there are not 50 out of the 5,631 men engaged in the lobster catching ever throws a lobster back, because they do not know that they have caught a female lobster. Very few can tell whether they are male or female, and no one can tell whether male or female from the

back. They are simply caught by the back ,and in the rush they are simply thrown into the boat without a thought. No one thinks of throwing them back. Not because they do not know, but because they will not do it. The lobster today is worth 10 cents. The Government offers five. There will not be fifty who carry out the law. When I was fishing lobsters, I was farming at the same time. It was to my advantage to protect the ground I was fishing, and I would not allow anyone to catch there. It was worth $300 a year to me besides being a great pleasure. After working on the farm all day, I would go out for two or three hours on the water. And I used to protect the spawning lobster. But as soon as I gave up, 8 or 10 men came and cleaned up the ground, and now you would not get half a case where you used to get 20. It is no use to make laws. You must close down. No Select Committee can suggest anything else than to shut it down, and it will have to be done in sections. You cannot close down the whole fishery. As Mr. Winsor said about the sealfishery, if you drop the market, it is ten chances to one you will not get it back.

It would be just the same with the lobster business. We have got markets for our lobsters now which are eager to get all we can give them, but if we close down the whole country, we will find that these people will substitute some other article to take the place of lobsters, and it would be difficult to get those markets back again. We would simply have to go over again years of toil. The Japanese crab is a very cheap thing, but it is almost as large as many lobsters which are being packed now. I had some last year, and there is very little difference between them and the lobster. Of course, a man used to lobsters would know the difference. These crabs can be packed and sold for $10 a case, while our lobsters cannot be sold for less than $30 a case, so that we will have to be careful that these do not get into our markets. The proper thing to do would be to close down the country in sections. Put a close season on one section of the country for a couple of years, and then on another, but don't close down altogether. We cannot afford to do it. I notice by Mr. Dee's report that he says:—

"On may 8th last, I was in a settlement in Placentia Bay, arranging for the carrying out of our propagation system. A man passed in the harbour in his dory. I went to interview him. After stating my plans of collecting the egg-bearing lobsters and putting them in a reservation nearby, he expressed himself as delighted with the scheme. "But," said he, "I haven't seen a spawner this year yet." I said, "You have two in your dory now." This statement he denied. I then asked him to throw up his catch of 17 lobsters on the stage, out of which I showed him two large lobsters, one 12 and the other 12½ inches in length, each of which contained not less than 50,000 eggs, or 100,000 eggs in both. He claimed that he did not know he had them. If I had not been there at the time there would be the making of 100,000 lobsters destroyed in one day by one man, because of the lack of interest and intelligence in the very means that gave him and those dependent on him their living; and that man only gives an example of what the greater number of them are doing. Then there is the man that is afraid that if he puts the lobster back into the water it will be caught in another man's trap, and that he will bring it in and cook it."

That was a rather peculiar statement, that a fisherman should say that he did not have any spawning lobsters

in his boat, while when the Inspector examined them he found two with from 50 to 100 thousand eggs in them. I cannot understand how a fisherman could not know a male from a female lobster. The only reason I can give is that the fishermen tried to deny having any spawning lobsters because the spawn was not developed on the tail. Of course, anybody would not be able to distinguish them, but it is very easy to discover which is which. If you are going to identify spawning lobsters by the fact that they have spawn on their tails, you are making a great mistake because it is only when the spawn is fully developed that it appears on the tail. They carry spawn internally.

The Inspector says:

"Then there is another class of man who is dishonest enough to brush the eggs from the lobsters, where they are as lost to the stock as if they had never existed, because they had not been fully developed, according to the laws of nature, under the mother care; also, the egg bearing lobsters are generally a large quality, and bring a few cents more in the can than is being paid by the Department for their preservation, which is five cents each."

That is true, too. There are men who are dishonest enough as soon as they get a lobster with developed spawn to brush the spawn off, so that it won't be discovered that they have a spawning lobster. Now the spawning lobster fully developed has a red color while a lobster carrying undeveloped spawn is black or dark green. The children sometimes give a lobster carrying undeveloped spawn this red hue by dipping the lobster in boiling water, and then they sell it for spawning lobster.

The Inspector goes on to say:

"When we consider that the young lobster fry leads a free swimming life for about the first three weeks of its existence, near the surface of the water, like particles of dust, a prey to all the thousands of other fishes that are continually seeking food, and feasting on any live object that comes their way, the victim of every storm and current that sweeps hither and thither against the land, all must admit that the rate of survival must be small indeed."

Now, I pointed out in one of my speeches that it was easy to hatch the losbters from those incubators but that, as soon as hatched, the small fish were devoured as soon as they were put in the water. It will be noticed that the Inspector bears out that statement. The whole trouble begins after they put the fry into the water.

"But in Notre Dame Bay, like Placentia and Fortune Bays, the fishermen objected to having the producers taken from their own locality—in fact, they stubbornly refused to save them, unless we placed them near their own fishing grounds, but in this instance we adopted the reservation plan right along the coast with which the fishermen as a unit were in full sympathy."

That is a serious thing. But the fishermen are not prepared to have the lobsters collected on their grounds taken somewhere else. They want the lobsters put on their own ground, and unless you do that, they won't make any attempt to save them. They object to having the producers taken from their own locality, because they feel that if they are taken only ten or fifteen miles away, and put in reservation, that they will never come back, and that they will never be any good to them.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— But it is only the lobsters which are about to be canned that the men are asked to sell. The Inspector only

wants to buy the lobsters that have been caught, and are about to be canned.

MR. COAKER—But the point is that the fishermen feel that if the lobster is taken away, it will never do him any good.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Precisely, but it will do him as much good as if it were put in a can.

MR. COAKER—Yes, but in a can he gets 10 cents for it, while the price paid for saving them is only five cents. Then again, men are very selfish as a rule, and are not content to allow somebody twenty miles away to get the benefit of a lobster which they have caught. Of course, you have got to get the people educated to view the matter in a proper light. The position now is as I have stated it. I would suggest that the Inspector pay as much for the lobster as the fisherman can get elsewhere,and then the fishermen will be only too glad to save them. And if you want to be certain of getting them, then authorize the Inspector to pay more—let him pay 15 cents for the lobster instead of five.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—What is the value of a lobster today, out of the water?

MR. COAKER—Well, the Inspector says that it takes 179 to fill a case. That case is worth $23.50. The expenses are only about $2. So that, divide 179 into $21.50 and you will get an idea of what a lobster is worth.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—What was the price of lobsters twenty years ago, when you were in the business?

MR. COAKER—We paid 60 cents a hundred for them, and sold them for $6 a case. So that lobsters have increased four hundred per cent. since that time, and now every man is canning his own lobsters, and that makes them more valuable to himself. I would advise you to pay a fair price for the lobsters and then you will find that instead of the three per cent. to which Mr. Dee refers, fifty per cent. of the lobsters which are caught are spawn lobsters.

"I might say that out of the 29.450 lobsters caught by 21 packers, we collected only the above mentioned 968 egg-bearing lobsters, or 3 per cent. of the total, while in 1912 the average seeded lobster to the hundred was 8 per cent. This shows one of the two deplorable features of this fishery—either that the fishermen do not appreciate the effort that is being made to protect and foster this industry, or that as the fishery declines the source of production is becoming weaker, and that both factors are working overtime to bring about the end."

That is Mr. Dee's report. A little further on he says:

"Here is a little illustration. Mr. John Woodman reports for 3,900 lobsters, but he only gets 28 spawners; Mr. Robert Shea's returns show 2,-000 lobsters, but only 14 spawners: Mr. Henry Smith's returns show 1,-500 lobsters caught, but he only found 10 spawners."

If that were a correct statement of the facts, the propagation of the lobster fishery would be a very difficult matter, but these are not the facts. The point of course is, that these men will not give in all the spawn lobsters which they catch.

"It will be seen that the vast District of Twillingate had for the past season 204 licenses, and caught 133.-540 lobsters of a large size, as is shown by the average of 179½ to the case. The total catch shows an average to each license in Notre Dame Day of 654 lobsters, or 86,328 lobsters caught by the 132 factories visited by the collector. I may say that some of these license holders were merely in

name, a great many not fishing for lobsters at all."

"We collected from the fishermen in these Bays 5,787 egg-bearing lobsters, or a little over 6½ per cent of the total catch, not one of which was less than 10 inches long, and about 1,000 that were caught about Birchy, Loo Bay, and Dildo Runs, were not less than 13 inches in length, and all full of the well-developed eggs."

That would be 3 per cent. more than were caught on the West Coast.

"In my whole round of Notre Dame Bay this season, I did not meet one man who knew that he was breaking the law by cooking and packing the spawn bearing lobsters. It required considerable talking to explain to the people how they were destroying their own bread and butter, but they quickly caught the idea, and highly approved of the Government's action. In undertaking this course, it is to be regretted that the means at our disposal for this work do not enable us to operate in all the districts, owing to their vast extent."

That is a wonderful statement.

"I must again call the attention of the Government to the salt water pond on Chappel Island, in Fortune Bay, and referred to in my report of 1912 as to its importance as a lobster hatchery, and in which I asked the Government to reserve it for that purpose."

You could not do anything better than reserve these ponds. I believe that there are many such ponds as these around the country, and they ought to be reserved for this purpose. Get all the spawning lobsters you can, and put them in, and don't allow anybody to catch lobsters within a certain radius of the place. After a time you will find that there will be a wonderful increase.

The Inspector says:

"I managed to prevent any fishing in it the past season, and on the 10th of July, in company with Mr. John Fudge, a fisherman of Belleoram, I baited five old dilapidated traps and set them in the pond. The next morning we had 15 lobsters, of an average size of 9½ inches long, four of which were full of well deveolped spawn. Removing these to the furthest end of the pond, after marking them, we baited and set again, and on the following day we caught 14 more, four of which were egg-bearing. Two of these were 8 inches, one 8½, and one 9 inches long—8 spawners out of 29 lobsters in this pond. In looking over the bottom of this pond with a glass, I could see very many lobsters, and when there are any to be seen, there are thousands burrowed out of sight."

That shows that in that Bay lobsters were plentiful. I have taken seven or eight lobsters out of a trap in the morning. Sometimes I would put a trap down and for three or four days would not get a lobster, and then perhaps one morning I would go out and find six or seven in the trap. Now, he says he got fifteen lobsters the next morning out of five old traps, which he put out, and that out of 29 lobsters in the pond he caught 8 spawners. Now, that is 35 per cent. of the lobsters. He states before in his report that there were only about 3 per cent. spawners when one fisherman caught them, while now from his own knowledge, when he caught them himself, he found an average of 35 per cent.

The Inspector then refers to the fact that it is useless to cancel the fisherman's license. He cannot be prevented from fishing, and his neighbour will pack his lobsters and take the responsibility of his pack by supplying his own label, or he may apply for such license in the name of any member of his family and get it. I find, says the Inspector, that the fish-

ermen merely smile when threatened with the loss of their licenses.

That is a thing which I daresay is reported to the department from year to year. It is a positive fact that the fishermen laugh at this threat. It is useless to say to a man, "If you don't observe the law, you will lose your license," because he can fish all the same. Here is the course which Mr. Dee recommends:—

"It should also be arranged that every applicant for license should swear to be careful to note every egg-bearing lobster, no matter how small the lobster or few the eggs, and place them back again into the water on the fishing grounds, or hand them over to some authorized person, who will place them into a reservation selected for that purpose; and, when the lobster season is over, each fisherman should be made swear to the number of egg-bearing lobsters caught during the season, for which he is to be paid."

It is no good to make a law compelling men to swear as to how many egg-bearing lobsters they take out of the water. The easiest way is to pay them 15 cents each for spawning lobsters, and then you will find that you will get them.

"It is necessary to establish a better system of placing wardens on the coast, as the present one is of no use whatever. There is a unanimous desire on the part of the fishermen that this work, so well begun, be continued and extended to its utmost."

The Committee may remember what I said in connection with this matter when addressing them the other day. I stated that some years ago, when I was a warden, I sent in a report in which I told the Fisheries Department that if they wanted to waste money all they had to do was to appoint fishery wardens. The present system of wardens is of no use whatever and if you are going on as you did last year, and as you have been doing for the last 20 years, you will simply be wasting money. These wardens do not do one iota of good.

I fully agree with the remarks made by Mr. Kent last evening in connection with the Department of Marine and Fisheries. He said that there should be at the head of that Department an able man, and that under him he should have an able staff, and that the Department should be doing a good deal of work which it is not doing now. All the observations which he has made, I can confirm. There is no Department in the country today at the head of which you require a better man than the Fisheries Department. The best man that you have in your ranks is the man whom you ought to have there. The Premier, if you like, ought to be Minister of Marine and Fisheries. There is no Department in the public service which can do more good, or which has a stronger connection with the commercial affairs of the Colony. If you go on putting a man there who will merely draw his salary and make a noise, as you have done and as all other Governments have done, since 1898 when the Department was established, you will be committing a huge blunder. You have men down in that Department who have nothing to do except spend money—send out grants, look after applications and send out lobster and salmon labels. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would only get to work with all his heart and soul for the next six months, you can hardly realize how much good he would do for the country, that is, if he had the power to carry out his ideas. I believe that the Government, if they want it to do any good, and if they want to make a success of the proposals which were tabled here last night, will have to reorganize that Department. You will have to get better men there. You will

have to get a man as good as can be got in the country and I tell you this, that if you can find a man in the country who is not a member of this House, whom you think will make a better Minister than you have now, we will find a vacancy for him in any of the Union districts. We want the best Government possible, and we will never have that until we put the very best possible men at the heads of the various Departments. Find your man and we will find a seat for him. We won't care what party he serves as long as he makes a success of the Fisheries Department. Fishery rules are all right, if only they are carried out. A lot of money is spent in paying wardens to carry out the law, and now Mr. Dee tells us the system is no good. Now, what are you going to do to improve the system? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been two weeks over in Burin, and when he comes back and as soon as the Spring opens he is going away to represent the Grand Lodge of British America. We have had no Minister of Fisheries in the House for days. If you want us to support the Fishery Memorials which you have just brought down, and if you want us to help you to do something that was never done before to uplift the country, you must show us that you are sincere. Much can be done in the next four years if you choose to get down to work and do it. Take this matter of the fresh fish business. I would be delighted to see the Minister of Fisheries making up his mind that he is going to the United States as soon as this House closes to see what chance there is of doing something with regard to getting somebody to come down here and put up our fish in the various ways suited to the American market. The other day I had an interview with Mr. Clouston and he told me what he has been doing and showed me the several ways in which he is putting up fish. I was surprised to find that he was doing such work. He packs the fish in boxes imported from Gloucester and costing about three cents each and he gets about 18 cents a pound for it, and he tells me that he can get orders for 500 times more than he can supply. He says he has got orders from all parts of Canada. I asked him what about sending away an agent. He said that it would not do any good because he has more orders now than he can handle. Now, there is any amount of fish down North. You could get all the fish that it would be possible to send to those markets. It would cost about $1.00 a quintal to put it up in labor in the condition in which he wants it to send away. Mr. Clouston says that he can afford to give the highest price that is paid for fish, and in fact a little more. As I say, it would cost about $1.00 in labour to put up this fish, and that money would be kept in the country. Now, who is going to get to work and get this thing done? The market is there for any amount of fish and you could pay for fish $1.00 more than is being paid to-day. Who will take an interest in it? You cannot expect men on Water Street to do it. You can't expect Mr. Clouston to do it, because as soon as he establishes a market, you will find half a dozen men coming in and reaping the profits of the business which he has built up. Something should be done by the Government. There are any amount of ways in which the Government could help. There is lots of money spent in connection with other matters which are not half as important as this. Now, I hope the Government will turn over a new leaf and take these things into consideration and endeavour to make the fisheries more valuable than they are now and see what a difference it will make to the country. I was speaking to Mr. Thompson down at the Institute the

other day and he told me that dogfish is a valuable fish, and that it is sold in England under the name of Rock Salmon. He says it is one of the best fishes which you can get to eat and almost equal to salmon. Of course, it has an awful appearance. But, you know, dogfish is the purest so far as flesh goes, of any fish, because it feeds on fresh fish. It is not a scavenger at all. It goes out for live fish and consequently its flesh is good. You will find a market in England for this fish. Now, we have here any amount of it. All you want to do is catch it.

I have not the slightest doubt but that we will see a reformation take place in this country during the next four years in connection with the fisheries. We can enhance their value fifty per cent, but in order to do this we will require to put in hard work and have competent men at the head of the Department. If the officials are going to work only five or six hours a day then nothing will be done and it would be far better to pay five thousand dollars to a competent head of the Fishery Department who would work for ten hours a day. As far as the seal fishery is concerned we seem to be content year by year to make no effort to ascertain from a scientific point of view, the habits of the seals and the conditions under which they live. We know absolutely nothing about their life nor the period of gestation, nor how soon they produce their young. Some people say once a year while others are of the opinion that it is much longer. From my observations in Green Bay, I have not the slightest doubt that the seal breeds once a year. Some protection should also be given to the seals which are known as the rangers which inhabit the rivers. Again,what do we know about the food of the seal. It is said they live on cod fish which if true it would be far better for us if we never saw a seal for the reason, that if we have a million seals around our coast the destruction of codfish must be tremendous. I have never known a captain of a sealing-steamer to take the trouble to find out what the seal actually does eat, and, it is very important we should know it. A great deal of valuable knowledge would be obtained if the Government would hire a steamer like the "Neptune" or "Terra Nova" to leave St. John's about the 15th of February and follow the old seals north to the breeding ground watch all their actions and find out where they breed and the particular kind of foods on which they live. In order to do this it would be necessary to kill occasionally a couple of old seals when full information could be obtained as to the particular kind of food consumed by the seals. We ought to know how many seals breed in the Straits. We know absolutely nothing about the seal fishery from a scientific point of view, and a great difference of opinion exists amongst our own practical men about the habits and food of the seals. We have been told over and over again that the killing out of the whale is to a large extent the cause of the scarcity of bait during the last few years. The resolutions discussed here yesterday provide for enquiries to be made concerning the whale fishery with a view to protecting those mammals,but it would not be found such an easy matter, as some people may suppose. What are we going to do if the Select Committee will report that the killing out of the whales has an injurious effect upon our bait supply. Would it not be better to tax each factory a couple of thousand dollars a year and if the owners did not feel inclined to pay it they could drop out of the business altogether. No doubt if this

Legislature were to close up the whale factories the owners would be looking for compensation, but, such payment should not be entertained for one moment. Last night the hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman, in speaking of the fishery resolutions stated that the credit system had something to do with the indifferent cure of fish. I agree with the hon. member, that the credit system has a great deal to do with the bad cure of fish for it is only reasonable to assume that a man will not take the trouble to turn out a good cure unless some inducement by way of higher price is held out to him. If a fisherman realized that unless his cure was up to a certain standard he would get a less price for his fish, he would take very good care to see that it was well cured. I do not agree with the hon. member for Bay de Verde that the cullers should be under the control of the magistrates or should be ex-policemen. We must have a commission composed of representatives of the Board of Trade, fishermen, government and others who would have full charge of carrying out all rules and regulations with regard to the cull and standardization of fish. I am very glad to learn from the hon. member for St. George's that he was instrumental in inducing the Gorton Pew Co. to come to this country, for I always understood that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had taken to himself that credit. I trust that when the select committee appointed last night on fishery matters will make its report to this House, we will have many valuable suggestions which we will be able to accept unanimously The representatives of the Fishermen's Union in this House cannot take part in the deliberations of that Committee for reasons which I gave yesterday afternoon, but. at the same time we will watch its proceedings and the evidence of any member of the F.P.U. will be at their disposal should they require it. Every representative of the F.P.U. in this House is desirous of improving the conditions of the fishermen and nothing will be allowed to interfere with that object. The fishermen are at present better represented in this House than they have been in the past thirty years, consequently useful legislation in connection with our fisheries should be brought into existence. Our party will do everything in our power to bring about good results, and I hope the Government will lose no time in getting to work to bring about some alterations in the present system as carried on by the fisheries department. The hon. member for Hr. Grace, Mr. Piccott would probably make a very good Minister of Agriculture and Mines, but he is not and never will be competent to fill the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries which should be filled by the very best man in the country.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I judge from the report of Mr. Dee and the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down, that an honest man the noblest of God's creation, was not to be found, engaged in the lobster fishery. It seems to me that a plan could be formulated to arrest the decline of this fishery and that if we paid 15 cents for each egg-bearing lobster put back in the sea we should hold out a sufficient inducement to the fishermen to carry out the rules and regulations in this respect. Some people are of opinion that when the female lobster is removed from its own pound to another locality the propagation is interfered with, but, I think that if we can succeed in having the egg-bearing lobster returned to the sea, we need not trouble about the propagation. I remember distinctly many years ago when the lobster

fishery was far different to what it is at the present day. I distinctly recollect the time when Mr. White commenced operations up north. At that time three men would have very little trouble in filling up a boat with lobsters in one day, and very often the supply exceeded the demand and many thousands were thrown away. We now see how unwise people were in those days not to have taken measures for the protection of the lobsters. I fully concur with the hon. member Mr. Coaker in his remarks about the wardens for I consider that under the present conditions their employment is only a waste of money. I notice that we have a vote in the Marine and Fisheries estimates of five hundred dollars for the protection of herring which fishery I think is capable of tremendous developments. Something must be done to obtain better prices for our herring. In looking over Mr. Dee's report, I find that seventy three thousand eight hundred and fifty-four barrels of pickled herring were put up last year which were valued at two hundred and nineteen thousand sixty dollars, or an average of two dollars and ninety-six a barrel. I believe that every man packing herring would welcome any information in connection with the cure which would result in a better price for the fish. In Green Bay herring are very plentiful on the south side in the months of May and June, and they are to be found in large quantities on the North side of the Bay during the autumn months. If we could obtain sufficient information to enable our fishermen to adopt the Scotch cure they would very quickly become proficient at the work and they would receive a far higher remuneration for their labours than they do at present. The report of Mr. Dee on the herring fishery seems to point out all its defects but suggests no remedy.

He gives as one of the reasons why the herring fishery is not more profitable that every man is his own cooper and makes his own packages and in some cases owing to lack of skill in this work and in other cases owing to actual dishonesty the herring packed by these men often turn out bad. Now I do not know if Mr. Dee has come up against many of these cases, but I know that in the neighbourhood in which I live every man engaged in this herring fishery makes his own packages, and he makes them good as he wishes to have the pack good in order to get good prices. I think that Mr. Dee has been wrongly informed in this connection. I have been in the business for about thirty years catching our own herring making the packages and putting up the herring in these packages and I think I am pretty well acquainted with the herring fishery in the district of Twillingate. I have packed one barrel according to the Scotch method, but there is no difficulty in doing that if you understand it and if you are going to get a better price. Of course the packages have to be made larger but that is not very difficult. What we want is information regarding the markets, and that we can get a better price for a better pack and we are ready to meet that demand at any time. I should like to see the herring fishery included in the Resolutions now before the Committee.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a remark or two in relation to this matter and I do so merely to obtain some information. As the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is absent I will probably have to wait till he comes back. The question I want to ask is, what is a fishery warden? I have heard of fishery wardens as being in different places. I would like to know what is the duty of a fishery warden. Perhaps the

Prime Minister can answer me.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—The duty of fishery wardens in this country is to see that the fishery rules are carried out and to prosecute in every case a violation of these rules.

MR. COAKER—What they usually do is go over their territory once a year and then draw their wages.

MR. TARGETT—I would now like to ask another question. Is a fishery warden supposed to go all round a district and is he supposed to visit places where lobsters are packed.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Every warden has his district defined and he is supposed to supervise that district and see that the rules are carried out in his district. Each one has a certain section of the country.

MR. TARGETT—I would now like to ask if these fishery wardens receive a salary and who pays them.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In every case they receive a salary and in every case it is paid by the Government of the Colony.

MR. TARGETT—Is there a fishery warden in Trinity district.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I cannot say for certain, but I imagine there is. I will have a list of the fishery wardens prepared to-morrow for the hon. member's information.

MR. TARGETT—The reason I ask these question is that I have been packing lobsters for about twenty years and I have not seen any fishery warden around to ask me any questions. I mean I have not seen one come to my place. I sometimes met a man on the road or on somebody's wharf and he asked me for information as to the lobsters I had got, how many pots I had out, and so on and certainly I tried my best to give what information I could. But I was not aware that he was getting a salary from the Government. If I had I should not have given him any satisfaction until he had regularly come to my place and inspected it and got his information on the spot. I should then have given him every satisfaction. Now down around Trinity Bay we do not know much about the laws, but I understand you are not allowed to keep any seedy lobsters. Now that law is of very little use because where you find one man throwing away these lobsters you find a hundred keeping them. Every year it is getting more difficult to observe this law. I believe that this law is a good one and always put back these lobsters myself, but there are lots of factories that do not throw away theirs. There is no one to see that the law is enforced and you can do as you like about it. I believe that it is better to throw them away, you will get better result in the long run, but another man may not see it this way and will not throw them away. I think that the law should be more strictly enforced. The lobster fishery is decreasing every year, and I think some thing should be done at once to try and preserve this industry, because it is a great industry. Some hon. member made a remark that it was better than the seal-fishery. If that is the case I think we should endeavour this year to make some amendments to the laws that have been made and see if we cannot get something better done. I believe that many of these men are unwilling to throw away these lobsters because they get nothing for them and I think that the fishery commission should do something in this matter. These men should be paid for these lobsters which they throw away. I do not wish to delay the time of the House, but I think that we should do something to protect the lobster fishery.

MR. CURRIE.—Mr. Chairman, I should like to make an observation or two on this most important matter,

rather with the desire of emphasizing some of the ideas expressed during the debate this evening. The various speakers have enlarged on the fact that in connection with our fishing industry a great deal of waste is going on, particularly in connection with our bait fishes. That is unfortunately only too true, especially with those valuable little fishes, the caplin. They come to our shores in huge schools, mostly during the month of June, and our people destroy them with a recklessness that is appalling. Tons of them are caught and never used. A small proportion is kept and cured for eating, and in many places large areas of ground are covered with them for fertilizing purposes. The quantity generally taken is out of all proportion to the requirements for bait. The caplin is a very prolific breeder, and the destruction of so many female caplin and the loss of so much spawn if continued must ultimately result in the extinction of the fish. Unless our people are taught to be more careful and more economical in taking these fishes, there can never be any hope of a continuous and plentiful bait supply. The hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, discussed the effect of the whale fishery on the bait supply. This is an old story. I have heard it discussed over and over again; it was a live topic in the District of Burin the past Fall. I am very doubtful, however, as to whether there is anything in the claim that the caplin, particularly, come to the shore because the whales are behind driving them. I have talked this matter over with a good many knowing fishermen and have also read something of the habits of the fish, and I am inclined to the conclusion that the whales have very little to do either with the presence or absence of bait fishes on our coast. They come to the shore to perform the natural function of spawning; they come whether the whales are on the outside or not.

MR. COAKER.—You are wrong there.

MR. CURRIE.—I am giving the opinion of many fishermen and the opinion expressed by many writers. The caplin come in to spawn.

MR. COAKER.—Not always. They do not always come to land.

MR. CURRIE.—They mostly do.

MR. COAKER.—Yes, if something is driving them.

MR. JENNINGS.—I have known cases where they did not come to shore to spawn.

MR. CURRIE.—That is probably so, but mostly the caplin spawn in shallow water. Further, it is generally contended by those who claim to know, and is asserted by whalers who have examined whales for the purpose of finding out, that whales do not eat caplin. I have heard that statement made, and I have also read it. The hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Jennings, informed us the other afternoon that caplin were more plentiful in Green Bay this year than ever before. That may be merely a coincidence, but what drove them to the shore in such large numbers, if, as has been contended, the whales have been mostly destroyed around the coast? They came to spawn. The same carelessness and waste has existed in connection with the herring fishery. There used to be a great industry in connection with this fishery down in Placentia Bay, but owing to the methods pursued, that fish was practically exterminated. There was the same reckless destruction of those fish without any thought for the future. The hon. member, Mr. Jennings, referred to the possibilities of this industry, which everyone must admit. There was a time, twenty to fifty years ago, when Labrador herring were famous in Canada and the United States, and there were large mar-

kets for these fish in Montreal and Boston. That industry has practically been destroyed and lost to the country through the careless and dishonest way in which they were packed. Some years ago when in Boston I was informed that many so-called barrels of Labrador herring were largely filled with stones or moss, any kind of old fish, and in some instances the bodies of dogs. The consequence of this was the purchasers lost faith in our pack, and to-day we are paying the penalty. As Mr. Hickman has so rightly pointed out, it is impossible for us to get into any market unless we put up our fish in a manner to suit that market. The American market now offers an opportunity which we should not allow to pass. Our utmost endeavours should be utilized to secure a hold on this market, and to that end, the greatest care should be taken to see that the quality of fish supplied is just that needed. The Americans themselves are not asleep to the possibilities which the free entry of fish into their country opens up, and already efforts are being made by them to secure an interest in our fisheries. They are already, so I am reliably informed, coming down here and entering into competition with our fishermen on the West Coast. It is, of course, contrary to our laws for them to take bait on our coasts or fish within the three-mile limit, but they are evading the laws by having their vessels registered locally and engaging Newfoundland captains and crews. The Government, I understand, are looking into this matter, and it will need to be looked into very carefully, for unless we protect ourselves we will find that the Americans will in this way build up a large industry, getting the cream of the voyage, for the only good that will accrue to us will be the wages paid to the captains and crews. I know that some of the merchants in my district are very much interested in this matter and they are taking the matter up with the Government in order that inquiries may be made to see what can be done to prevent this action on the part of the Americans from developing into a serious menace. This is one of the matters which the Commission might well enquire into, for I take it there is no limit to the scope of their investigation. The only way we can hope to improve the conditions that now exist is by making thorough and strict enquiries into the situation, bringing in such laws and regulations as are deemed necessary and stringently enforcing them. The opinions of everybody should be welcomed, and I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Bonavista state this evening that the members of the Union will be glad to give the Commission the benefit of their knowledge and experience. I trust the work of the Commission will result in large benefits accruing to the country.

MR. HALFYARD—I rise Mr. Chairman, to give these Resolutions my hearty support. The fishery is the staple industry of the country and we are all interested in it, and Resolutions dealing with this matter are such as appeal to anyone who has the interest of himself and his country at heart. The fishery of course, like every other industry has varied in the manner of prosecution. We are all agreed on one thing, however, and that is that the fisheries have not been given the attention in the past that they merited. Now we are waking up and members of this House and the people of the whole country will have to take knowledge of the fact that the Government is endeavoring to do something to create an interest in this great industry.

With reference to the statements that have been made as to the whale having the effect of driving the caplin to land, of course, that is a matter of opinion. If we had sufficient data

for the past twenty or thirty years as to the caplin that came to shore before the whaling industry was started on the different parts of the Coast we might be able to arrive at some conclusion. I do not think that we have that information because it has not been kept and that is why we are looking for information on this subject.

I fully concur with Mr. Coaker the hon. member for Bonavista, with regard to the person who should occupy the important position of head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The man at the head of that Department should be the best man, the best educated, the most scientific, the brainiest man in the country, and if we could obtain such a man we would be doing a service to the country. When the matter of qualification is looked upon as a secondary consideration, when other things take first place, and when the person who is in charge of that Department allows deputies and secretaries to take charge and give out work you cannot expect the work of that Department to be done in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed a Resolution and asked leave to sit again.

It was ordered that this Report be received and adopted and the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had appointed a select committee of the Council, consisting of the Honourables Messrs. Harvey, Job, Winter, Goodridge, Templeman, McGrath, James Ryan, and the President, to co-operate with the select committee of the House of Assembly on the subject of certain Fishery Resolutions.

SEALING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Coaker the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend 55 Victoria, Cap. 2., entitled: 'An Act to Regulate the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen will remember that when this Bill was last before the Committee, I suggested that it was advisable to dispense with the section dealing with the duties of the cooks on the sealing vessels, and no doubt hon. members will remember the grounds upon which I based my contentions. Everybody will agree with the principle that the food of the men should be very carefully looked after, but I do not think it would be wise to impose a penalty on the owner or master merely because in his spare time the cook does some work that cannot be said to be in connection with his ordinary duties. I do not think that the record of the past in the matter of the food and the duties of the cooks on the sealing steamers justifies us in taking such a step as this section suggests. In addition to this it has been pointed out in the debate that this is entirely a new departure from the practice of the past, and that in passing such a section we should be putting in force something radically different to what has been done in the past, and something that in all probability would not be carried out.

However, I do not propose to take up the time of the Committee by going over all the points again, but I wish to suggest to the hon. introducer an amendment which, I trust, will commend itself to him. It in no way detracts from the spirit of his provis-

ion in the sense of providing that cooks shall take care to see that the food of the men is properly looked after, but at the same time it will get over the difficulty that would exist if this section were passed, which is that we would be taking out of the hands of the captain to some extent at least, the management of the ship. I think this matter will be simplified if an amendment is made, providing that the general control of the captain over all persons on board shall not be interfered with.

Hon. members will see that the only point in the amendment is to get over what, as it was suggested, might be an awkward situation under certain conditions. It has been pointed out by hon. gentlemen, who have had much more experience than myself in these matters, that the captain should have the same general control over the cooks as he has over other members of the crew and it is to obviate any difficulties on that ground that I make this amendment. In a voyage like that which a sealing steamer takes, conditions must alter materially from day to day, and it is essential to my mind that under certain emergencies every man on the steamer should be under the control of the captain.

I hope my hon. friend, the introducer, will accept this amendment in the spirit in which it is offered.

MR. YOUNG—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on this Bill, before it goes through the Committee. I agree with most of the sections as to the advisability of which there is certain to be a difference of opinion not only in this House but also among those who have been going to the sealfishery for years.

As to the sheathing of the decks, the sleeping accomodation of the crew, heating of the steamers, and agree. The prohibiting of the use of the protection of the sick, I quite rifles by the crew is a matter of opinion. I know that if I were in the 'Stephano' or 'Florizel' and we struck a patch of hood seals, I would like to be able to use a rifle on the dog hoods There is not one man in ten who can kill a dog hood without the assistance of a rifle. That is my experience.

I think that every steamer should have a doctor or a man who is skilled in medicine. Every captain should be compelled to take a doctor, if it is at all possible, even if every man had to pay fifty cents towards his expenses. A dollar is nothing compared to a man's life and I think it should be compulsory for every steamer to have a doctor.

The next point is the use of soft bread. I know men who would not care much about soft bread if there were prospects of a good trip of fat. If they missed the seals it would be all right to give the crew so much soft bread a week, but until the main patch was cut up, I do not think that many of the men would worry much because they did not get it. I would not like to see a return of the old days of hard tack and oleo, but I do not think we ought to make it compulsory to have soft bread while the men are busy at the seals and every moment is precious. Why should you hamper a captain with all kinds of rules and regulations at a time like that? When the men are on the ice and geting their share of the seals, are you going to have them called on board to get their soft bread? If the steamer misses the seals, then by all means let the crew have the best possible food.

Another section says that fish brewse must be served on alternate days. That to my mind is impossible because it takes a lot to feed two hundred men and the cooks will not be able to find room to soak it unless

they put it to soak in one of the punts. Another section says that onions, potatoes and turnips shall be in the soup.

I wonder what some of the old sealers would say if they read these regulations. I went to the ice when I was sixteen years of age and I have served under as good captains as ever went through the Narrows, Captains Charles Dawe and Arthur Jackman, but in these times there was no question of food regulations when we struck the seals. The whole success of the seal fishery depends on a very short time and if there is any delay or anything goes wrong then it is a great loss to the crew and to the owners. Look at the expense of fitting out some of these steamers for the seal fishery. Why, I was told by Mr. Munn that the 'Stephano' would require to get 22,000 seals to pay expenses.

All the responsibility of this is on the captain's shoulders and I do not agree with any proposal that would take away from him any of the control of the steamer. The cook should receive his orders from the captain like all the rest of the crew, otherwise you will make it possible for great difficulties to occur that would never occur otherwise. I have had enough experience at the icefields to know this. If all the men are out on the ice, and the captain wants something done that is absolutely necessary he cannot ask the six or seven cooks to do it, if this section is allowed to stand as it is now. Nobody has asked for such a regulation but the cooks are on the contrary only too willing as a rule to do what they can for the good of the voyage. I remember being with Capt. Henry Dawe once in the 'Ranger.' We struck the seals on a Thursday and we found that the three cooks were as good as any ten men of the crew. Every man on board worked with all his might day and night, and by two o'clock on Saturday afternoon we had our load panned. Under such conditions as that no man on board wants to stop work and get soft bread or brewse. Now we are asked to pass a law which states that if a cook wants to help to get a load of seals of his own free will, the owners shall be called upon to pay a fine of $500. I strongly object to that clause and I hope this House will object to it, for it is not asked for by the fishermen. It is all right to have all these different kinds of food when there is nothing to be done, but to make it compulsory to have them prepared when the steamer is in the seals is very wrong, and I object to it.

I come next to the section which says that if a certain number of men want to be landed, the captain shall bring the steamer to the nearest port and put them ashore and then leave for the fishery again. This will mean that if the steamer does not strike the seals early in the trip the command of the steamer will be taken out of the captain's hands and he will have to do what the crew or part of the crew want him to do. If he does not do it, there is bound to be trouble. As it is, I would like to know what the captain is going to do if twenty five men want to be landed at a northern port and twenty-five at a southern port. I suppose he will have to make two trips and he will easily lose forty-eight hours if there is any ice in the bays. During that time he might have been able to get a good trip of old seals. I object very strongly to this clause. If a man wants to go to the seal fishery let him go for the whole trip or let him stay home altogether. There is usually plenty of employment for a man to do home, and if he is not satisfied to stay out for a whole voyage let him stay home and

not hinder the other men from making a good bill. It is not fair to the owners to have this section put in for all the good men will sign for the whole voyage, and the men who want to make trouble should not be protected by the law. Look at the trouble Captain Kean was put to last year when he had to land fifty men at King's Cove. Perhaps he would have had a trip of seals only for this. I do not want to see the whole voyage spoiled because a small portion of the crew want to get home before the end of the trip.

As it is now time for adjournment, I must bring my remarks to a conclusion, but I may have something further to say when the Bill is before us again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and the Committee have leave to sit again to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR GRIMES gave Notice of Question.

MR. JENNINGS gave Notice of Question.

MR. TARGETT gave Notice of Question.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on Wednesday next move the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next February 23rd at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, Feb. 23rd.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present two petitions from Torbay. One from the North and one from the Southside. They both deal with subject of Elective Road Boards. This is much desired by the petitioners. I feel sure that this request will meet with every consideration by the Government,and I heartily endorse these petitions. I ask that they be referred to the departments to which they relate.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from residents of Fortune and Grand Bank, asking that a connecting road be built to Dantzic Cove. This little settlement is situated near Point May, and is now, I think, the only place in the District that has no connection with the main line; it has indeed no road at all, and the people are compelled to do their travelling altogether by boat. I understand a road from Fortune to Dantzic would open up some very fine agricultural land, and I do hope the Government will be able to make an allocation for this necessary work.

I also beg to present a petition from the residents of Allan's Island, Lamaline, praying for the construction of a bridge, connecting that island with the mainland. Allan's Island has a population of some 300 to 400 people, and is the centre of extensive fishing operations. the firm of Samuel Harris of Grand Bank having a large branch establishment there. It is separated from the mainland by a narrow gut, and it is across this gut the people

desire the bridge to be built. Years ago it was spanned by a bridge, but it was carried away, and has never been replaced. I know of no work in the District that would be more useful than this. The people do a great deal of business with the mainland, where the Post Office, Telegraph Office, Custom House, and all other public offices are situated and they have to be continually moving to and fro by boat. The loss of time apart from the inconvenience is very great. There is the further danger of serious accident, as Lamaline is a stormy place with some winds. It was only the past year that two fine young fellows attempting to make the island were upset in their dory, and drowned. I have been informed that the cost of a substantial structure would not be very great, and I do trust that the Government will be able to provide for its erection. I have much pleasure in endorsing the prayer of both petitions and ask that they be referred to the department to which they relate.

MR. LEFEUVRE—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in giving my hearty support to the petitions presented by my colleague.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Bonavista for a sum of $50 for a public well in that place. The water which is now being used by the people there is very impure. Horses, dogs, and sheep are drinking therefrom. Some years ago the members promised to do their best to remedy it, but nothing has yet been done. I trust that the Government will consider this.

MR. WINDSOR—Mr. Speaker, I heartily support the petition.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Harbour Grace. This petition is signed by John Tapp and others, asking that a sum of $100 be granted the Harbor Grace Volunteer Fire Company. I must say that it is for a very worthy object and one that ought to be encouraged. This is a very reasonable request to ask. We have 40 or 50 men giving their services for the protection of the town. For the last 40 years, these men have done their work voluntarily, at great trouble and risk. I trust that this amount will be forthcoming.

MR. YOUNG—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by the hon. member for Harbor Grace. Mr. Parsons. These men often take very great risks in saving the lives of other people. I hope that the Government will see their way clear to grant the money asked for. I wish to give it my support.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr Speaker, I wish to support that petition.

QUESTIONS.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether previous to undertaking the construction of the breakwater at Port de Grave, any examination of the location of the proposed breakwater was made by the Government Engineer, or any other authority, with a view to ascertaining the feasibility of the proposal; and, if so, was there any report upon the matter, and what was the effect of the report, and, if in writing, will he table it; and whether any alternative places were under consideration, or suggested, and, if so, were they passed upon by the Government Engineer or any other authority.

MIN MARINE AND FISHERIES—That matter is being looked into and I will reply in a few days.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay up on the table of the House a copy of returns of expenditure of the following allocations made to Ed. Redman, of Harry's Harbor, viz., $300.00 allocated April 30th, 1913, and $200.00 allocated August 23rd, 1913.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES—The answer to that question is being prepared.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House the amount of yearly salary paid Fishery Warden at Hant's Harbor.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the information.

SUPPLY RESOLUTION.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported a Resolution which was read a first time as follows:

Marine and Fisheries, $103,040.00.

The said Resolution being read a se cond time it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolution was agreed to.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Tabled information asked for by Mr. Abbott in connection with Forest Fires. Also certain information asked for by Mr. Stone on Feb. 20th.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to amend 55 Victoria, Cap. 2, entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery."

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to amend Title 1, Chapter 2, of the Consolidated Statutes, entitled Representation in the House of Assembly and the Powers and Privileges thereof."

On motion it is ordered that these orders stand deferred until a later hour.

COMBINES AND MONOPOLIES BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the Investigation of Combines and Monopolies."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, this Bill is framed along the lines of an act for the conduct of public enquiries. There is in other countries, I believe, more elaborate machinery than it is proposed to create here. In Canada they have a very comprehensive measure whereby a very small number of persons can apply to a court who grants an order. The matter is then referred to the Minister who has charge of such matters and an enquiry is held and the parties represented. As a result of the enquiry the Government enforces certain changes to meet the requirements of the case according to their powers. The present measure is principally intended to give the government power to enquire into the cost of coal. There does not appear to be any other machinery and there is a great deal of uneasiness in the community and a great deal of feeling that we are being charged too much for coal. Whether that is so or not I am not in a position to say, but I have had a statement submitted to me and I have seen statements in the press recently that a higher price is charged here for coal than is charged in similar cities paying the same freight and duty and it is important that the public mind should be set at rest in relation to this matter by independent enquiry. It is only a question of finding out the cost of the article at the pit's mouth, the freight, handling, duty etc., and then we shall know whether the amount of profit is unreasonable or not. It may be that there is nothing in the rumor that such a trust and combine exists. Personally I have no evidence to submit to the committee in this respect and the act simply goes so far, as to give to the Governor in Council power to

cause enquiry to be made concerning any matter which is thought to be the subject of a combine. In that case the Governor in Council may by commission confer powers upon commissioners of summoning witnesses to give evidence on oath and produce such documents as may be necessary in relation to the investigation. The act is along the lines of the Public Enquiries Act and it has not been considered necessary to make any more elaborate machinery than that.

In Canada and the States this question has of late years filled a prominent place in the public eye. It has led to enquiries, commissions and prosecutions to protect the public. One thing we are all certain of that is that in every walk of life the cost of living has gone up. And it is not quite just to lay all the blame upon trusts or combines. One of the chief causes has been the increased cost of labor. During the last twenty years the cost of every kind of labour has increased by leaps and bounds. I noticed the other day a report of an investigation that took place in the United States in regard to wholesale prices between 1890 and 1910. They found that in 1907 there was the record of increase 44%. An investigation by the Department of labour in Canada showed an increase in the last 10 years of from 25 to 50%. Comparison between the prices in the United States, Canada and Great Britain showed more of an increase in the United States than in Canada and in Canada more than in Great Britain. England being a free trade country competition keeps prices down and keeps labour down. In Canada and the States the competition with foreign manufactures hardly exists while in England the foreign article coming in duty free makes the home manufacturer keep down his prices. This keeps the price of labour down too. But as I say, it is very difficult for trusts and combines to touch the price of an article, but they hope by trusts and combines to reap greater profits and meet the increased cost of producing the article. I find in Bradstreet that the prices in 1910 show an increase of 81% over 1896 and the census commission in the Dominion of Canada prepared a statement showing that good prices increased from 1902 to 1906 20%. The whole question in to which we shall have to enquire in relation to this matter of the price of coal is whether there is anything being charged over and above what is necessary to meet the cost of producing the cost of selling, delivering the article and leave a reasonable profit. I find that in 1892 the cost of coal at the pit mouth was $2.25. Today it is $3.25. That is an increase of 40%. In 1892 the duty was 30 cents now it is 70. In 1892 the freight was $1.70. Now it is only $1.30. In 1892 the insurance was 5 cents. Now it is only 2. In 1892 the cost of discharging was 15 cents. It is now 30. The loss of weight is allowed at about 30 cents, and cartage from 30 to 60 cents. That would bring the cost in 1892 up to $4.74 and to-day $6.02. To that must be added about 16 cents for storage and about 2 cents for fire insurance. Upkeep of premises 5 cents that would make coal cost $6.32. There is still a large difference between that and the selling price.

The present bill is for the purpose of enabling the Government to hold an enquiry into this matter in the interests of the public with a view to seeing if anything can be done and whether any unreasonable charge is being made. Coal is not like any other article and more especially in a country like this where it is an absolute necessity and everything possible should be done to keep the price down. In the olden days we had coal

here at reasonable rates. We could get Sydney coal at from $4.50 to $5.00, but considerable changes have taken place particularly in the cost of production, and owing to the greater demand for coal in Canada, as well as the increased industrial development during the past few years. Notwithstanding all that there are people who think that coal could be produced and sold here at considerably below the figure at which it is sold. However that may be. I am not able to say The duty of the commission here proposed is to inquire into such conditions and see what can be done. I beg to move the first resolution.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, just one word in connection with this Bill. The intention is that such a commission should enquire into the existence of a combine; it has for its object the ascertainment of facts regarding the condition in relation to the price of goods to the consumer and to the seller. That I take it is the object of this Bill. I do not think any difference of opinion can exist as to the desirability of getting at the bottom of combines which exist for the purpose of excluding competition. This will have to be regulated by legislation. But this act is not going to accomplish that object. It is not sufficiently vigorous.

This is a matter which I think ought to be fairly and squarely enquired into. Now, it is quite evident that a commission such as is contemplated under this Act, appointed by the Governor-in-Council merely for the purpose of making an enquiry, cannot go beyond the enquiry stage. The Act provides no remedy. Then, again, it is quite possible that people who are charged with a contravention of this Act may have sufficient political pull either to prevent an inquiry or to prevent the publication of the report. I think that in this Act precaution ought to be taken against any such possibilities as that. In the event of the Commission of Enquiry finding there are sufficient grounds to believe that a combine exists, the Commission ought to be above even the suspicion of political complexion or the possibility of the person charged having sufficient influence to annul the effect of the inquiry. If the Commission or tribunal, whatever it may be, is appointed and they work automatically upon a complaint being made and substantiated with evidence to show the bona fides of the complaint, the enquiry ought to go on, and if a Combine is found to exist, some means of publication of the fact ought to be provided for, unless it is remedied within a reasonable time. The mere enquiry, without any means of publication and without any means of forcing a remedy, is absolutely useless. A Commission may be appointed and their report may be pigeon-holed and never heard of again. I think that if this Act is going to accomplish any good it ought to be more vigorous than it is at the present time. The first Section merely defines what a Combine is. The second provides that a Commission may enquire on oath into the existence or non-existence of a combine, and the next provides that witnesses must attend. That is the whole Act. There is nothing as to what will be done after an enquiry is held and it is found that a combine exists. We have heard here statements in relation to the coal business, which allege that arrangements exist between the coal dealers. I do not know whether it is a fact or not, but that is the statement. Rumour also has it that money is paid by certain firms to people who entered into competition with them to keep out of the business. Things of that kind are said to exist in this country, and if it is true, it is a serious matter. If the people are paying not only a fair profit for articles but also the

amount necessary to pay the price to bar competition, then it is a combine which should come under this Act, and for which some remedy ought to be provided. These are the kind of combines which have been legislated against in Canada and the United States. They have, of course, been larger and affected a greater number of people, and if they exist here, they ought to be enquired into and some means of dealing with them provided. As to the object of the Act, I think it is a very good one. It is one, I think, on which there is no difference of opinion between the parties in this House. In the Manifesto which Sir Robert Bond issued to the country before the last election there was a clause promising to effect legislation in connection with combines affecting trade. My object in talking now in reference to this Bill is to point out that it is inefficient, and is capable of abuse. I don't say it will be abused, but it is capable of being abused, and here is the place and now is the time to remove any possibilities of its being abused for political purposes.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this Bill, I would like to ask the hon. introducer what he means by the words: "Combine means any contract, agreement, arrangement, or combination which has or is designed to have the effect of increasing or fixing the price or rental of any article of trade or commerce." Do those words include raising the price of fish? Suppose the buyer is offering $5.00 for fish and the fishermen say, "We will not take $5.00. We want $6," and they hold on until $6.00 is paid, will you get after them?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I should not suppose that would come under the Act.

MR. COAKER.—It raises the price of fish.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Every one has a right to legitimately combine as regard the sale of their products.

MR. COAKER.—Well, what is the use of this Bill at all if people have the right to legitimately combine? The merchants will say that they are combining legitimately.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—This bill is for the purpose of enquiring as to whether the prices charged for various articles are legitimate.

MR. COAKER.—Then you consider that if the fishermen hold out for $6.00, that would be legitimate.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Certainly. The man who owns the property has a right to set the price. He can put what price he likes on it.

MR. COAKER.—Well, supposing a man has gasolene for sale, and he is offered thirty cents, and he says he won't sell for less than forty?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That could not possibly come under this Act.

MR. COAKER.—Well, I think you should make the Act quite clear so that there will not be any misunderstanding about it. Now, as regards to combines. The price of fish in 1911 started in the early part of the season at $6.00, and fell to $5.50. When it fell to $5.50, we refused to sell. We called upon the fishermen all over the country to hold their fish for $6.00. The fish went 50 cents lower and was quoted at $5.00. We still refused to sell. Subsequently, we got $6.00 for it and afterwards it went to $6.60. Now the drop from $6.60 to $5.50 was agreed upon by some of the merchants. These men agreed to pay $5.50 and no more. That is the kind of thing which has existed here, and if you go the right way about making the enquiry, you will find that there is a combine to-day fixing the price of kerosene oil, biscuits and also seals. Last year we had an example of this combine work as regards salt. We arranged with a merchant here in

the early part of the season to give us a large quantity of salt. The price we quoted was $1.15 a hhd. I went North for a while, and on my return I was notified that the price had gone to $1.25 and that our order could not be supplied at $1.15. Well, instead of paying $1.25, we imported a load of salt and that load of salt cost us about $1.05 a hhd. As soon as we commenced discharging our salt the price fell from $1.25 to $1.05. Who fixed the price at $1.25? Kerosene oil, we were notified last Spring, would be sold at 16 and 17 cents by dealers in St. John's. An agent of the Imperial Kerosene Oil Company came down here and offered it at a cent a gal. less. A couple of local buyers entered into a contract with them and the price of oil was immediately lowered. Then there was a combine on gasolene. There is no doubt that you would have lots of trouble in getting at the proof of these things, but they can be found out. The men who work these things are very shrewd, and they work in a shrewd way, but there is no doubt that the prices of the articles to which I have referred are fixed by combine. It has been stated, and I think truthfully, that money has been paid to manufacturers in order to get them to close up their manufacturing plants. I have been told that the Rennie Baking Co. receives $5,000 a year in consideration of their not manufacturing biscuit. That Company does not manufacture biscuit. They did do it, but they do not do it now. I do not know what effect it would have on the market if they did manufacture them, but the probabilities are that the price of biscuit would be lower than it is now. The fact remains, however, that only two concerns in the Island at the present time manufacture biscuit. Statements have also been made to the effect that a price was paid a firm who had a seal manufacturing plant to keep that plant out of operation. I don't think that that firm is receiving the money now for the very simple reason that probably the plant is not in a condition to run but there was a day when they got $5,000 not to operate. At the present time you can only sell seals to three firms in this country, Baine Johnston's, Job's and Bowring's. No matter what we believe seals to be worth, we must take what those firms offer for them. If they say they are going to give $4.50 a quintal for seals, it is impossible to get more. Large profits have been made in the manufacture of seals. In considering the Sealing Bill at first in the F.P.U., we thought it might be possible to establish a Committee made up of two men from the Board of Trade and two from the Fishermen's Union to fix the price of seals, which Committee would have the right to know the cost of manufacturing and the profits which are made, but we found that it was not possible to do anything with the idea. There is a monopoly in connection with this matter. These men can pay what they like and we are going to find that it will not be easy to get over the trouble. If you beg them hard enough, you may get 20 cents more, and if you organize a strike, as was done before, you may get 50c. more, but I do not want to see any strikes in this country. Industrial strikes are the worst things that can happen any country. We are going to try to get an increase in the price this Spring. If we coax them to give an extra 25c. they may give it. There is not the slightest doubt that the seals are worth $5.00. At the present time, our business men are not going to be anxious to give us the increase, because they met some unexpected losses last year. It was not that the price of oil or seals was not high, but because some firms that handled the products that they sent across went into liquidation, with the result that

our business men met with serious losses. I am glad to see this matter taken up by the Government, but they must go a little further. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, when the Commission finds on investigation that a combine exists, what are they going to do then? You must add a section providing some penalty or at least some way of dealing with the matter.

Now, with regard to Coal. The Premier in his remarks stated that the price of coal in Sydney was $3.25. That is the price to a man buying a hundred tons. The price to large dealers is $3.00. A commission of 25c. a ton is given when the dealer takes 5,000 tons. It is a little higher if they take larger quantities. Now, we did not get the drawback because we did not take 5,000 tons. If we did take that amount we would get that commission. Harvey and Morey get it. If we got the commission, our coal would cost us $4.75 delivered to the wharf outside of freight. We sold for $6.80, so that we got $2.05 to cover freight. Now the point is, as the Premier said, that there are a lot of incidental expenses in connection with the handling of coal which we do not take into consideration at all but at the same time we are able to bring coal here and sell at $6.80 unless it advances in price. Firms who are engaged in the coal business must make a large profit in order to cover expenses and to live out of it, and it is only right and proper that a man should be able to live well out of his business. In order to help the poor people out, we are going next year to try and get down a couple of loads of coal and we hope to be able to sell at $6.80 a ton. Of course, we must have a little more to cover freight than the ordinary dealer because it takes us a little longer to discharge the boat. We are only going to sell to householders so as to give the poor man a chance. We may establish a Union in St. John's and as we have a rule not to sell to anybody who is not a member of the Union, any people in St. John's who want to avail of our prices will have to join the Union.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my only objection to the bill is that it does not go far enough. I think it should give the commissioners power to get after the men who are found to be acting in contravention to the spirit of the Act, and I trust that the Rt. Hon. introducer will do something in this connection.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman. I anticipated to a certain extent the objection which my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has made to this Bill. I think in my opening remarks I pointed out that the Bill was only a tentative measure, an experimental measure, if you like. We have not in this country those extensive combines which have to be dealt with in other countries. I pointed out that two or three years ago, if I remember rightly, a very elaborate Bill was introduced into the Canadian Legislature and is now law. Under that Act, when a certain number of persons are satisfied that a Combine of an injurious character exists, they make application to a Judge by going through certain formalities. The Judge will order an enquiry, which order is passed on to the Minister of Labour. The Minister appoints the Commission. The parties charged appoint one man, the movers in the matter appoint another and then a third person is, I think, appointed by the other two and on their failure to appoint the Minister appoints a third person. That is how the matter is dealt with in Canada. My learned friend pointed out that the great thing in a Bill like this is to have nothing of a political complexion in relation to any enquiries which are

made under it. With that I entirely agree. The whole value of this Bill would be destroyed if the public once felt that an enquiry which was held under it was held merely for the purpose of whitewashing somebody or of hiding evidence.

The Hon Member for Bonavista said that the Bill ought to be absolutely complete. Well, there would be scarcely any point in having the machinery of so complicated a character as to make it almost impossible to carry out what we intend to do. If this Act is not found to be sufficiently broad and comprehensive to deal with our simple cases as they arise, then it would be a very easy matter to amend it and make such provisions as may be necessary from time to time. The best legislation which we have in the world came as the growth of years. You cannot make provisions in a Bill to meet every possible contingency on its first production. Take the Merchants' Shipping Act, an Act I suppose of eight or nine parts, with nearly a thousand sections. I suppose there has been no session of British Parliament since that bill was introduced 60 years ago at which some amendment has not been made. Today it is a perfect statute, dealing with everything in relation to shipping that is possible to conceive of. As I say, it was the growth of years and amendments were brought in from time to time to meet cases as they arose. Now, in this country, we are not suffering very much from Combine of trade. Although arrangements may have been made between business people from time to time, I have not heard of any very distressing results because of them. I have heard of the cases referred to by the Hon. member from Bonavista. Rennie's Factory and the Sealing Plan —and I presume these are the cases referred to, though not named, by the leader of the Opposition. Now, I am not able to speak with any degree of accuracy in relation to the profits which are made by any of these people. Some think they are making very great profits out of the seal fishery and out of the cod fishery. I only know that after half a century nearly all Water Street had to put up their shutters, and the vessels and fishery outfits and all that sort of thing were a drug on the market for years. That may have been the result of the business not having been based on sound commercial principles. I hope that that is changed now and that a reasonable and just profit is being made by those engaged in trade so that they may be attracted to continue in the business. As I have said, this seems to me to be a measure that will meet the present case. As regards the enquiry, it is a very simple matter. For instance, take the matter of coal. Our people are being charged a very high price for coal. It is a mere question of having an enquiry that would be above suspicion and above reproach into the whole business. The Commission could enquire into the cost of the coal, have the contracts produced under which the coal was purchased, add duty, freight and the cost of handling, and you have it.

The fact may be ascertained that unreasonable profit is charged, in which case necessary steps would be taken in relation to providing a remedy to meet the contingency. I think that this Bill as it stands at present will meet all requirements. I have every sympathy with the remarks of the hon. member, Mr. Coaker, in relation to the price of seals, the price for which is four dollars and fifty cents a hundredweight, of which the men receive one third. If they are not getting sufficient value, it is by reason of lack of competition in the purchase and manufacture of the

seals. It is possible that an enquiry under the bill may be able to reveal the fact that the manufacturers owing to modern methods of manufacturing may be able to pay the sealers a larger price. Twenty five or thirty years ago, we had something like fifteen factories, manufacturing seal oil on the Southside, while only two are in operation today, which are now able to do the work with the assistance of modern machinery. Of course, if the sealers could only manufacture their own share of the voyage we would have no difficulty in dealing with this matter so far as the seal fishery is concerned. It is not the intention under this Bill to have an investigation into the methods of conducting any particular industry, unless a prima facie case is established, showing that some wrong has been perpetrated. I think that this Bill as it stands at present will meet all requirements, and if an additional section or two is found requisite, this Legislature can deal with the matter in another session.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I may say that so far as this Bill goes, I am fully in accord with the principle but to my mind it does not go far enough in the direction of suggesting a remedy for any wrong which may be found to be in existence by trade combinations. It is very clear, however, from the remarks of the Prime Minister, that the Government is not at present prepared to find such a remedy. Section 1 of this Bill, defines a combine as being an arrangement or agreement amongst parties, which will have the effect of raising the price of articles to the detriment of the consumer. Every rise in price of goods is detrimental to the consumer. The points raised by the hon. member, Mr. Coaker, as to whether the formation of the F. P. U. is not a combine under this act is very debatable. In my opinion such an organization would come under this bill. The F. P. U. is a body composed of sixteen or eighteen thousand fishermen whose produce is for sale, and it is necessary for these men to get as much as they possibly can for it. If by agreement they can raise the price of their products, surely the consumer will have to pay that higher price, and that would be detrimental to the consumer. What then is the difference between the case of those Union men and the coal dealers? By reason of the combination of the fishermen and of the coal-dealers the consumers in each instance pays a higher price for fish and coal. Both cases come within the first section of this Bill. I have very little sympathy with the coal-dealers, who combine to raise the price of coal, but I have every sympathy with those who try to raise the price of fish. I regard the second section as a very necessary one for the purpose of compelling the attendance of witnesses to give evidence on an enquiry into combines and monopolies. I can readily understand that it is not contemplated to bring the F. P. U. under this Bill, for no Government would interfere with an organization with a membership of eighteen thousand men. But the operations of coal dealers, biscuit manufacturers, and others are in contemplation as objects of enquiries and investigations. It is to be hoped that manufacturers and others possessing political influence will not prevent the Government from making the fullest investigations for such are found to be necessary. As the bill now stands, if a Commission reported the existence of a combine formed for the purpose of restricting competition in commerce, the Government would be helpless to do anything for the Prime Minister has said, that in such a case steps must be taken to find a remedy. I am prepared to sup-

port this Bill, but I regret to find that the Government is not in a position to go further and provide a remedy such as is in vogue in the United States and Canada.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— I think that there is a great distinction between an organization like the Fishermen's Protective Union and manufacturing concerns and those who combine in the coal trade. The former are combined to obtain everything to which they are entitled such as getting the best price they can for their fish, and as long as their demands are reasonable there can be no possible objection and no purchasers can be compelled to pay any higher price for the fish than they may feel inclined.

On the other hand a coal combine is where people owing to lack of competition or improper revenue tariff or some other cause, charge more to the consumer than a legitimate profit over all expenses. There is a very marked distinction between the two cases. This Bill merely aims at an enquiry as to whether an excessive price is charged for articles of commerce. In such cases action will have to be taken, but I am not prepared to say in the present instance what form that action will take. Sometimes trusts and combines result in lowering the prices of goods. Take for instance the Standard Oil Company which is the greatest trust in the world, and we find that owing to its manipulation and mode of carrying on business we are now able to purchase kerosene oil at sixteen cents a gallon, as against more than three times that amount years ago. On the other hand, there are trusts and combines who when they get full control of a particular article compel the consumer to pay more than a legitimate charge, and it is the object of this Bill to enquire into the methods of such concerns. I do not think that we should encumber this bill at the present time, but amendments can be made at another session should such be required.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Chairman I think that the principle underlying this Bill is one which we have been looking for, for some time. We heard today in this House instances quoted as regards certain combines alleged to be in existence in this city. Whether or not these combines exist, I am not prepared positively to state. but a great deal of comment has been made the past few years in connection with the prices charged for their products by certain manufacturing concerns. It very often transpires that there is not sufficient demand for a certain class of goods to make a number of factories pay, and in that case it is often desirable to close down one or more factories and allow others to continute business. It is only reasonable to suppose that men will look around and seek a remedy for an evil, and it sometimes transpires that an understanding among manufacturers is necessary in order to make the business pay. It may happen that two factories in a place entailing a dual management and cost of production may by a combination of interests be able to control the market and increase their profits by a reduction in management expenses. Such may be regarded as being undesirable and in the direction of preventing competition, but this Bill will permit an investigation into all such combinations which are not in the interests of the public. If combinations are doing what is right and fair they should welcome every enquiry. but cases may occur which require the fullest investigation and scrutiny.

We were told this evening that factories had closed down, and that large

sums had been paid them for closing down. The Rennie Baking Co. has been mentioned here this evening as one of the companies closed down, and that they did so for a consideration The question then is whether this consideration came out of the pockets of the consumer. That is the point at issue. The question is whether the amount paid Rennie for closing down has been added to the price which the consumer has to pay. I think that that is a matter that requires investigation, and I am glad that the Government has decided to put an Act on the Statute Book giving the necessary powers to investigate all these matters. The member for Bonavista referred to a combine being in control of the manufacturing concerns which manufacture seal oil. and skins have advanced to the consumer. I do not know whether the fishermen and sealers who prosecute this fishery have received an adequate share of this enhanced value. This is a matter that is also worthy of investigation, and I hope that when the Bill becomes law it will be gone into. Reference was also made as to how this Bill would affect the Fishermen's Union. I think the best answer to that is that the Fishermen's Union would not fear an investigation by anybody. I believe there is good reason for many of its demands and I do not believe that it is going to demand anything unreasonable. The question with the Fishermen's Union is what the man who takes the fish out of the water is going to get for his fish. If he gets a fair share for his labour he is satisfied. There are other expenses such as handling, packing and marketing that also govern the price. The cost of production is the first charge and the cost of preparing and marketing are additional charges, and they all go to make up the price that the article should command in the market.

There may be a great deal said here, Mr. Chairman, as to other industries. The coal industry has been referred to before during the Session. We all deplore the high price at which coal stands. We need to find out what is the cost of production, what it costs to load it on the steamer and other attendant expenses of bringing it here to market. Then we have to get at the price of unloading storing, insurance and other expenses before we can decide upon the price at which it should be sold. The merchant should not be allowed to raise the price to whatever he thinks fit I have very much pleasure in giving my support to this measure and I trust it will be a very effective measure in the interests of the people of the Colony.

MR. GRIMES—I rise Mr. Chairman, to support the principles of the Bill, as I think the time has arrived when some step should be taken towards regulating Combines and Monopolies. We have all had experience of these Combines in this country and how they have tended to increase the cost of living. The Rennie Baking Co. has been referred to in this connection. I remember when the Biscuit Combine was formed. At that time I was a clerk, and biscuits were selling at five cents a pound, and within a week from the time of the formation of the Combine they went up to seven cents, a difference of two cents a pound. This showed very clearly that the four or five thousand dollars paid Rennie for closing down was being paid by the consumers of this article. Reference has also been made to the Combines in connection with the sealing industry and the tobacco industry. The price of tobacco remained fairly steady in this country for fifteen or twenty years, but the moment the combine was formed, we found that the price went up. I am

informed on good authority that in some cases the price increased from 25 to 40 per cent. Well if that is so, it shows the great need of this Bill. Now, a great many of the people who consume tobacco are the poorer classes of this community. It is the poor man's luxury. I think the Government should investigate these matters and punish the guilty parties. That is the fault I find with this Bill, that it contains no penalty for anybody doing these things.

The Premier made reference to the increased cost of living in the United States and in England and in Canada. He said that it was due to a large extent to the increased cost of labor. I presume he meant that owing to the labor organizations demanding higher wages it meant a higher cost in the production of an article. I read an article a short time ago which stated that the Commission appointed in England to investigate these matters had reported that while wages had increased 17 per cent., the article produced had increased 42 per cent., showing that while some increase in the price of the article was due to the increased cost of labor, the greater amount of the increase was due to the existence of Combines and Monopolies. I say, Sir, that the time has come when steps should be taken to bring about laws that will prevent combinations of men into monopolies, which make it more difficult for people to live in this country. I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill and I hope the outcome of it will be an investigation into the matters that help to increase the cost of living in this country. I hope the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition will be adopted and that some sort of machinery will be put in that will make the measure effective.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, as the Government seems determined to put this Bill through as it stands I may say that I have not the slightest doubt but if an investigation were conducted into any of these monopolies and these objectionable conditions were found to exist a great deal of public opinion would be aroused over the fact that this Bill provides no penalty. If the Government hold an investigation and find that a factory has been paid five or six thousand dollars for closing down and that the price of the article has been raised in consequence there is going to be great indignation all over the country, if no steps are taken to punish the guilty parties.

Now the Premier has made a statement this afternoon about the amount of money lost in the crash. I admit that a lot of money was lost in the Bank Crash, and that many large firms closed up at that time. Now we find in the North that although at the time of the Crash some large businesses went under, in some cases two or three smaller ones sprung up out of each of these larger businesses. The foundation of Duder's failure was laid to a certain extent by men who were getting large salaries, and out of these salaries they were able to start business immediately after the crash. Today in the North we have three large businesses worth half a million dollars that sprung from the failure of Edwin Duder. J. & W. Owen's business sprung from this failure, and when Mr. Owen died ten or twelve years ago he was worth a quarter of a million dollars. Earle's in Fogo have a large business, which also sprung from Duder's business. Thirty or forty years ago Ryan's of Bonavista were doing a small business and to-day they must be worth a million dollars. Templeman of Bonavista started about twenty years ago. He was then doing a small business. If he is worth anything today he must

be worth anything like $250,000. G. J. Carter of Herring Neck is a man who was a clerk at the time of the crash and to-day he is worth $200.-000. Now there have been a great many failures, but these failures were not all due to the supplying system. In many cases they were simply due to bad management. There is no firm in the country that goes more largely into the supplying business than the Ryans and yet they are doing a sound and prosperous business. The reason I mention this is because I do not want it understood from the Premier's speech that everyone engaged in the supplying business is losing money. I trust that the Government will see our position in connection with the Bill now under discussion. We have asked that something in the nature of a penalty be inserted in the Bill. If the Government do not choose to do this the responsibility is theirs.

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 without amendment.

It was ordered that this Report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter V. of 8 Edward VII., entitled 'An Act with respect to compensation to Workmen for Injuries Suffered in course of their Employment'."

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I may say that the object of this amendment is simply to bring loggers and drivers of logs within the provision of the Workmen's Compensations Act. They at present do not come under the Act. I have known instances of men being killed and others being injured in the lumber woods, and their dependents have not been able to procure any compensation.

Upon motion of Mr. Coaker this Bill was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Commitee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

LOGGING BILL.

Second reading of a Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging"

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to protect the men engaged in logging, and it deals with the wages, food and accommodation of these men. Ever since the logging industry started there has been a lot of dissatisfaction as regards the accommodation and food in the lumber woods. There is quite an improvement nowadays as regards food. There has not been much complaint the last year or two in this direction. Any complaint in that regard is more as to the cooking. However there has been great complaint as regards the accommodation. Time was when logging camps were simply a few logs thrown together and covered over with felt. A stove was in the middle and the beds were made of lumber placed around in order to form bunks. No mattresses were provided. Now a few years ago, I took up this matter with Mr. Crowe, who employed thousands of men, and he agreed to put mattresses in the principal camps. I believe that this was done and every man provided with a mattress. At that time it was also agreed that a bath tub would be put in. It was found that did not work, because there was no warm water to be had and the men would not use cold water. Now the reason mattresses are not more generally used is because employees have found that they are no good after one season, as they are so dirty as to be unfit for use and have to be thrown away. It is not to be expected that the employers

want to provide new mattresses every season, because where a thousand or twelve hundred men are employed the expense would be too great. The only thing to be done then is to keep the men clean, and it is provided in this Bill that bath tubs should be installed and hot water provided. Of course every man is not going to bathe every night. Now I think every employer of labour should be satisfied with the provision of the Bill because it will have the effect of making the men contented and they will stay in the camps and there will not be the trouble and dissatisfaction that formerly existed. Their men will be in a healthy condition and will get their rest in the night and the next day will be able to do better work. There has been a certain amount of opposition to this bill from some few of the employers and they have been making some objections.

Some objection will be made to the first section by some employers, but I do not think it will do them any injustice, for the wage named there is based on the wages that are paid as a general rule in the logging camps to-day. Some men to-day are paid as much as $35.00 a month with bonuses, which comes to considerably more. In fact, Mr. Crowe has informed me that last year he paid $1200.00 in bonuses alone. Experienced men are supposed to receive a dollar a day in Mr. Crowe's camps, while in other companies the men receive $24 a month. In the A.N.D. Company's works the wages average from twenty to twenty four dollars a month. If that is correct, and I know that it is correct, there is no hardship done by the minimum wage suggested by us for eighty cents a day only comes to $20.00 a month. A man who receives $24 a month has only to work twenty-five days during that month on an average.

It is true that we shall add a little expense for improved accommodation and food. but the employers will not lose, but gain by this because they will find at the end of the season that because the men are treated better they will be able to work better and give more returns for their wages. In any case you cannot expect a man now to go into the lumbering camps for less than $20.00 a month. If he does go there at all it is because he wishes to make some money to help his family over the winter and, if he does not get at least twenty dollars a month, what is the use of his going there at all?

It may be contended that many of the lumbermen are young men of seventeen or eighteen years of age and that they are not worth as much as the men of twenty five years of age and that, therefore, they do not expect to get as well paid. The Act will make a provision for this because we realize that an experienced man is worth more than the man who goes to the woods for the first time, and we say that the experienced man should receive not less than a dollar a day and the inexperienced man not less than eighty cents a day. Some of these young men have experience and that being so, they are entitled to receive at least a dollar a day, and this is only right for you cannot expect a strapping young chap who has had experience to work for eighty cents while the man next to him gets a dollar although he may not be as good a worker.

Another objection which the men make is that sometimes they are promised $24 a month, but when a man works for six weeks and perhaps gets a letter telling him to come home he finds that he receives only $21.00 or thereabouts. When he wants to leave before the season is over he always finds that some amount is held back

or, in other words, he does not get the pay that he was promised he would get These are facts which hon. members can easily ascertain to be correct and that is why the provision is there. Why should not a man receive what he was engaged for? He is told that he will receive $24.00 or more, as the case may be, if he is worth it, but it is too often left to the boss of the camp to say what he should get.

We want to be fair in the matter and we do not want any man to be paid more than he is worth to the man who employs him. We do not want to give the men more than they earn but we do want to go as close as we possibly can to the right figure. In doing so, we must expect to meet opposition and we must not expect to be lauded and praised by the employers. However, we want only what is reasonable and fair and, while we do not want everything on our side, we do not want all these matters left entirely in the hands of the employers.

Mr. Jones, the manager of the Grand Falls works, heard the other day that the Bill fixed one dollar for all the men per day and he pointed out that this would not be reasonable. In his first year a man may not know how to cut a log so that it will fall right, although he may be a good man in every other way. An experienced man can cut a tree so that it will fall right and naturally, he is worth more to his employer. Mr. Jones pointed this out and I told him that we were prepared to meet him in the matter and we have put in the qualification, which hon. members will see on referring to the Bill. The minimum wage of eighty cents a day does not refer to experienced men, but only to those who are in the woods for the first time. Mr. Crowe has told me that he is perfectly satisfied to give a man a dollar a day if he cuts a cord and a half of wood, which is a reasonable day's work. Perhaps such a suggestion would meet any objection on the part of the employer and later on we may consider the advisability of adding a section on these lines.

I cannot see what objection the employers can have in meeting the demands of the men as outlined in this Bill. It comes from the body of the men, and they are practically as one in asking for this measure. It may be asked why they do not seek a remedy by having a strike, but it is not easy to get the men together. They are working over a very large area and it is impossible to go after them and organize them. Furthermore, we are not in favour of strikes if they can be avoided and that is why the men who are in the F.P.U are seeking to obtain through it a fair wage for a day's work. The members of the F.P.U. say that an experienced man should not get less than a dollar a day. This is what the men say and they are the great majority. They do not want a strike, but they look to this Legislature to see that they are protected and that they get their rights. It is our duty to give them protection and we ought to be able to see that they are properly paid without there being any necessity for a strike.

Section 3 is inserted in the Bill for the protection of the employer, for it is unreasonable for a man to go into the woods and do two or three weeks work and then give it up, leaving the company no chance of getting a man in his place. That is not right to the company, for if they hope to be successful in their operations they must have a certain number of regular men employed. We want the men to be well treated and we want them in return to stick to their work and,therefore, we say that any man who intends to leave must give a week's notice to

the employer. I do not think there will be any objection to this section for all will admit that it is not fair for a man to take the place of another and then give up the job when the company has no chance of getting a man to take his place.

The next section sets forth that on every Saturday each logger shall receive a written statement of the time during the past six days for which he is entitled to be paid. At the present time, when the man is paid he cannot tell if he is getting what he is entitled to. For instance, if a man cuts his hand and is unable to work for half a day, that time is usually taken off and he is not paid for it. If the accident has been caused by the man's own carelessness or neglect there is more excuse for deducting the time from his wages than there is when the accident was not his fault. However, this is not the question that we are considering under this section, which is put in for the purpose of making it compulsory for the men to know every week what amount of time has been deducted so that he can see how the matter stands at once and thereby disputes will be avoided.

The next section provides that each camp shall have a sleeping compartment and an eating compartment, and the sleeping compartments must be comfortably heated. In the past there have been camps in which the accommodation for the men was very poor, as many as thirty men having to eat and sleep in the same small room. We know this is a fact and we know that the conditions were not for the good of their health. It will not cost very much to have an apartment put up and a stove put in it. It would be only three or four days work for as many men and why should they not have it? Why should these men have to go into the lumber camps and be treated like dogs? In some of the camps conditions have not been much better than they were in the sealing steamers twenty five years ago as far as accommodation is concerned, but these conditions cannot be allowed to continue. Mr. Crowe agreed to put a compartment on the end of the camp to afford the men sleeping quarters. It has been done in some places, but there was dissatisfaction because of some lack of care. Perhaps it was that the roofs of the compartments were draughty. Nothing is more apt to give a man a cold than draughty rooms to sleep or eat in. What is the good of sending a good man to the lumber woods for a couple of months when his health is likely to be undermined by an attack of pneumonia or pleurisy. A severe attack often proves fatal for the doctor is perhaps some miles away and the patient has to wait three or four days for him. The doctor in many cases is able to do very little to help him, but for all that he sends in his bill. Perhaps the man manages to get a message to a friend and sets off for home on a slide. The roads are very bad and, if he recovers at all, he is certain to be a much weaker and more delicate man than he was when he first went into the woods. All things are against the interests of the logger, but, on the other hand, if he is treated well and given good sleeping quarters and wholesome food he will keep his health and show his appreciation of it by giving his employer good service.

I feel sure that some of the employers will object to the next clause of the Bill, which provides that inspectors shall be appointed by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to see that provisions of the bill are carried out. If they are not carried out, it will be the duty of the inspectors to report the breaches to the employer and to the Minister and then, if no remedy is effected, the matter will be brought

before a magistrate. The delegate of the F.P.U. or of the men shall also have the right to take these proceedings. We are going to have a delegate in the camps who will be the agent or delegate of our men just as the 'Longshoremen's Union in the city have a delegate. We shall pay his wages and he will see that the laws are observed. If the Inspectors appointed by the Ministers of Agriculture and Mines are not active in carrying out their work our delegates will see that it is done. I do not think that any reasonable man will object to this section for it is only right and proper that the men shall be protected in carrying out their work and we shall see that they are for it will not matter to us if there are fifty bosses there.

The next section deals with the food to be supplied to the loggers. It is impossible to pass a Bill like the Sealing Bill with respect to this matter, but there ought to be some way whereby the men will be able to obtain decent food. It will be a very simple matter for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to obtain information from reliable sources as to what is sufficient food for the men and he will prepare a schedule,which will have to be carried out by the employers subject to a penalty. I think the food which the men receive is pretty fair, but there can be some improvements made in the manner in which it is given to the men. There is another point in connection with this matter and it is that some companies like the A.N.D. Company give the whole matter into the hands of a contractor and this man gets so much for every cord that is turned in to the company. The contractor pays the logger and the more work he can get out of the men and the less the food costs him the more profit he will make.off his contract. There are other companies who manage all the departments of their business and their bosses work under their directions and are not contractors. The contractor gets all he can out of his contract and one evil of this is that sometimes the men do not get the wages that they are promised when they go to work and often the men are not fed properly. Under this section there will be a schedule of food to be given the men and they will be able to know when they are not being fed properly according to the law.

The next section provides that each logger shall be provided with a suitable bunk and mattress. Now there are sometimes two or three men in one large bunk, but instead of this we want to see each man with his own mattress and bunks. We want no man to sleep on the floor as some have had to do in the past, nor do we want men to come in and take any bunk according as they return to the camp. Sometimes under the present system men cannot get a bunk to sleep in and they have to sleep on the lumber until they can get a more suitable place. We do not want this as it is not at all comfortable for the men who get very little sleep, but have to turn a great deal.

We also want the men to own their own beddings. Now the system is for a man to get a rug for which he is charged a tremendous price and it is not fit at the end of the season to be taken home. Owing to the new accommodation which we are asking for they will be able to take their rugs home and their money will not be lost as it is now. I want to see the men provided with bed-clothes at cost price and I object to any contractor making a profit off them at the expense of the men. They have to be covered while they sleep, and it is not fair to make a profit out of their bed-clothes under these condi-

tions. I hope there will be no objec tion whatever to this section, for I am sure hon. members will see the justice of it.

Axes are to be supplied to the men free of charge. They cannot be expected to bring axes to the camps when they have to travel sometimes fifty miles with a pack of clothes on their shoulders. We believe that each man should be given an axe when he starts work, but, as we know the employer cannot afford to be giving them away for nothing every now and then, we say that, if a man loses his axe, he should be given a new one and the cost price of it shall be deducted from his wages. This is fair to both the employer and the logger. We also ask that the handles be supplies free of charge to the men. Sometimes a man breaks quite a number of handles during a month, not because he trys to do it, but because it is apt to happen when a strapping man makes a slashing blow at a tree. Now, men are charged very high prices at some of the camps, according to the man in charge. Sometimes the contractor has charge of this also, and makes a big profit out of it at the expense of the men. We are going to have the men treated squarely by the contractor as well as the employer, and we say that no man should pay for a handle unless he breaks more than one a week, and then it must be sold to him at cost price. If this is brought into force, there will be no loss to the employer, for no man is going to break his axe-handle purposely.

The next section provides that each camp shall be provided with a bath tub that shall be screened off in one of the compartments, and there shall be warm water provided. All the employers ought to agree to have this carried out, for if the men can keep clean and have a good night's rest, the employer will certainly be repaid. Some may turn up their noses at the idea of a logger wanting a bath, but I know that when a man feels clean and comfortable he is willing to work harder than he otherwise would. At all events, let the men have the bath tub and give them the opportunity of using it. A bath tub can be bought for four or five dollars, and it will be no trouble to provide water. The whole thing can be managed very easily and very cheaply, for one good bath tub will last a good many years.

I have known men to be living in camps where the snow has been driving in. The camps are never looked after, and often snow falls on the men while sleeping. They complain about the holes in the roof, and nothing has been done; but as soon as the horses come, 4 or 5 men are sent to make accommodation watertight and comfortable for the horses. There are men to see that all the holes are repaired, for there must be no snow falling on the horses; but it does not matter at all about the comfort of the men. We want to see that these conditions are brought into the Bill. The inspector and our travelling men will look after the conditions and I have no doubt that the faults will be remedied. I have no doubt that men such as Mr. Jones will do anything reasonable to rectify any faults. Last year I became aware that he was very eager to do his very best and if things are not carried out properly, it is not his fault. There are only two doctors for 30 or 40 camps which extended over perhaps 60 or 70 miles. What can two doctors do? If a man is injured, it will often take two or three days before the doctor arrives. There is not sufficient medical attendance. If a logger employs only a few men—say 100—he is not supposed to employ more than one doctor. The men grumble because they do not see a doctor from one month to the other, and yet they are charged 30c. for his attendance. Some men will say that it is best to

have this doctor in one proper and definite place, where he can be found. If we had a doctor to visit around he would be found at any time. What good may not come from it? The men say that a doctor should visit their camps at least once a week. I think, also, that a gramophone might be provided to each camp. We did not insert this regulation in the Bill, because we thought the Companies would do it of their own accord. I wish that the Government had $200,000 on hand this year instead of a deficit, because I would like for it to take off the duty on gramophones. 45 per cent. is a very high rate of duty to be imposed on these things. They would be a great source of entertainment and a great benefit at the people's homes, both for the grown folks and for the children. It gives music in its perfection; the best musicians and the greatest singers can be heard. In the lumber camps where the men, after their day's work, have nothing to do between 6 and 9 o'clock, these instruments would be a great benefit. I intended, if I could get the Premier to take the duty off gramophones, to give every branch of the Union a first-class machine, and also give them a continual supply of records. There could be some sort of an alternating system arranged, by which the new records could be passed on from place to place. I think we will carry it out. We ask that when a travelling inspector comes to a camp and asks for shelter, free board and lodging be provided for him. Otherwise he would very likely be told to get out and go sleep in the woods. We want this clause so that this law may be carried out. When we get into Committee there will be many matters to be explained and inquired into. I trust that all the members of this House will make up their minds that the Bill is reasonable, and in the interests of the men.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that everyone must be in sympathy with the principle running through this Bill, although they may not be able to agree with all the details of the Bill. There are very many things in this Bill which cannot fail to recommend themselves to the House. As long as it is clearly understood that the various sections may be reasonably and fairly and suitably amended when we go into Committee, there is no very great objection to the Bill going to a second reading. I think that the introducer of the Bill has expected objections to some of the Sections, and has fairly stated some of these objections. Now, in relation to the various sections that he has referred to: Section 3 states—Loggers, employed by the month, desirous to discontinue, shall give not less than one week's notice to their employer, or employer s agent, prior to the end of any month, or, in default, shall forfeit wages for the expired portion of the month. Having given notice they shall, at the end of the month, be paid all wages due. In case of delay in payment of wages, the employer shall be liable to a penalty, at the suit of the employee, of $1 for each day's delay. When loggers are engaged they sha! each be supplied with tickets signed by, or on behalf of the emp!oyer, stating the wages to be paid. That is a fair concession to the employer and I think that there can be no very great objection to it. It is to the interests of the men as well as those of the employer. To section 4, there does not appear to be any objection either. This section states that:—On each Saturday an agent of the employer shall give to each logger a written statement of the time during the past seven days, for which he is entitled to be paid.

As regards the inspectors, that shall require consideration. It seems that the time has arrived when we have some 2,000 or 3,000 men in the camps and thus it is necessary that we should have some inspection from a health standpoint. This is needed from the standpoint of the men's health, and from the health of the community because if an epidemic broke out in these camps these men would take that home and there would be an epidemic all over the country.

Therefore, from the standpoint of the community's health as well as from the convenience of the individual man, I think there can be no objection to an annual monthly or quarterly inspection. In relation to the men's homes, their beds and food, there can be no possible objection. It is only a fair and reasonable concession for the men and I should hope that the employers would have no objection to that. There can be no objection raised to section 8. Section 9 states that bed clothes shall be supplied to loggers at the actual cost and expense. That is a very reasonable charge on the employers. Section 10 deals with the supplying of axes and the care of them. Section 11 deals with the providing of bath tubs and bathing facilities in the camps. To both these sections there does not seem to be any special objections If men desire to have a bath at the end of the week, it seems that no great objections can be made.

Section 12 is an important one it states that logging camps shall be covered with board, sheathed with felt, and otherwise made water tight. The sides of the sleeping compartments shall be lined with sheathing paper, or board, or other satisfactory material. Section 13 which deals with the visits of a physician to each logging camp is also very important. I have heard it stated that it is better to continue the present system. Take the case of the A.N.D. Co. They have 1,500 or 2,000 men. The doctors are held at central points in telegraphic and telephonic connection, and if there is anything seriously wrong these doctors are available, and can go at once. If they were travelling from camp to camp, it would occupy a month or so and there is always the danger that there will be sudden sick calls. A man may cut himself seriously, and would not know where the doctor was. On the other hand, if he knew that he was at Grand Falls, Millertown or Badger, he would be at once communicated with. However, it is possible that these companies may be in entire harmony with that section. Now, these represent the greater number of the sections and the principles of the Bill. The hon. member who introduced the Bill has anticipated our making some objections to section 1 or 2. The first section states that men engaged in logging operations who have had one season's experience in logging shall receive not less than one dollar per day, in addition to food and lodgings, and wages shall be paid monthly, and in cash. Section 2 reads as follows: "No man shall be engaged logging at less than eighty cents per day with food and lodgings, paid monthly, and in cash."

Now, the point that I am looking at is this, if you fix the wages of the loggers, what will you do if the men in the mills or some other laborers ask you to define their wages also? If the thousands of men working at Grand Falls and Bishops Falls, ask you to fix their wages, and you refuse them? Were it known to a Legislature that a man is not receiving a living wage, a wage that is sufficient to support himself and his family; they might intervene to see that he got a living wage. If you fix a minimum wage for the loggers, then you must

do the same for the men on Bell Island, and for every man in the country who asks for it. It must also be remembered that the A. N. D. Co., the largest paper and pulp company in the country,have not yet been able to pay a dividend. They have spent $10,000,000 altogether and they have not made a dividend of ½ per cent. for four years. There is very little likelihood of a dividend this year. Last summer there was some little trouble at Grand Falls, and the men sent to the United States to secure an organizer to see about a rise of wages. This man heard their grievances and then he heard the other side. He went to Mr. Jones and the people in charge and asked for their side. They showed him the cost of the undertaking and pointed out the fact that they had not paid a dividend, and that there was no hope of doing so. He met the men and told them that there was nothing to be done; that they were being well treated. The men were perfectly satisfied; they felt that he was disinterested, and fully competent to look after their interests. The logging operations of this company would cost in the neighborhood of half a million dollars for the season. If to this is added an increase of 10 per cent., it would mean some $50,000 or $60,000 additional expenditure. Would we be justified in asking a company which has been unable to declare a dividend to make this increase in wages? As long as the A. N. D. Co. is unable to pay a dividend, you will not have another dollar invested in this country in paper and pulp manufacturing. Last year this company lost $10,000 in running this industry.

I am not stating these facts, because I am interested in the A. N. D. Co. On the contrary they have been no friends of mine, for they are against our policy. We know that they have allowed their employees to leave their work and fight our candidates Last elections it was the same, and the men were paid their wages, without working for them. I mention this to show that we have no special interest in advocating the cause of the A. N. D. Co. I am looking at this as a national industry.

Whilst doing everything possible to improve the lot of the men, we must be careful not to do an injury to the industries of the Colony. With every other part of the Bill, I am in sympathy. A little amendment may be required to the sections here and there. I see no objection, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill being referred to a Committee and then probably a way out of these difficulties will be found.

It being now 6.30 p.m. Mr. Parsons left the Chair until 8 o'clock.

The House then rose till 8 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair at 8 p.m.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker I wish to say a few words in relation to the bill before the House, the Act to regulate the Employment of Loggers. I think the bill ought to go to a second reading. The object ought to commend itself to every member of this House. If conditions exist in the logging camps as they have been described, there can be no doubt but that there is need for reform. Some sections in the Bill may give rise to some difference of opinion, but on the whole the bill should commend itself to us all. To secure the health of the men in camps, to secure them against accident, are matters upon which we cannot differ. The great object of this bill is to see that these things are secured. Some of the Companies may be now living up to the requirements of this Act but there may come a time when such regulations as these in the frame of a law may be very helpful. One of the greatest advantages provided by the Act is proper inspection

of the camps by a proper authority. That is provided for by section six. Then power is given to representatives of the men to inspect conditions, and they are given legal standing and they are to have their authority recognized throughout the camps and see that the provisions of the law are carried out. The only question upon which the Prime Minister expressed himself as differing in opinion is that contained in Sections 1 and 2. These sections lay down a principle of a minimum wage for loggers in the camps. The question of a minimum wage is a very large one. It affects not only the industries about which we are now legislating but every similar industry. It also raises a very debatable economic question. In the case of Grand Falls or Bishop's Falls, or any other great industry, before passing on such a principle we should have accurate knowledge of the condition of these industries. It may be contended that these industries are of no benefit to the country. If they cannot afford to pay the men who labor for them a sufficient wage to support their families in the ordinary common comforts of life then they are not economic industries. And this is one of the points upon which we should be informed before we pass upon these sections. A suggestion was thrown out by the introducer who evidently saw the difficulty that a minimum wage ought to be accompanied by a minimum output. A man who receives a fixed wage should produce a proportionate amount of goods. That involves then two principles. It may be possible to reconcile the two or so draft the law as to be acceptable to the employers and the employed. The Prime Minister informed the House of the conditions under which the Companies at Grand Falls and other places are labouring. For instance no dividend has been paid by the Harmsworth Company since the beginning of their operations. The other companies have been operating at a loss. These are important facts that we will have to consider when we go into Committee. I am not one of those, Sir, afraid to face the question of a minimum wage. If it is found that an industry is not paying a wage that it can afford, a wage that will keep their employees in comfort, then it is the duty of this legislature to pass a minimum wage law. I am prepared to admit the principle contained in this Bill, and I think it should be allowed to go into Committee to see if the objects of these sections can be attained. I believe in the principle, and I think it can be attained.

Of the other sections, many of them can give rise to no dispute. They provide for reasonable requirements, and from what the introducer has said, it appears necessary to have legislation to regulate the camps, and to see that the industry is carried on with that respect to the conditions under which we live. The enforcement of these provisions is provided for and proper inspection, and a good deal is placed in the hands of the men themselves.

I therefore support the bill and think it ought to go to a second reading on the principle it contains.

The Bill was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the law relating to the Representation in the House of Assembly."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, the object of this Bill, as has been pointed out, is to take in, by the extension of the boundaries of

the District of Twillingate, one or two settlements in the country that have been settled in recent years and have grown up since the railway has been built, and increased their population by reason of the logging concerns established at Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls. When the election took place last Fall it was found that these settlements were disfranchised by not being in any district. The boundaries as a rule are coast lines, and there has been no extension of districts since the last amendment was made. These boundaries now proposed are only temporary to meet the case of an election that will take place to fill the vacancy in the District.

MR. COAKER—Will it be this year?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I thought you were strongly against spring elections.

MR. COAKER.—You want a new Minister.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—However, whether in the Spring or Fall, it ought to be very consoling to the hon. member to think there is going to be an election. If it is more convenient we will hold it in the spring. If not, it will be held in the Fall. There will be an election before the House meets again. And this Bill is to provide that the population of these settlements shall not be disfranchised. Hereafter, if there is a redistribution bill, as there will be some day, it may be necessary to make considerable alteration in the boundaries of the various districts so as to include the whole country. It will be remembered that when we first got representative government there were only 15 representatives. There was one for Bonavista, Burin, Ferryland, Fogo, Bonne Bay, Conception Bay, Placentia, Trinity, Fortune Bay, Twillingate, St. George's Bay, three for St. John's.

In 1855 the number was increased to 30 when we got responsible government. Since then it has been increased to 36. Not very long ago the Government received from the F.P.U. a memorandum in connection with a redistribution of seats, and they asked that 2 members additional be made sc : to make the representation 38 instead of 36. The population of Newfoundland, according to the last census, was 243,000, so that if you divided the country up into 36 districts you would have a little less than 7,000 in each district. In 38 districts the number would be still lower. I informed the hon. member the other night that when I was dealing with this matter I would make a statement in relation to the position which the Government takes regarding the request of the Fishermen's Union. In the first place. I think the general principle of one-man districts must commend itself to every one. It would be very much to the advantage of the people who live in the larger districts. Take, for instance, Placentia and St. Mary's. You have got in that district three large Bays, Placentia Bay, St. Mary's Bay, and Trepassey Bay. The three representatives have to cover that whole country under the present system, whereas if it were divided up into three districts, the interests of the people would be very much better looked after. Originally, the whole Island s divided into fifteen districts. There was only one member at that time for the whole of Conception Bay. Then as the population increased the representation also increased until it has reached the stage in which it is to-day. From a population standpoint, as well as a geographical standpoint, a re-distribution would now probably be required, to have the representation equitably and fairly distributed over the district, but it is a matter which cannot be dealt with within a day or a week. It could not possibly have been got ready to be dealt with at this session. In the first place, regard must

be had to the denominational status in the various districts. You must divide up the districts in such a manner as to preserve, if possible, the relative numerical standing of the different denominations. There are some districts which it would be not at all difficult to divide, and there would be others where the difficulties would be very great. The first time this matter was brought up was, I think, in 1887 or in 1888, and there was a committee appointed to go into the matter. The late Ellis Watson, then member for Trinity, was chairman of the committee. The whole matter was gone into very fully at that time, and it was found that it was quite impossible for a committee sitting during the session to deal with it intelligently and in a satisfactory way. A map was obtained I remember, and on that map the country was divided up into districts. It was found that while in some districts the denominational matter was capable of easy adjustment, in others serious difficulties presented themselves. Take the district of Twillingate. That district calls for two Methodist representatives and one Church of England. In dividing up that district into three one-man districts, you would have to be careful to preserve that proportion as far as possible. It is not as if you could go to one settlement and take a piece of that and then go miles away and take a piece of another. You have got to divide up the country geographically. Now, I pointed out to the hon. member for Bonavista, who is also the President of the body who forwarded the memorial, that it is not a very easy matter to accomplish what he desires, but I would inform him that the Government have had the matter under consideration, and it is quite possible that it will be taken up within a reasonable time. I may say that my own feeling in the matter is that it would be a great advantage to the country if we could have from 36 to 38 one-man districts, provided that could be accomplished without in any way altering the denominational status in the various districts. That is, of course, a matter that regard must be had to, because it is important. Since 1887 or 1888 no attempt has been made to deal with this subject. It has been suggested from time to time, and it has been discussed in the press from time to time. Various administrations have discussed it in party meetings, but no real attempt has been made to do anything. It is only when you sit down to make your division that you will be able to understand how difficult this matter is. Of course, in a district where there is a very large preponderance of one denomination, it is easy enough. For instance, take the District of Burin. You could cut that district right in two at Burin. There would be no difficulty at all in that district, but the same is not true of Notre Dame Bay or some of the other larger Bays. The thing will probably have to be done by a Committee of one or two—by some persons fully conversant with what would be desirable.

The present Bill is merely for the purpose of dealing with the district of Twillingate and I beg leave to move the first section.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. There cannot be any objection to the bill which has been tabled. As far as I can see, it is only for the purpose of enabling the people in the section which it affects to vote and there is no ground for any difference of opinion with regard to it. I am pleased to hear the announcement of the Premier regarding the resolutions placed in the hands of the Government by the F. P. U. These resolutions asked that 38 single districts should be evolved out of the present system. We are not very particular as to what you do with the representation in St. John's but we think that there should

he 31 of those districts outports. We went to considerable trouble to ascertain whether this would be possible or not and we gave some consideration to the matter on the lines suggested by the Rt. Hon. Premier. We found that it would work out at about 6,200 people in each district. It would take about 38 districts. We followed the chart right around the country and we considered that out of those 38 districts 13 could go to the Catholic population, the balance to the Protestant. Now, with regard to the district of Twillingate. It is very easy to work out the system there. On the North side, there is a large proportion of Church of England people and the Church of England representative could be returned for that side of the Bay, while the bottom and South sides would return Methodists. In Fogo, it would be very easy and in Bonavista and Trinity, it could be arranged. There is no difficulty whatever with the working out of the system in the Northern Bays. The most prudent course would be to appoint a committee from both sides of the House and give them power to draft a Memorial to be laid before the House. Now, I find that they are doing something with regard to re-distribution in Canada at the present time. The Government has taken both sides of the House into its confidence and in that way they expect to draft a Bill which will be acceptable to both sides of politics. There is no doubt about the fact that there is considerable difficulty and the matter would require a lot of consideration, but we went to the trouble of drawing up a chart and we are satisfied that the thing can be done without doing any injury to any particular denomination. There is a great deal to be said in favour of single man districts. Under the present system, it takes a lot of money for candidates to canvas a district like Bonavista or any of the other large districts. You must have a steamer in order to be able to do it with any degree of thoroughness. If you divide the country into single man districts, it would be a very simple matter for a man to canvass his district and the cost would be comparatively small. Of course in our case we got through Bonavista with a very small expenditure, but we had the organization, and we found it very easy and very cheap to get around. If we had to canvass that district as our opponents did, we should not have been able to contest it at all. Another thing in favour of single man districts is that under the present system we find that there is one good man in the district and he usually has with him two common Jacks. Under the other system, each man would have to look after his own part and he would have to go on the platform of his own district and generally conduct his own campaign. The result will be that we would have superior men in politics. We have good men now who are anxious to go into politics, but under the present system it is too costly. If the system was revised, they would probably be into political life. Another advantage which would come from it would be that a man would have a personal knowledge of his own district. He would know almost every stone in it and when applications were made for allocations for various purposes, he would be able to deal with them on their merits. It is hardly worth while that we should go into the matter now, especially in view of the assurance of the Premier that the Government is considering the matter very seriously and that they intend to take action. The only question now is as to when action will be taken and how it will be taken. The best thing to do would be to appoint a Committee

similar to that which was appointed the other night to deal with the fishery resolutions, that is a committee representing the whole House, and give them power to sit after the present Session of the House is closed. Then, if they could not get anything ready for next Session, they might have something for the Session after, and something would certainly be done before the next election. I have not the slightest doubt that if Sir Edward Morris's government will deal with this matter, they will go down in history as one of the Governments which has done some real good for the Colony. The system under which we are now working is 30 years old and it is certainly time to make a change. The Government will deserve credit if they have the pluck to face the situation.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman. I suppose that as I am the only representative of the district of Twillingate in the House at the present time, it would not be out of place if I were to say a few words regarding the bill now before the Committee. The Bill meets a want which was badly felt last fall. Because of some oversight, a large number of men who were engaged in logging down in that section of the country were practically disfranchised. They had no chance of casting a vote unless they went either to Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls or Botwood and under the circumstances, this was practically impossible. While the Government made all the arrangements that it was possible to make at that time, yet there were a very large number of men who did not vote. This Bill will deal with that difficulty.

If the Rt. Hon. Premier would take a suggestion from me while we are on the subject of the district of Twillingate, I would like to advise that no election be held in the Spring unless it is not possible to avoid it, or unless there was no opposition. Judging from the last election held down there, it is a very expensive affair and it would be almost impossible to conduct the election at all at the spring of the year. The last time they did get through it some way or other, but I do not think it would be advisable to try it again.

With regard to the re-distribution of seats, I think it would be a tremendous advantage to the district of Twillingate. I don't think there is a district in the Island which would derive more benefit than Twillingate. I was just thinking that if somebody were foolish enough to ask me to contest that district in four years time and I were foolish enough to agree to do so, I would just sit down and write a letter addressed to the people of the district and have it published in the "Advocate" explaining the position and asking for their support. Then if they elected me, alright, and if they didn't, alright. If the district were divided up into three parts, it would do away with the tremendous expense of travel and the local administration of affairs would be very much easier. Now, as regards the denominational difficulty, I know it exists and will have to be considered. As far as I am personally concerned, I judge a man as I find him and I don't care at what altar he worships. Nevertheless, I suppose the question will have to be dealt with in connection with any re-distribution of seats which may be attempted. The Hon. member for Bonavista in speaking of the representation for the district of Twillingate said that there should be one Church of England and two Methodists. He should have put in one Salvationist. I think it is a great pity we cannot do away with this denominational business throughout the country. I think it is time that we

faced this matter and dealt with it firmly.

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 without amendment.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to apply to this Colony the Law of England in relation to the Suppression of what is known as "The White Slave Traffic."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair,

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Com mittee.

RT. HON. THE PREMIER—Mr. Chairman. In 1905, this Government was invited to co-operate with Great Britain in relation to a Convention dealing with the White Slave Traffic. The Convention was executed on the 18th of May, 1904, and it was signed by nearly all the European powers, including Great Britain. The object of the Convention was to prevent women of adult age, as well as minors, from being subject to abuse or constraint and to give them efficient protection from the criminal traffic, known under the name of the "White Slave Traffic."

On January 19th 1906 the Government of the Colony at the suggestion of the Secretary of State for the Colonies adhered to the Convention and appointed the Inspector General of the Constabulary to be the local authority in relation to the matter. We are now asked to pass this Act confirming the convention as far as this country is concerned. Section 1 reads as follows:

1—The law of England relating to crimes and offences made pursuant to said Convention shall be the law of this Colony so far as the same can be applied; subject to such amendments, alterations and further enactments of the Imperial Parliament as may hereafter be made and which shall, after twelve months from the passing thereof respectively, be the law of this Colony: Provided that between the time of the passing of any law and its coming into force in this Colony the law as it previously stood shall continue to be in force therein.

We are only following the example of England and all the great European countries who are parties to that convention. I am not aware that there is any great necessity for this Act in this country, for I have never known a case where that horrible traffic has taken place, but one can never tell what time such a thing may happen, and it is just as well to be on the safe side and be prepared for it.

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 without amendment.

It was ordered that this Report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow

SAWMILLS BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the amendment of the Crown Lands Act respecting Sawmills.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The object of this Bill is to regulate the cutting of timber on Crown Lands, and on the three mile limit. There are three classes of mills in operation today in this country. The first is that of the large mill owner, who has

a license and is cutting thereunder. Then we have what is called the small fisherman's mill, or free mill, cutting from Crown Lands without license or lease, and then we have what we may term the small commercial mill, which is also operating on the three mile limit without a license and really for the purpose of trade. In the year 1906 there was an honest effort made to try and regulate the traffic, and an Act known as the Sawmills Restriction Act, was passed, but it has not been successful in meeting the difficulties. There is a considerable amount of difficulty in this country in the way of regulating those mills operating on the three mile limit. The purpose of this legislation is to take charge of those mills and put them under license, and if found necessary gradually to ease them off the limit, without being too harsh, and without confiscating property.

There is a considerable difference of opinion today among the public as to whether those mills operating on the three mile limit, should be continued or not. Only today a petition was received containing 10 signatures, protesting against a mill being operated in the vicinity of Heart's Content.

The other day a petition containing 114 names was presented to this House, which took an opposite view in respect to this identical property. So that hon. members can see at what variance our people are in connection with mills on the three mile limit. We propose to divide mills operating at present without a license on the three mile limit, into two classes. The first will be the small fisherman's mill, which will be given a free license, and whose output will be limited, while the other mills which are really commercial mills, will pay a license, probably amounting to about one half of that now paid by mills operating under license. Those commercial mills will pay a small license fee and a small royalty, which has been inserted in this Bill. It is to be hoped that in the course of time all those mills will be gradually removed from the three mile limit. I have had prepared a few notes and statistics in connection with the three classes of mills, which I have mentioned, which I shall read to this House:

The Act refers to and is intended to regulate the cutting of timber on Crown land, and particularly on such land lying within three miles of the seashore which is known as the 'three mile limit' and sometimes referred to as the 'fishermen's limit.'

This strip is not reserved by the Crown Lands Act or any other Act of the Legislature, but is simply a strip over which successive Governments have declined to grant licenses to cut timber.

It may be noted that the exclusion of this strip from license was not originally intended principally to secure a supply of timber for use for fishery purposes (i.e. for building boats, etc.) as the practice originated in the following way: Applications were made for limits which extended down to the seashore. Some of these surrounded settlements, and it was to secure to the inhabitants of these settlements, a supply of wood for fencing, building, firewood and such like general purposes, as well of course, as for fishery purposes, that it was thought advisable to exclude a portion surrounding such settlements. As the boundary of the settlements was very indefinite a strip three miles from all the seashore was excluded. Such applications continuing to be made it became the usual practice in dealing with them to exclude any land lying within three miles of the seashore

whether settlement existed there or not.

Land within this strip has not been exempted from the operation of the Crown Lands Act except so far as the issue of licenses to cut timber are concerned. Mining titles and grants for agricultural purposes have continued to be issued, the latter giving the grantee absolute rights over the timber which even a license to cut timber would not do.

Although the original idea of reserving a strip of timber around settlements for general purposes may have been a good one it does not appear that the general reservation of a three mile strip from all parts of the coast is useful or necessary, or that mills should be prohibited from being operated on this strip or timber cut thereon for milling purposes. In fact the shutting down of the mills at present in operation would be a great loss to the country generally and to the people of the outports, particularly, for the following reasons:

(1.) Those mills give employment during the winter months to a great many people living near them who are unable to take advantage of employment offered by mills working in the interior of the country, as many who are not able to leave their families for long periods are able by cutting logs near their settlement, to earn a considerable amount each year.

(2.) They supply the people with timber for houses, and to a considerable extent, for boat building, at lower rates than they would be able to obtain if these mills were shut down much of the timber cut being sawn for the persons on the halves, i. e., the person supplying the logs receiving half the lumber sawn therefrom.

(3.) They supply the greater portion of such products as staves, heading, laths and shingles, produced in the country. During the year 1910-11, 120 free mills (i.e. mills cutting less than 10,000 feet board other than staves, laths, etc., per annum) produced:

Staves. Heading. Laths. Shingles
2,696,000 539,000 153,000 113,000

equivalent to 1,920,000 feet board measure, valued at $24,748.20., and 151 other mills operating without license and generally getting their logs from the three mile limit produced:

Staves. Heading. Laths. Shingles
4,274,000 607,000 2,314,000 10,807,000

equivalent to 4,155,428 feet board measure valued at $57,907.20, or the total quantity produced of these articles from logs cut principally on the three mile limit was:

Staves. Heading Laths. Shingles
6,970,000 1,146,000 2,467,000 10,920,000

equivalent to 6,075,428 feet board measure the estimated value of which was $82,655.40, while the quantities of the above mentioned articles produced by all the mills owned by licensees of timber limits was only:

Staves. Heading Laths. Shingles
64,000 9,000 2,708,000 1,719,000

equivalent to 599,756 feet board measure and valued at $9004.40. To the output of staves etc., from timber cut on Crown Land must be added 23,199,000 feet manufactured into scantling board etc., and valued at $297,624,10, making a total output from unlicensed mills equivalent to 29,262,000 feet, the total manufactured product of various kinds being valued at $380,279.50. These returns are for the year 1910-11 for which year the statements received are most complete.

(4.) The ouput of these mills tend to supply lumber all over the country at a much lower price than would otherwise obtain. During the year 1910-11, 15 mills operating under license cut 23,226,200 feet, and 271 mills operating without license(practically all on the three mile limit) cut 29,262,000 feet. Of this 29,262,000 feet

(in round figures) about 23,000,000 was cut in board, scantling, etc., the estimated value of which was $297,624.00. Thus over half the local supply of such timber was cut by these mills, and it is questionable if the source of supply were done away with, whether lumber would not have to be imported to supply the demand. It should be borne in mind that a considerable proportion of the value of the whole output of these mills is distributed in labor.

Quoting from a report of Mr. Thistle on the subject: "These mills employ in operating and in lumbering for them 2,434 men, for about five months. Placing the average wage at $25 per month, there would be disbursed in wages $304,250; but this large amount is not actually paid out in wages in the ordinary sense, as a large portion of those engaged in this particular milling and lumbering industry own the mills themselves, and do both the work of lumber men and mill men. They constitute the employer and the employed, being at the same time owners and operators."

(5.) The exclusion of the three mile strip around the whole coast does not appear necessary, because the supply of timber required specially for fishery purposes, boat building, etc. may be obtained from a much smaller area It is stated that it is not usual for fishermen to obtain their supplies of such timber at a greater distance than one-half to one mile from the shore, though in some instances they may do so. If such timber is not available within this distance at one place it appears to be the practice to move along by boat to another location where such timber is nearer. Further if it is shown in special cases that it is necessary to reserve any particular piece of timber land as a supply for fishery purposes this can always be done in limited areas by refusing license to operate a mill in the vicinity and to reserve any particular part by order of the Governor in Council.

(6.) Much of the timber on the three mile limit is not, and probably never will be, used for fishery purposes, and if not used in some other way will simply remain to rot or be destroyed by fire. The introduction of motor boats in general use will also probably have the effect of diminishing the quantity of timber required for spars etc., as the use of wire fencing has the quantity of timber used for that purpose, while as before stated, large quantities of the timber used in building the hulls of boats, etc., are manufactured in whole or in part by the mills under consideration.

(7.) The Act gives the Government control over the mills at present in operation and ensures that, with the exception of the free or fishermen's mill, they shall pay into the revenue a substantial amount in return for their being allowed to operate. It also gives power to control the extension of the industry in future, as, if it is found desirable licenses to operate mills can be refused.

(8.) The operation of these mills should be far from an unmixed evil, even from the point of view of the fisherman. He requires board, scantling, etc., for building houses, barns, stages etc., as well as timber for boat building, and this class of mill caters especially to his wants at a much lower cost than if he were dependent on an outside supply.

(9.) There is at present considerable amount of capital, about $250,000 invested in these mills, which are mostly owned by residents of the various outport settlements, and unless it can be very clearly shown that these mills are of much greater damage to any interests of the country generally than they appear to be, it

would be a great injustice to prohibit their operation.

(10.) It may be pointed out also that the cutting of wood for milling purposes within three miles of the shore is not the only cause for the reduction in the quantity of timber now available for fishery purposes. The following is quoted from the report of Mr. Thistle, Timber Inspector, for the year 1910-11.

"The fisherman must be convinced "that the fir and spruce trees he de- "stroys to procure one hundred rinds "or sheaths of bark if cut and sold "as cordwood, would be worth fifteen "times as much as the market value "of his hundred rinds. That the hun- "dred trees killed by him for the "bark only would make about three "cords of wood, which if made into shingles, laths or staves would be "worth $15, or if sold to make paper "pulp would yield about an equal va- "lue. He must be convinced that bark- "ing of birch trees, that yields only "a meagre sum to those engaged in "it has not only been a large factor in "killing this class of ship's timber "but has largely helped to kill the "shipbuilding industry. That thous- "ands of dollars once disbursed at "home are now sent to Nova Scotia "and the U. S. A., for the pur- "chase of vessels that should be "built in our own docks; that such a "deplorable destruction, although "permissible, helps to kill the trade "of all contributing to the equipment "of our shipping, the blockmaker, "sailmaker, cordage maker and black- "smith alike."

Statement No. 1.

Statement of staves, heading, laths and shingles cut by free or fishermen's mills on the Three Mile Limit.

District	Staves	Heading	Laths	Shingles
Trinity	2,528,000	475,000		
Bonavista	168,000	64,000	3,000	13,000
Fortune			150,000	100,000
	2,696,000	539,000	153,000	113,000
Value	$18,872.00	$5,390.00	$306.00	$180.20

Total value ... $24,748.20
Total equivalent in feet board measure ... 1,920,000 ft.

Statement No. 2.

Statement of staves, heading, laths and shingles, cut by mills which are not free or fishermen's mills operating on the Three Mile Limit and which cut over 10,000 feet:—

District	Staves	Heading	Laths	Shingles
Harbour Main				10,000
Trinity	1,705,000	383,000	15,000	4,626,000
Bonavista	2,418,000	184,000		1,233,000
Twillingate	106,000	25,000	1,503,000	1,470,000
Fogo	10,000		30,000	250,000
St. George		6,000	80,000	200,000
Fortune	4,000		619,000	2,238,000
Burin	1,000		61,000	105,000
Placentia & St. Mary's	30,000	9,000	6,000	675,000
	4,274,000	607,000	2,314,000	10,807,000
Value	$29,918.00	$6,070.00	$4,628.00	$17,291.20

Total value ... $57,907.20
Total equivalent in feet, board measure ... 4,155,428 feet

Quantity of Staves, Heading, Laths and Shingles cut by mills operating without license 1910-11.

District	Staves	Heading	Laths	Shingles
Harbour Main				10,000
Trinity	4,233,000	858,000	15,000	4,626,000
Bonavista	2,586,000	248,000	3,000	1,246,000
Twillingate	106,000	25,000	1,503,000	1,470,000
Fogo	10,000		30,000	250,000
St. Georges		6,000	80,000	200,000
Fortune	4,000		769,000	2,338,000
Burin	1,000		61,000	105,000
Placentia & St. Mary's	30,000	9,000	60,000	675,000
	6,970,000	1,146,000	2,467,000	10,920,000
Equivalent in feet B.M.	3,485,000	1,146,000	352,428	10,920,000
Total				6,075,428

Statement No. 4.

Quantity of staves, headings, laths and shingles cut by mills operating with license, 1910-11:—

District.	Staves.	Heading.	Laths.	Shingles.
Twillingate	64,000	9,000	2,618,000	1,569,000
St. George's			50,000	100,000
Burgeo & LaPoile			40,000	50,000
	64,000	9,000	2,708,000	1,719,000
Equivalent in Board Masure	32,000	9,000	386,856	1,719,000
Or in all—599,756 ft. B.M.				
Value	$448.00	$90.00	$5,716.00	$2,750.40
Total value				$9,004.40

Statement No. 5.

Statement of number of saw mills without license cutting 10,000 feet of Board or less per annum:—

Trinity	102
Bonavista	15
St. Barbe	2
Fortune	1
Total	120

The approximate average cost of installing each of these mills is estimated by Mr. Thistle at $600.00, the total value at that rate being $72,000.00. All these mills are operated by water power.

Statement No. 6.

Statement of number of saw mills cutting over 10,000 feet board per annum each:—

District.	No. of Mills.	How operated. Steam.	Water.	Approximate cost of installing each mill.	Total.
Harbour Main	3		3	$1,300	3,000
Trinity	61		57	800	45,600
Trinity		4		2,000	8,000
Bonavista	32		18	800	14,400
Bonavista		14		2,000	28,000
Twillingate	23		8	1,000	8,000
Twillingate		15		2,500	37,500
Fogo	3		1	1,000	1,000
Fogo		2		3,000	6,000
St. Barbe	4		2	600	1,200
St. Barbe		2		3,000	6,000
St. George's	1	1		2,000	2,000
Burego & LaPoile	1	1		2,500	2,500

Fortune	9		3	600	1,800
Fortune		6		3,000	18,000
Burin	5		4	800	3,200
Burin		1		2,000	2,000
Placentia & St. Mary's	9		6	600	3,600
Placentia & St. Mary's		3		2,500	7,500
	151	49	102		$206,900

N.B.—Cost of mills estimated by Mr. Thistle.

Now there is a very interesting point raised and it is whether there should be any more rinding of trees permitted. In a district where there is only a limited amount of rinding done every year and where the white ends are afterwards used for commercial purposes it may not be much harm; but there are times when it is done in a very wholesale way and works great destruction.

Now it is not the intention to interfere in any way or put any fee on these small fishermen's mills cutting under ten thousand feet of board measure. That is a first principle. They are not to pay anything, but it is proposed that they will be regulated and controlled within certain rules and generally supervised. Where these mills are situated an attempt will be made to see that what further cutting is carried on will be done in such a way as not to injure the forest, and so that the reproduction of the forests can go on. I think it is generally understood that our forests will reproduce themselves in about twenty-five or thirty years. When I say "reproduce" I do not mean that very large stout timber will grow, but that within that time you will get a very fair sized tree. Now basing the cut on last year's figures the revenue ought to be $26,000, which would be a considerable revenue and will put them somewhat on an equality with the larger mills which under their licenses have to pay on their output.

In 1906 an Act identical with this was passed but it was never brought into operation and the mills have gone on and have not been licensed or restricted in any way. No doubt that was due to the fact that there were difficulties in the way. Now it is proposed to deal with the matter in this way:

Be it enacted by the Governor, the Legislative Council and House of Assembly, in Legislative Session convened, as follows:—

1.—Any bona fide fisherman who wishes to operate a saw mill for the purposes of preparing staves or heading for making barrels for fishery requirements, or for the making of shingles, lobster laths or lobster boxes, whose whole cut of timber for other purposes does not exceed 10,000 feet board measure in any one year, may obtain, free of cost, a license to operate a saw-mill for such purposes, and any other purpose in such quantity, subject to the following conditions:—

In the 1906 Act a license was referred to but we have put in the words "free of cost" so that there may be no doubt about it.

Now you have the first section of the first resolution dealing with the fishermen's mills, which will be absolutely free, but at the same time licensed and controlled, and each millman will know that his chance for a renewal of his license will depend on the manner in which he has carried out the rules and regulations that will be laid down and form part of his license.

The next resolution deals with the present unlicensed commercial mills—not the fishermen's mills but mills operated purely for commercial purposes, of which there are about

150, and reads as follows:

(a) The license may be granted by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines for one year from the 30th of November, upon the application of the bona fide fisherman, as aforesaid, who shall set forth in his application that he is such fisherman, and also the situation of his mill, its capacity, and the period during which it has been in operation. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines may, in his discretion renew the said license annually.

(b) The licensee shall make returns to the Department of Agriculture and Mines, quarterly, or at such periods as may be required by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, sworn to by him or his agent, showing the quantity disposed of or sold of all sawn lumber, timber, railway car stuff, ship timber and knees, shingles, laths, cordwood or bark, or any other product of timber in whatever form the same may be disposed of, or sold, by him during such quarter or other period, and the price or value thereof, under a penalty for every default of twenty dollars, to be recovered in a summary manner before a Stipendiary Magistrate or Justice of the Peace.

(c) The license shall entitle the licensee to operate a saw mill and to cut timber therefor on Crown Land, and to purchase timber so cut and to manufacture the same in his mill in the manner, and to the quantity hereinbefore provided.

(e) The licensee shall pay annually a royalty of ten cents per thousand on all shingles manufactured in or by his mill.

(f) No person, without obtaining a license as hereinbefore provided, shall operate a saw mill of the class described in this section after six months from the passing of this Act, under a penalty not exceeding twenty dollars for every day when such mill is so operated; and all such licenses issued before the thirtieth of November of the present year shall terminate on the said date, on which date also the first royalty under said licenses shall be due and payable.

(g) Before the granting of a new license three months notice shall be given in the Royal Gazette and one weekly paper published in this Colony, and the Department of Agriculture and Mines shall forward a copy of such notice to the Representatives in the Legislature for the District in which the mill sought to be licensed is situated.

Now subsection (f) is the principal section and if the people in the neighborhood of any such mill or the public generally object to such mill being carried on, the matter will be brought up in the regular way and dealt with under that section. Now, the next resolutions are as follows:—

2. It shall be lawful for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to issue licenses to persons or companies who are at present operating mills on what is known as the three mile limit and are not the holders of timber or pulp licenses under the Crown Lands' Act, to cut timber and to operate saw mills for one year from the thirtieth of November which said licenses shall be renewable at the discretion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines on payment of a fee of five dollars. The licensee of any such license shall pay, as a royalty, the sum of one dollar per thousand feet, board measure, on all lumber sawn or manufactured in the mill operated under authority thereof.

(a) The said license shall terminate on the 30th November in each year. The fee for the said license shall be affixed thereto in stamps. The license shall be returned to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines before the 30th of November in each year accompanied by the amount of the

fee. The absence of a stamp on said license with the date of the year in which the same was affixed, shall be conclusive evidence that the said license was not renewed for the year in which such stamp was not affixed.

(b) The license shall be produced by the licensee to an Inspector or other person authorized by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines.

(c) Such license shall be subject to all the provisions of the Crown Lands' Acts as to scale, making returns, inspection of books, for date, payment of royalty, and otherwise, except that return for royalty shall be the quantity actually manufactured in the mill, and such other conditions as to the area in which the licensee is to cut as may be prescribed by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines.

(d) Such license shall not convey any exclusive right to cut over any particular land, but shall merely permit the licensee to cut logs from Crown lands for the purpose of having the same sawn or manufactured in the mill licensed, and such right to cut shall be in common with the public, but he may also purchase logs so cut by any person entitled to cut on Crown lands, and the license shall not convey any right whatever to water power.

(e) Application for such license shall be made to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines accompanied by a fee of five dollars, and before the issue of said license, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines shall cause to be published for a period of thirty days, by affixing the same at a Post Office or other public building in the neighborhood of the situation of the mill proposed to be operated under such license, a notice setting forth the fact that such license has been applied for.

(f) It shall be lawful for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines at any time after the issue of such license to revoke the same upon the application or petition of any persons who shall satisfy him, by any evidence, or in any manner, that the grant of such license, or the operation of such mill, is contrary to the public interest.

(g) No person, not being a holder of a timber or pulp license under the Crown Lands' Act shall, without obtaining a license as in this Act provided, operate after one month from the passing of this Act a saw mill for the manufacture of timber cut on Crown land. under a penalty not exceeding twenty dollars for every day when such mill is so operated; and all such licenses issued before the thirtieth day of November of the present year shall terminate on the said date, on which date also the first royalty under said licenses shall be due and payable.

3. In estimating board measures, the following equivalents shall be used:

6,000 half drum staves shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.

4,500 drum staves shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.

2,000 herring brl. staves shall equal 1.000 ft. board measure.

1,600 tierce staves shall equal 1,000 ft.

board measure.
1,400 fish cask staves shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.
7,000 laths shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.
10,000 shingles shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.
Heading to be estimated in feet, board measure.
10,000 tub staves shall equal 1,000 feet board measure.
A tub shall not exceed 30 lbs.

4. The Governor in Council may, when it shall be made to appear to him to be for the interest of the Colony, by Proclamation to be published in the Royal Gazette, prohibit the rinding of growing or standing trees on the public lands of the Colony or portion of the same, or lands held under license, lease or grant, for the purpose of taking away the rinds of the said trees for any purpose whatever.

5. The penalty for the infraction of any of the provisions and conditions of this Act, where such penalty has not been fixed by any preceding section of this Act, or by the Crown Lands' Act, 1903, shall be a fine not exceeding ten dollars for each infraction thereof. All penalties under this Act may be sued for, in the name of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. before a Stipendiary Magistrate or Justice of the Peace, by any Timber Inspector or other person authorized by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines.

6. The Governor in Council shall have the right to reserve, by Proclamation in the Royal Gazette, such sections or areas of Crown Land as may from time to time, in the public interest, be deemed expedient, and to prohibit the cutting of timber on such lands for milling purposes, and the penalty for cutting timber on such lands shall be fixed and determined in such proclamation; provided, however, that no such reservation shall be made until public notice has been given to those residing in and near the locality in which the land proposed to be reserved is situated.

7. The Act 6 Edward VII., cap. 28, entitled: "An Act to restrict the erection of Saw Mills within three miles of the coastline of this Colony, and better to preserve such timber lands for the purposes of the fishery, for ship building, for fencing and for firewood," is hereby repealed.

Now, under this Bill we shall be able to have a report from the inspector in relation to the location of each of these mills, shall be able to have the history of each and know the quantity of timber cut, the area over which cutting is carried on, the damage being done, the quantity of timber still remaining. In other words, I hope when we meet again here that the Minister of Agriculture will be able to make a statement supported by the reports of the inspectors as to the location of everyone of these mills, and all about them; in other words, give a complete photograph of the mill and the surrounding country, and let us get some adequate idea about the three mile limit and the injury done there, if injury is going on, because we cannot get away from the fact that this matter has been arousing considerable comment and dissatisfaction for a great many years, and if this injury is going on we should know it, and if possible find a remedy. Now, I do not know any other way of doing it, except a survey of this whole three mile limit—make a survey from beginning to end, and have a report from some person who would be capable of going over it. Here you have numbers of people holding licenses and interested in these mills and industries, and the public requiring to purchase the output of these mills, and before we deal with them in any way that

might be to their disadvantage we want to have all possible information concerning them. As a matter of fact the reason why the 1906 Act was not enforced was that so many people were interested that they had sufficient influence to prevent anything being done. Now, I am satisfied that after a while this matter which at present is at such a chaotic state will be reduced to order, and I believe that the three mile limit and that portion of the three mile limit in which the fishermen are interested will be properly surveyed, and properly restored to its original state. As we go along I shall be glad indeed to accept any reasonable amendment that will make the measure now submitted more perfect.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, we will of course, have an opportunity of considering these resolutions when the bill comes up, so it is not our purpose to discuss them in detail now. This bill is one of considerable importance and it raises some questions in my mind which require consideration. For instance, take the second part of these resolutions as they are here. It strikes me, Sir, as being open to abuse and as probably accentuating the evil which exists at the present time. The necessity for taking some steps to protect the three-mile limit has been accepted in this Legislature before, and Minutes of Council have been passed by previous governments protecting this limit. At present, of course, there is no positive enactment amongst our laws dealing with this question of the three mile limit, and under the second resolution, a man who holds a license under the Crown Lands Act at the present time by taking out a license under this Act, would get the unrestricted right to cut timber on Crown Lands subject to the royalty which is provided here. He would get that without any publication in the Gazette. He might extend his areas indefinitely that is, he only gets it for a year, but it would be renewed from year to year. Now, I think it is probable that some alterations in the second resolution at least will be suggested during the progress of the bill through the House or through the Committee when we go into Committee on the Bill. Of course, I think the principle of separating fishermen's from commercial mills is a good idea, and properly finds a place here. However, it is not my intention to discuss this matter tonight, as these resolutions will take the form of a bill and I do not at present intend to delay the House with a discussion of this matter.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, with regard to these resolutions, I agree with the remarks made by Mr. Kent that it is not necessary at this stage to criticise this measure at any great length, as we can more fully consider it at a later stage, but there are a few remarks that I would like to make with reference to ideas that I got from the Premier's address. Now, you expect a royalty of $1 a thousand from these small commercial mills. You are going to have a great deal of opposition to this Bill from the fishermen, because this is going to mean that the lumber they were getting for $10 is going to cost $11, and they are going to thank you for the present increase.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There will be no increase. The competition will keep down the price.

MR. COAKER—I would like to see you make some arrangement with regard to mills erected on the three mile limit At present they are not regulated in any way and some of them are doing a great deal of damage. Down at Botwood there are four or five commercial mills operating and they are working summer and winter, moving along the coast and cutting

right out to the shore in summer, and then in the winter they move into the interior and saw as they go. Now these mills are doing a tremendous lot of damage and sawing a lot of lumber that might be of great bene fit to the fishermen. When they move into a place they cut out the whole area in a short time. I do not believe that one of the these mills should be allowed to cut more than 50,000 a year. They should be limited to that amount. Now, with reference to the rinding of trees, I have very much pleasure in finding this placed in the resolution. Four years ago the Fishermen's Union sent a resolution to the Government with reference to the rinding of trees, and I am glad that the Premier has followed in some way the ideas laid down by us four years ago. A great deal of damage has been done in certain sections of the country by this rinding of trees, and I am glad that the Government are now going to deal with the matter. Down in some parts of Green Bay you will find thousands of trees that have been rinded and the white ends have never been used and the consequence is that in four or five years the trees fall down and rot. Of course, where the white ends are taken out and used as firewood it is a different matter. Down at Coaker ville, where I lived, there was a splen did forest and in the spring of the year the fishermen used go in and cut the rind from the trees. I pointed out to them what an injury this was to the trees, but it was hard to get them to stop it, while others were likely to go into the woods and do the same thing It has certainly delighted the members in the back row to find that the representations made by the Union four or five years ago have now been attended to by the Government.

At our first convention we drew this up. It was held at Change Islands and it will be admitted that we grasped the situation very clearly, for every thing that has been done this session has had some connection with what was dealt with at our convention at Change Islands in 1909. We must recognize this and we must rejoice to know that we have a F. P. U. Government in power.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I do not claim to have a legal mind but I would like to call attention to the word "other" in section 1. It seems to me that it gives the mill owner power to cut a thousand feet of lumber outside an area for any other purpose than that mentioned in the section. That would give a man a good chance to cut a lot of timber for purposes other than required for the fishery. As I have said, I do not quite know the exact legal meaning of the section, and possibly some hon. gentleman could give us an explanation on that point.

That was the only matter that I wished to refer to, but as the rinding of trees was referred to I would like to say a word or two on that question also I had occasion since last fall to walk thirty miles round our bay and I found all along that distance that trees had been rinded during the past summer. Men at the bottom of the bay had done a great deal of rinding and there must have been at least three thousand of the best trees damaged in that way. The rinds had not been used for fishery purposes but had been bought by firms for lining vessels for sending fish across to other countries. It was not by fishermen, properly speaking, that the trees had been destroyed, but by men who sold them for the purpose that I have mentioned, and this has been going on for a number of years

MR. YOUNG—Mr. Chairman, I trust that if the men to whom the hon. gentlemen has just referred did rind the trees that they sold them to the merchants. They are required for the sides of vessels and if they are used for that purpose it is to keep the fish and therefore, to help to get a better price for the fishermen. We need the rinds to protect our vessels and there should be a square deal for all. I do not think it is right for some to have the use of rinds and not others who want them to save their fish from getting bad. We must keep our fish good or it will not be sold on the other side. The more the merchants get for it over there the more the fishermen will get for it here. I hope the House will not put an end to the buying of rinds, for if this is done the fishermen on the Labrador and also the shore fishermen on the South and West coasts will suffer very much.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I think my hon. friend has misunderstood the statement which I made. I want him to understand that in Twillingate the fishermen are satisfied not to rind the trees but to use some other material for their fish. They are satisfied to put up with the inconvenience for they want to have their forests perserved.

MR. YOUNG—Mr Chairman, I might say that I do not want to contradict what my hon. friend has said but to show that in this case much hardship can be done to our fishermen. Our fishermen salt fish like the Gloucester men, that is to say, their fish is very heavily salted. If it is covered up by canvas or felt it is all right on a short trip in a steamer, but on a warm day in summer it is likely to be sunburnt. The Labrador fishery will be dealt a very severe blow if the Government stops the men from using these rinds. If the merchants buy them now the men who go into the woods and cut them are paid for their work, and the fishermen reap the benefit of better prices for their fish. If rinds are not used the cargo will be damaged and if we want to preserve the standard of our fish we ought to take this into consideration. I have no timber limits, and the Bill does not affect me any more than any other man, but I do not want this matter to go through the House because I think it will be a bad thing for our people. Is it not a good thing that men can earn money cutting rinds that are used for the preservation of our fish? We have been using rinds for a number of years, but I have not yet heard any complaint against the matter until now. I want to see the men protected.

I may go to a place on the Labrador coast with eighty or ninety men on my vessel, and if these men are unable to cut rinds or cannot get firewood it will mean a great inconvenience and loss to them. None of the men want to cut trees on the three mile limit for lumber, but they want rinds and the firewood, and I do not think they should be deprived of them. I am in favor of the Bill generally speaking, but I do not want the Government to stop the fishermen cutting rinds for their use.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, there is no section in the Bill which stops a man from cutting firewood and the fishermen can cut all they want of that. However, I would like to make a suggestion to my hon. friend about the trouble of making fish and covering it with felt. If he will gather some moss and put that on some felt and then put some felt over that again he will have no further trouble.

MR. YOUNG—In reply to my hon. friend, I shall place him in a position where he is seventy miles from any moss. You cannot expect men who are fishing all day to go thirty five

or seventy miles looking for moss. If it is on the spot we can use it all right, but when it is not there it is a different matter and I can tell my hon. friend that the men on the Labrador can see as far through a stone wall as anybody else.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted, and the Bill: "An Act in amendment of the Crown Lands Act respecting Sawmills", was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SEALING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Coaker the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend 55 Victoria, Cap. 2, entitled: 'An Act to regulate the prosecution of the Sealfishery.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, the member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, has given as his opinion that the cooks should be under the general authority of the captain and should help in any emergency such as when required for the safe navigation of the ship. I am prepared to meet my friend, Mr. Higgins as far as the saving of life is concerned; but I do not feel like accepting the words 'The safe navigating of the ship.' My reason is that in committee we had a fairly explicit explanation from Mr. Young of the duties of the cooks in his day. From what we gather, there was scarcely a day on which they could do their work. If we permit the cooks to navigate the ship, we must let them do as they like; for they will find it convenient to let these men navigate the ship more often than they should. There has often been a grumble, because the cooks have been sent to navigate the ships. I am not prepared to accept the words 'For the safe navigating of the ship,' because the cooks will then have to do whatever they are commanded.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word. I am sure we all appreciate the attitude of the introducer of the Bill. He is apprehensive that the latter part of the amendment will be stretched by the Captain and it will lead to the cooks doing much work outside of their ordinary duties. I don't think it will lead to any such thing. The penalty that a Magistrate can impose upon the Captain, if the food is not cooked, is such that it will have the effect of making the Captain keep the cooks at their regular work. In section 2 we have provided a limit to the work of the cooks. We have been informed that it would take all the time of 5 or 6 cooks to carry out the requirements of the sections. We suggested this amendment since the cooks signed on as part of the crew and we therefore thought it right that in cases of necessity they should be under the Captain's orders. That necessity might be either the saving of life or the safe navigating of the ship. No honourable member of the House will deny that where the saving of life is concerned or the safe-navigating of the ship is at stake the cooks should be under the control of the master. It is the wish of the cooks themselves to help along the ship and get her out of the jams. Any good, energetic fellow is going to help along the voyage whenever he can. If he does not do so, I must say that he is just as bad a cook as he is a sealer. I therefore ask the Committee to consider the

amendment, as it stands, because in all fairness and after all consideration, not alone as to the interests of the masters and owners but also to the rest of the crew, I think that in case of emergency, the cooks should be under the full control of the Captain. I regret that Mr. Coaker, the honourable introducer of the Bill, has not seen fit to take the amendment in its entirety. I wish to vote for every feature of the Bill that I can; but I shall have to move that this amendment stand as I read it. I do so because I think that when an emergency occurs the Captain should have the power of ordering every man on board.

MR. YOUNG—Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few remarks on the Bill before the Committee. I do not wish to speak about the amendment; but I want to refer to the section which deals with the use of rifles. The non-use of rifles is alright so far as old harp seals are concerned. With regard to dog hood seals, however, the case is different. It needs cold lead to kill them, for battens have no effect upon their hoods. If any amendment is made, I would like to see that clause struck out. I would like to see doctors carried on all the steel ships if possible. Often a man breaks his leg or arm and, if there was no doctor to set the bone, mortification might set in.

It is alright to have soft bread three times a week, if the cooks cannot find anything else to do, but baking bread. If the cooks have time to supply this bread, I have no objection I wish the honourable introducer to understand that it is not because Mr. Coaker introduced the Bill that I am objecting. Even if my leader introduced the Bill I would have to criticize it. Again it is alright to have pork and beans and brewse, if the cooks have time to cook it. To make brewse a great deal of bread has to be soaked overnight and much fish is required.

The men who cook the brewse will tell you that when you cook a bag of bread, you are going to have 18 inches of burnt bread at the bottom before the top part is boiled. Let them have potatoes instead. Then comes the onions etc.,in the soup on Saturday. What happens if they are out at the end of the voyage and raids have been made on the supplies? What happens if the onions give out? It would not be fair to the owners to have to pay $500 You cannot figure how long you are going to be out. I hope that my criticism wil be taken in good part. One cannot expect impossibilities and that section should be struck out.

Fresh beef once a week. That is all right while they have it aboard.

Cooks shall do nothing but cook. That is absurd and should be struck off. As to sick men, that is a clause that the Government should consider amending. Why should sick men be transferred to ships with a doctor that belongs to the same owner. Let them be transferred to any ship in sight that has a doctor even if the Government bears the expense. I want that section amended. I hope the introducer will not think I am talking against this Bill. I am in favour of it. I am going to vote for it. I am only expressing my opinion. Ships to the Gulf sail from here on the 13th of March and if they strike the seals they are not allowed to kill until the 15th under penalty of $4,000. If they sail away and take an inside cut or an outside cut and find the seals why should they not go ahead and kill away. Give them a free hand. If not then hold them in port until the 14th. Have they got to wait until the other ships come up and perhaps get a better position in the patch. When you let them go out, let them kill as many and as soon as they like. Then the owners are liable to a penalty if the

men start killing. Why is that? What do they know about what is happening at the ice. I do not agree with that clause. Strike it off. I think such a clause is aimed too much at the employers. Take the firm of Bowrings Look at the employment they give. Look at the expense to which they are put for the seal fishery. No, I think that clause should be struck out.

I would like to refer to the matter of cooks again. A cook should be allowed to do other work if necessary. I know it is their duty to cook for the men and he will generally have enough to do. In the Stephano there will be 7 or 8 cooks and 203 men. That makes their hands full. I agree to that But if the men are away for 24 hours or even less and they come back they are tired out. Well, the cooks would be a lazy lot indeed if they did not get over the side and help ship the pelts aboard. And in that case one freshman is worth three tired ones. I hope hon. members do not think I disagree with this bill. With this clause and those others I have mentioned stricken out, the bill would be all right. Some suggestion was made that I instigated Mr. Higgins' amendment I may say, sir, that I had nothing whatever to do with it. Mr. Higgins did not need any suggestion from me to show him the necessity for his amendment.

I do not wish to detain the House, but before I sit down I would like to make a few remarks on the question of the cull of fish.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The hon. member must speak to the bill before the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN—The Hon. member must speak to the Bill

MR. YOUNG—I intend to do so sir. I was going to talk about fish. Fish is one of the article of diet proposed in this Bill. Fish and brewse are to be supplied for breakfast. I wanted to discuss whether it was to be Labrador or shore fish. However, if the hon member from Port de Grave does not care what kind of fish his constituents eat at the ice I will not press the point. All I have to say about fish at the ice as an article of food is see that it is clean from the knife. Place it in enough salt and I will not trouble about the cull.

I do not believe in the cook clause. I have been to the sealfishery. I am not going this year because I have not been lucky enough to get a ship. Perhaps the owners have been lucky in not giving me one. However, that may be I do not believe that the fishermen want this law. These cooks have nothing to do from seven in the morning till 7 at night and in that time they might pick up 5,000 seals.

I am surprised that the President of the F.P.U. should introduce such a measure and I was surprised when he hit below the belt the other day when he said that Mr. Piccott was not the right man for his position. I claim that he is. And such a statement from the President of the F.P.U. is an insult to the 1414 men, merchants, clergymen, fishermen and all who sent him here.

It may be said by hon. members on the other side in the back row that I am criticising this bill because I am sitting on this side. That is not so. I am prepared to support any bill that is for the good of the fishermen. We are charged on this side of the House with insulting the fishermen. I never heard it, and I do not believe that any such insults have been used. I would be long sorry to do it myself. But that does not excuse the other side for insulting us. Mr. Piccott was hit below the belt by Mr. Coaker. As far as insults go where is there a greater insult than to be termed underdogs. That is insult enough. I have

nothing more to say at present on this bill, but I trust that it will not go through without the amendments I have suggested.

MR. COAKER--Mr. Chairman, in regard to the amendment proposed by Mr. Higgins, I am prepared to accept it as he suggested. If it were not put in the captains would still have the power to do all that the amendment suggests. But nevertheless, I accept it.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Chairman, just one or two words in reply to Mr. Young. The President of the F.P.U. has been criticised in connection with this Bill. I think I said before that at a convention at Greenspond a committee of 5 or 6 was formed to draft this bill I was one of that Committee The Bill was brought in by the Committee to the Supreme Council and received the support of the delegates from each district. It has gone before every Council making in all about 18 000 men and no one has informed his Council that it was not wanted, or that it was not required. It is not fair to lay any blame on the President of the F.P.U.. It was brought in by this Committee and agreed to by the delegates.

Mr. Young reminded me of a man who hardly knew how to read, trying to read a paper. He had to leave out every second word. Had we followed Mr. Young's advice we would leave out every second word in the bill.

My learned friend during his speech referred to an incident within his own knowledge. He says they had been a week on the ice and at the end of the week they had to haul some pans. Three cooks went with them and he said that the three cooks were as good as twenty men. There must have been something very strange about that. If these men had been well looked after, as they should have been, they would have been able to do their work. A week on ice doesn't disable a man, provided he receives proper attention. The hon. member says that the fishermen don't want this. I will tell him now that they do want it. He referred to the fact that there were no fishermen on this side of the House except Mr. Jennings. Well, I thought I was one. At least, with the exception of last summer, I have been fishing all my life. This is a thing which all fishermen have asked for and if you will take a vote of those going to the sealfishery, you will find that 80 out of 100 will support it. You cannot expect cooks to do the work of cooking and also go on the ice. They have sufficient work to do on board ship and if they are to do it properly they must not be asked to do anything else. This thing is going to benefit not only the men but the captains, the owners and everybody else, because when men are properly attended to they will be able to do better work and give better value It has been stated here that the men receive as good food at the sealfishery as they do home. That is not correct. Up to the present time the food that has been supplied on the sealing ships has not been nearly as good as the food to which the men have been accustomed in their homes. The hon. member for Hr. Grace offered a suggestion that the wisest course to pursue would be to vote this measure down. I offer a counter suggestion to that. If you want to do something really good and something which would benefit the sealers, vote for this measure. It is something which the fishermen really want. It is something which would be of real advantage to them.

MR. YOUNG—Mr. Chairman, just a few remarks in reply to the hon. member. I just want him and the hon. introducer of the Bill to understand that what I want is that in case of

emergency the captain should be at liberty to use the cooks for other purposes than for cooking. I don't want the bill to go through as it is now. I don't want to prevent the men from getting good food. The better food they get, the more I will be satisfied. In reference to the incident which I described about the three cooks doing as much work as twenty men, I just cited that incident to show that sometimes it is very important that the captain should be able to send the cooks on ice to haul seals on board. In that case, these men had been working on ice for a week. They were tired. When the cooks came out, they were fresh men and consequently were able to do nearly as much work as all the others put together.

I didn't say that the Hon. gentleman was not a fisherman and I don't mean to say that Mr. Jennings is the only fisherman on this side of the House. What I did say was that when he was being nominated, Mr. Jennings was the only gentleman who gave his occupation as a fisherman.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I have had no practical experience at the seal fishery either in sealing steamers or sailing vessels, but I attended the Council at Greenspond when the subject matter of this Bill was discussed and approved of by a large number of fishermen. I was present during the discussion which occupied two days and two nights during which time five or six hundred men who are engaged in the fishery were present. I am quite prepared to accept the decision of these experienced men,and I can assure this committee that the several matters contained in this Bill were the outcome of that debate. In the conduct of the lumbering business two men are usually appointed to cook for thirty men, but we find according to the regulations for cooking at the seal fishery one man is obliged to cook for thirty three men. Under these circumstances I should think that a cook has not much time to walk around the decks with his hands in his pockets. I think that this Bill is one which will be of great benefit to the fishermen,and I believe that every fishermen will concur with its provisions. I trust that it will receive the favourable consideration of this Committee.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks on this Bill, and on the amendments proposed by hon. members. I have listened attentively to the remarks made by the introducer and by other members, and looking at the lateness of the hour and the time taken up in the discussion, I may say that in my opinion there has been a great deal of time wasted. This bill was brought here with the intention of doing a large amount of benefit to our fishermen. It is quite true as some hon. member remarked that the age we live in now, a man is not able to live as his forefather did, and I find that if our forefathers, who were so strong, had only taken as much care of themselves as we are trying to do of ourselves, some people would not now be in the degenerate condition in which they find themselves. This bill has quite a number of good points which were inserted for the benefit of those who go to the sealfishery. I was sent here by the fishermen of Hr. Grace district and whatever I consider to be for the benefit of the fishermen and labourers of the country, I will support it no matter who the introducer of the measure may be. That is the purpose for which I was sent here, and my Constituents expect that I will do my duty and I intend to do it.

There has been a lot of discussion over the clause in this Bill relating to the cooks. A cook as a rule is the

hardest working man aboard a ship, whether on a sealing or foreign voyage. I worked in the capacity of cook, and on many occasions, I had no watch below during the day, nor on Sunday, and I was a servant performing all duties aboard the ship, and I was obliged to have meals ready when the time arrived. The cooks who go to the sealfishery have not in every case conveniences for cooking, and they labour very often under great difficulties in preparing the food. The work about the deck of a sealing steamer is far from clean, and as proper cooking will occupy all the time cooks should be prohibited from doing any other work. I would like to say however, that a master of a ship in order to preserve the necessary discipline should have authority over the cooks, stewards, and every one else aboard the ship, and if he has not that authority he has no right to be there as Master of the ship. No matter what laws we may enact here a cook is obliged under the British Merchants shipping Act to turn to work if the Captain of the ship orders him to do so. We may not think for one moment that any law we may pass is going to over ride that Act which has been brought to perfection by the British Parliament for the protection of seamen and those who sail under the British flag in every part of the world. When this bill goes to the vote I shall give it my support. I am of opinion that the fifth section of the Bill might be modified for it may happen that a sick man could not be transferred for weeks to a ship belonging to the same firm. Any ship no matter to whom it belongs should if coming into port take a sick man from any other ship. This is the quickest way for a sick man to get home. I consider that where a sick man is concerned every effort should be made to send him to a place where his sufferings would be relieved. Section 7 which refers to the landing of some of the crew may possibly mean a hardship to the others. Last year a number of men on board the "Erik" demanded to be brought to the land. The Captain at first refused to do so but eventually the men were landed at Bonavista. The Government were obliged to provide for the sending of these men to their homes. Take, for instance, three or four wooden ships belonging to Bowring's. A large number of the crews of these ships would refuse to remain out longer than the 15th of April. The Captain says: Yes, I will land the crew and he does so. In such cases I consider it would be very unfair for the Governemnt or the owners to be compelled to feed these men and provide means for conveying them to their homes. If this industry is worth continuing, we must pull together, and not place any more obstacles in the way of the owners than we possibly can avoid. The owners are now satisfied to provide crews with every necessary comfort and better quality of food than in days gone by. I consider that we cannot expect much more in this connection from the owners. It is not at all unlikely that at the time these men wanted to be landed the ship might be in the vicinity of the old seals, and in consequence thousands of dollars might be lost during the time the ship was steaming to and from the land. I feel sure that this House will give every consideration to matters affecting the fisheries of this country. We are a fishing country, and we will never be anything else. Mines and mills are only side issues, but we must look to the water for the main finances of the country. Canada has its wheat fields, but Newfoundland reaps its harvest from the ocean. It is the centre around which the Colony turns, and we should do all in our power as

a body of men sent here by the fishermen to pass such measures as will lessen their hardships and encourage them in pursuing their avocations.

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.

It was ordered that this Report be received and adopted, and the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

And it being now after midnight, Rt. Hon. Prime Minister tabled the Report of His Excellency the Governor to the Colonial Office on the Seal Fishery.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider the raising of a sum of money by loan for the extension of the Railway System of the Colony.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider the raising of a sum of money by loan to provide for the extension of the Telegraph System of the Colony, for the further extension of the Lighthouse system of the Colony, and for the construction and improvement of Public Buildings.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to provide for certain Retiring Allowances.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until this afternoon, Tuesday, February 24th, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, Feb. 24, 1914.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the residents of the North Side of Torbay. The petitioners ask that a sum of money be granted for the repair of a road to Gallow's Cove. This allocation is one that is badly needed, no repair having been made to that road for many years. It is continually used by the fishermen of that settlement I ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the Highlands in the district of St. George's. The petitioners complain that the bridge there is in a very unsafe condition, and without it all communication would be cut off. I hope this will be attended to at once. I beg that it be referred to the Dept. of Public Works.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from the inhabitants of New Melbourne. The people there are badly in need of a telegraph office, and hope that the Government will give their request consideration. I ask that this be referred to the proper Dept.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support that petition.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bunyan's Cove. The petitioners request that a sum of $400 be granted them in order to keep a road in repair, which is nearly useless at present. These people also ask that the Government will consider the building of a halfway house, as one is very much needed in that place.

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the petition presented by Mr. Winsor.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present to the House a request which I should like to read, signed by Robert Pittman, of St. John's, asking for a pension on the ground of long

service. (Petition is read.) I should like to see this petition receive the support and sympathy of the members of this House. I have much pleasure in presenting this petition to the House.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the petition just presented by Mr. Higgins on behalf of Mr. Pittman. I think it deserves every consideration. Mr. Pittman is now a man well up in years. He is a man of more than ordinary intelligence and he is a man who has done good service in several departments of the public life of the Colony. He is now over seventy years of age and is becoming infirm. I think his case ought to receive some consideration on the lines suggested by the petition. A small pension is what he asked for, and he deserves it. I do hope that the Internal Economy Committee will take this matter into consideration and do something along the lines suggested.

PUBLIC SERVICES LOAN BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions on the subject of 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.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, in submitting these resolutions, I would like to explain to the Committee the amount of work done by the Government during the last twelve months as a justification of the loan asked for. As the Committee is aware, the extension of the telegraph line around the Island within the last twelve months amounted to something like 700 miles of wire. The whole Island has been brought into communication with the Capital and a long-felt want has been supplied in a number of places. I will read to the Committee the number of places at which new telegraph offices were opened during last year:—

Fox Harbour, Freshwater, Grand Falls, Lady Cove, Robinson's Head, Salvage, Sandy Point, St. John's (Riverhead), Stephenville, Trinity East, in all, $5,316.30 was spent on buildings and improvements in that area. On the telegraph line from Cape Race to St. John's, $3,563.82 was spent. It may be asked why that line was built. In the past, the line was built from Cape Race along towards Trepassey, around St. Mary's and on to St. John's. Since the Marconi station has been operating at Cape Race, enormous traffic has been opened up over that line. It has been found impracticable to keep that line in first-class condition. It runs along by the sea-coast for miles and in bad weather it is impossible to work it. A year or 18 months ago, on the recommendation of the Superintendent of Telegraphs, the Government decided to build this new line. The Superintendent showed that they were losing at the rate of from $2,000 to $3,000 a year under the system as it was then working, and that the outlay for building the new line would not amount to more than $7,000. The Anglo-American Telegraph Co. have a line along the Southern Shore to Cape Race in first class working condition, and they keep an office at Cape Race for no other purpose than to take over the work which the Government lines are not able to handle at certain times in the year. Since the Marconi station has been erected, it has been proved to the Department that it is absolutely necessary to bring the line along the Southern Shore. That would shorten the line and make it better in every particular. I understand the intention is to put the line right through to Cape Race without having any offices between Cape Race and St. John's. I understand from the Superintendent of Postal Telegraphs

that the Anglo Office has been receiving between $2,000 and $3,000 a year from the transmitting of messages which the Postal Offices were not able to handle. That money will go to the Government office under the proposed arrangement. Now, I think this is a very reasonable proposition. By building this line we stand to gain an extra $2,000 a year without allowing for any increase at all. In other words, we are positively sure that we are losing $2,000 a year by not being able to handle business, and the idea was to build a line which would be able to handle the business. It is proposed to complete the new line this Spring. It is about three-quarters built now. The material is on the ground and the poles are distributed right along to Cape Race. $7,000 is the amount asked for by the Superintendent to fully equip the line. Now, in Fortune Bay, Fox Cove and Little Bay East the Government spent $1,234.53 in the erection of new lines during the past year. In Freshwater, $263.00 was spent. In Notre Dame Bay $409.00 was spent. In Placentia Bay $14,929.77 was spent. In Ramea, $2,721.28. In Summerside, $330.00, and on telephones, $1,928.00 was spent, (these telephones being used in conjunction with the various telegraph offices.) In Trinity Bay, $3,142.00 was spent, and on the main line, $35,634.44. In connection with the line from Argentia to Placentia, $482.00 was spent; from British Harbor to Trinity, $350.65; from Campbellton to Lewisporte, $497.00; from Cape St. Mary's to St. Bride, $370.00; from Gaultois to Hermitage, $1198.16; Placentia Bay,including cable, $20,142.73; and from Ramea to Burgeo, $5,934. The whole total spent on the main line from St. John's to Port aux Basques amounted to $65,557.99.

These amounts practically cover the amount asked for in the Loan Bill that I am introducing to-day.

For the Construction and Improvement of Public Buildings, $175,000 is being asked for. The Public Building at Bay Roberts will cost about $20,000. It is a three-storey building. On the first floor, there is a Post Office, a Customs House, a Poor Office and a Savings Bank. On the next floor, there is a prison, a Court House, three cells and a Magistrate's Office. In the basement, there is a coal cellar, a boiler house, a kitchen, a telegraph office and four rooms for the janitor. A town like Bay Roberts calls for a building of this sort. The amount of business done there is considerable and the Government, after considering the matter, decided that it was imperative to erect this building and also one at Channel, one at Spaniard's Bay, and one at Hr. Grace. The new building at Hr. Grace is occupied as follows:—First floor, post office, telegraph office and savings bank. On the second floor, there is a large room suitable for a Court House, a tidewaiter's office, a sub-collector's office, and a telegraph office, and in the basement two bond stores and an examining store. The Spaniard's Bay building consists of—On the first floor, a Court House, post office and poor commissioner's office. On the second floor, the janitor's apartments consisting of four rooms and a storeroom. At Channel, the public building contains a post office, sub-collector's office, Court House, jury room, Magistrates' office, prison and apartments for the gaoler. The amount asked for is $125,000. The building at Bay Roberts has cost to date $17,500. It will cost, when completed, $20,000. The building at Grand Falls is practically completed. It is costing something like $16,000. The one at Spaniard's Bay is a little more than half finished. It has cost to date $9,500. The Channel building has cost $8,500.

Then we come to the improvements in the General Hospital. It is not ne-

cessary for me to go into details in reference to the improvements in that Institution. Five years ago, the Hospital had room for not more than 30 or 40 patients. To-day it can accommodate something like 150. The number of nurses and servants is about 90. Within the past two years a Home has been built for the nurses. That Institution cost quite a sum of money. To-day all the buildings have been practically completed and are in operation. If we have nothing else to our credit after our term is over, the General Hospital will at least be one monument that will go down in history as the work of the Government of Sir Edward Morris. The improvements cost about $48,000. For the addition to the General Post Office, they are asking $14,000. That addition is rendered necessary on account of the enormous increase of work in that Institution within the last few years. The officials have had to work down in the basement, a place which was unfit for anyone to work in. The Government investigated the matter and decided that it was absolutely necessary to make this addition. The Freshwater Public Building calls for $5,200. That is a building along the lines of the others already mentioned.

If there is any other information which the Committee would wish to have regarding these matters, I hope to be in a position to accommodate them.

We are asking for $45,000 to finish the incompleted lighthouses. There are several around the Island which are not quite finished. The Minister who is here in the House and who is more familiar with this subject than I am, will be able to give the Committee any information they desire on this point.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, in connection with the lighthouse matter referred to by the Hon. Minister of Finance, I may say that a fog alarm has been placed on Cape John. The lighthouse at that place is in course of construction and the machinery has been ordered. Fog alarms are also being placed on Puffin Island and Penguin Island on the Southwest Coast and there is also one for Fermeuse. Then there are five lighthouses on the Labrador. As far as construction work is concerned, all these have been completed, but it is impossible to order lights until we get the elevation of the various towers so that the lenses may be ground to suit the reflection of the light. These lamps have to be ordered this year. Then, there is a provision for a lighthouse at Cupids, one at Chain Rock here and several places around the coast are badly in need of them. Then there are places where the lights at present installed are obsolete and new lights will have to be ordered for them. To do all this, it would be necessary to have at least the amount of money which is here asked for. I am sure that every member of this Assembly who travels by water knows the necessity of having the coast well lit and also the necessity of fog alarms and I may say that I consider that too much attention cannot be given to our coast and to the safeguarding of the lives and property of our fishermen.

On the Labrador Coast there are at present some ten or twelve lighthouses but there should be twice that number, and the immediate need of fog alarms in many places on that coast is a long-felt need and a want which has inconvenienced many fishermen on that coast from time to time. Indeed, were it not for the remarkable knowledge these men have of this coast, along which they travel, many more serious accidents would give it the publicity which it merits. They must rather trust to their memories and their sagacity which is almost instinctive, than to any help which in times past they have received from the various

Governments in power. When we take into consideration the fact that some forty or fifty thousand fishermen travel along our coasts and the means whereby they are helped,and compare with the conditions under which the fishermen of Nova Scotia,America and Norway pursue their avocations the fact becomes immediately apparent that we have done surprisingly little for their welfare and assistance. Besides the fact that there is a lack of fog alarms and lighthouses, the coast is full of shoals and sunken rocks, which render its navigation especially dangerous in rough weather. This fact will have to be faced sooner or later by the Government. Up to the present the Government have taken a large interest in these matters, and I do not doubt this special case will receive its most ardent support.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, were not loans taken in the last year or two to cover the matters we are now dealing with? I should like to know what was done in relation to them, and how much was taken up by the public.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND COSTOMS.—The 1912 loans for lighthouse construction, telegraphs and poor house, totalled $770,000. Out of this, $390,000 has not been raised or issued.

MR. KENT—These Resolutions require very careful consideration, but we shall be able to give this when the bill goes into Committee. I consider that these loan bills are in reality in part a further instalment of Supplemental Supply in disguise. In the past such expenditures as these have been made as a rule on current account. Matters appertaining to repair and upkeep should certainly appear in current account and not on capital account.

DR. LLOYD—There was a loan bill in 1912 for $250,000. How much of that was susbcribed?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There is no balance left from that.

DR. LLOYD—It was $150,000 for telephones, and $100,000 for lighthouses and fog alarms.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The $100,000 was subscribed, and has been spent on lighthouses. The $150,000 has not been taken up.

DR. LLOYD—We will leave the matter until tomorrow when the Minister has the facts at hand.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, when the Minister of Finance raised the loan for the telegraph extension, would it not be possibie for him to refund to the district of Twillingate the amount transferred from the roads, bridges, and marine works account to the Postal Telegraph account. Some moneys from the surplus trust account have been transferred to the telegraph account, and this was very unfair to my district. A sufficient sum should now be raised for the necessary refund.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, the matter spoken of by the hon. member was not confined to the district of Twillingate.

MR.KENT—I understand that there is a Report from the Medical Superintendent of the General Hospital on the matters referred to the other day. Is that the case, and is that Report tabled?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—That is in the hands of the printer and will be here in a day or two. I will try and get the original tomorrow.

MR. CLIFT—I do not like to trouble the Minister again, but I must confess I am not quite clear on the amount of the loans that have been taken up. Now, there were loans to the extent of $770,000 authorized under two Bills, $520,000 and $250,000. $180.000 was taken up by the public and $200,000 was taken up for Old Age

Pensions. That makes $380,000 subscribed out of $770,000. That leaves $390,000 to be taken up.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and the Bill: "An Act respecting the Sale of Debenture Bonds for the Public Service of the Colony" was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

RAILWAY LOAN.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of raising a sum of money by loan for the Extension of the Railway System of the Colony.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, in submitting these resolutions to the Committee we propose to ask for the sum of £400,000 sterling for the completion of the railroads at present under construction. There is very little for me to say to the Committee, as the House has already been furnished with the Government Engineer's Report on this matter, and from his report and from the figures received from him, the Government is instructed that the sum asked for in this Resolution will be necessary to complete the Branch Railroads now under Contract. As you are all aware this work is under construction since 1910. When these resolutions were brought down, at first we asked for something like $4,000,000. Since then we have asked this House for an additional $2,000,000, and now we are coming for the third time and asking the House for an additional $2,000,000 to complete these Branch railroads. We may be told that when we came down the first time, we asked for $4,000,000 to complete all the branches. Well, my answer to that is, that when we came down the first time, we came down without surveys or proper estimates. Even so, it is only a case of history repeating itself. I think, that when Mr. Fielding brought down his Estimates for the Grand Trunk Pacific railroad, he asked the Commons of Canada for $13,000,000. He stated then that that amount would complete that railroad. He came down sometime after and asked for the sum of $63,000,000. Now the continuation of that road to its completion, I think, will cost something like $160,000,000, while in proposing these resolutions today to the Committee, I am instructed by the Government Engineer that according to his Estimates, this amount will complete the branches that are under construction today. The correspondence between the Government Engineer and the Government is not tabled, and I do not think that it will be tabled; but be that as it may, this is his estimate, and we are here asking the Committee for this amount. We all agree that building railroads in this country, as well as in every other country, no matter what sacrifices we have made or may make to raise these loans and pay the interest, is of general benefit to the country. Its purpose is to open up the country. What would Newfoundland be today but for its railroads? Where would Newfoundland be today but for what the railroad has done for the country? It has opened up the country and opened up new industries. Take the lumber industry and the pulp and

paper mills in the interior of the country today. It would have been an impossibility to establish these but for the railroads. Look at the railroad around our Island today, and compare that with the position of 25 or 30 years ago. When we started to build the railroad, we were told that it would amount to nothing; that the grass would grow on it, and that it would simply be a rusty streak through the country. We could not conceive thirty years ago what railroads would mean to the Colony. It any member had got up in this House twenty-five or thirty years ago, and told this House that in 1913 or 1914 the railroad would be running from St. John's to Port aux Basques, right through the heart of the country, and bringing a daily mail, I ask you Mr. Chairman, how many people would that speaker have convinced? The greatest believer in railroads twenty-five or thirty years ago, could not, and did not conceive what we would be doing in Newfoundland today. Today the railroad means everything to Newfoundland. Although we may be told that we are paying too much for our loan; that we are spending too much money in railroads; that we are extravagant and that we are travelling too fast in this direction, I submit, Sir, that even now we are too late in the day. It is twenty or thirty years ago that we should have done the work that we are asking this Committee to provide for today, and I would like to know the position that Newfoundland would be in at the present moment if the work we are now doing had been done twenty or thirty years ago, but it is better late than never. What have railroads done for every country in the world? Take the case of Canada, and take the number of railroads through that great Dominion. When these railroads were about to be built, and when loans were about to be raised for these great enterprises, a certain amount of opposition was put up against them, but look where Canada is today. Is she not one of the most prosperous countries in the world? We are only a small country with 240,000 inhabitants, yet we hope to make something out of this Island of ours, in the near future. We cannot do that, Mr. Chairman, by sitting down and doing nothing. We cannot do that by sitting down and wondering what is going to become of us if we spend so much money in railroads. Then we have been told that the next thing we will find is Newfoundland put into Confederation. Now all these things have been said over and over again. I remember thirty years ago hearing, as a boy, that the ruinous policy of Sir William Whiteway was going to put the country into Confederation. That he was building railroads that would never pay. Now what is the position of Newfoundland today. Whether the railroad itself is paying or not, I cannot say. I myself believe that it is paying today, but that railroad has done for the people of Newfoundland more than I can estimate for this Committee this evening. It has increased the earning power of the fisherman and the laboring man in Newfoundland. If we were to put ourselves in the position that Newfoundland occupied thirty years ago, what would we find? I can remember, Mr. Chairman. when not five per cent. of the inhabitants of this Island knew anything about the Island five miles from the fringe of the seashore. Now all that is past, and the railroads have opened up our country and made it a good country to live in. If our fishermen today meet with bad voyages, and find themselves in the fall of the year without any provision for their families, what is the position compar-

ed with thirty years ago? A man immediately packs his bag today, Mr. Chairman, and leaves the country by means of that railway system. Take a man in Placentia Bay thirty years ago who found himself without sufficient for his wife and family for the winter. That man might be satisfied to go to any part of the world. That man would find that it would cost him to get out of Placentia Bay and get across the Gulf and go to Canada more than it would to feed his wife and family for the winter. It would be almost impossible for him to go. But today when our men return from the Labrador fishery or from the other fisheries around the Island and find that they have not sufficient to live on you will find them getting out in all directions, taking advantage of the many industries that have been created around the Island, or answering the many calls of labor across the Gulf, all this has been accomplished Mr. Chairman, through the railway that has been built in this Colony during the past thirty years. It is not necessary for me to state the many good things that have been done by the building of the railway in Newfoundland. These have been pointed out in this House by abler tongues than mine; but this resolution asking for this Loan, to complete a certain number of Branch Railroads around this Island, I consider it a pleasure and an honor to come here this evening and bring in. I am glad to have taken part in the building of the railroad into the District of Ferryland, my native District, within the past four years. We were told in this House by people who were supposed to know it all, people who were looked up to, that building that railroad through Ferryland from St. John's to Trepassey, was a waste of money. Now that statement went abroad, and has been read and weighed around this Island by a certain number of people. My answer to this this evening, Mr. Chairman, is that thirty years ago we were told by just as competent advisers, that the railroad then built in this Colony would amount to nothing, that it would simply be two streaks of rusty iron, and that it meant bankruptcy for Newfoundland. Now what are the advantages for the District of Ferryland? That railroad links up the district of Ferryland with Trepassey and St. Mary's, and along that shore there are many sources of revenue that we cannot see today. St. John's is practically blocked with ice in February and March and in April some years. How do we know today but in the very near future the principal boats crossing the Atlantic may not make Trepassey their terminus,and leave the mails and passengers there for this city, and for the rest of the Island. That may happen in the near future, or within the next twenty five or thirty years. If that would happen not only would Trepassey benefit but the whole shore would benefit, and all the settlements around St. Mary's Bay would benefit as well. Now with the railroad running as it is at the present time, before it has been taken over by the Government. and before it has been running on schedule time, what do we find? The revenue derived from that railroad along the Southern Shore, I may say, surprised the Contractors. Over four thousand people were carried one month last autumn from Renews to St. John's. There was also a certain amount of freight. Now that railway has yet to be linked up with Trepassey and St. Mary's, and with other places around the Island, and whoever may be here in twenty five or thirty years time will be able to tell the history of the development of that railroad through that part of the country. I am no prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I am confident that the Government that built that

railroad, will go down into the future and be looked upon by the people of Ferryland as having conferred one of the greatest boons ever granted by any Government. I have no fear of that, Sir. Yet, when we come in here and ask for a few million dollars to build railroads, a hue and cry is raised about it, that we are going to bankrupt the Colony, and that we are going headlong into destruction.

What does it amount to? We are building these railways and at the same time we are increasing the revenue of the Colony. If you will go back eighteen years or even less, you will find that the revenue of the Colony was only one million dollars, and our people were much poorer, but today our revenue is four million dollars, and there are no poor people in the colony. I do not say that this great change of conditions is due entirely to the building of railways, but in a great measure it is due to the building of the railway system throughout the colony.

We are told that we are piling up too great a debt, but I am not afraid of it, for it must be borne in mind, that we have only to pay the interest. We are merely paying money into a bank so that our children may be richer by it. We are giving them what we did not have ourselves; we are opening up avenues of employment, and giving them a chance to earn a dollar that their fathers did not have. The railway will be there for them, but all we are called upon to pay is the passing interest. We leave the principal to be paid by our children and they will pass it on in turn to their children. We shall not have to pay for it at once out of current account but it will be paid for gradually out of the earnings of the Colony.

I think the answer the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister received from the people when five years ago his Manifesto was sent broadcast throughout the Colony, and he promised in it, to open up the country, and build branch railways, if he was returned to power, was sufficient and remains sufficient to him to go on with the building of the railway, and to carry out the contract that he made with the people of the Colony at that thime. Nothing has happened since to justify him in halting, and our course should still be onward. We should continue to open up industries and build railways, and make improvements all around the Island. We must not stop a moment. We all know that there are bright and dark days in the lives of every Government, and every individual, and this Government like all others must expect to meet them. For all that, we must not look back, and although we are about 250,000 people we should look forward and make Newfoundland as prosperous as possible and make it worth living in, and worth leaving to our children.

In submitting these Resolutions, I have asked for the sum of £400,000 to complete the railway work. We hope to have it completed in two years. I submit these Resolutions to the Committee for their consideration, and I trust they will be considered by them in the same light as they are placed before them by me.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, the Resolutions that have been dealt with this afternoon by the Hon. Minister of Finance deal with a continuation of the loan, which was contracted in 1910 and the Speech that he has made in introducing these Resolutions, was one which we might have expected from him four years ago, when the contract was introduced. It is not the speech that we should hear from him today, for now he comes before us for more money to complete the contract. We are not discussing now the policy of railway extension for we

are committed irrevocably to the contract that was made in 1910 and, no matter how we may differ as to the advisability of making the contract, we are bound by it. Therefore, we expected that the Minister would come before us today and make a practical, hard, business-like speech, bristling with facts and figures, and showing in detail the expenditures made in connection with the Branch Railways. I was very much disappointed to find that on this matter, he had nothing whatever to say.

Before we proceed we ought be given a great deal more information. We ought to know exactly (and by examination, if necessary) the expenditures that were made under the two former loans. There was a loan of four million dollars in 1910, and a further loan of two million in 1912. The expenditures under these loans should have been dealt with very fully by the Minister and taken up under the various heads. Then, again, we should have been told something of the progress of the work, the character of the work, the work done, and the work not completed. We have not been informed if any of the branches have yet been completed. We were told the other day that the final certificate had not yet been given for any of them. We ought to know the expenditures that were made on all lines, not merely the gross amounts, but the details of the expenditures and we should be given an opportunity of examining the various accounts.

We have had statements from time to time showing the different heads of expenditure, but we require the details. We have had particulars of the amounts spent for the acquisition of the right of way and these particulars show that many of the expenditures under this head have been very improper, and the amounts paid for land, the fees paid to the arbitrators and the legal expenses are such as to warrant us in asking that a similar statement be furnished of expenditures under every other head.

We ought to know exactly what has been done under headings other than that of construction work. Take for instance, the length of the line to Fortune Bay. All the information that we have is that the line commences at a point between Come by Chance and Northern Bight, but we do not know where the terminus will be. We ought to have at least some idea of the length of the line for every mile of railroad will cost the colony $15,000,00 for construction alone, as well as the extra expenses for stations, rolling stock, and other works. We ought to have these particulars before we proceed with these Resolutions. As the matter now stands, we have very little information on any points. Take, for instance, section 34. We ought to know what stations have been built and what extra expenditure over and above the $15,000 per square mile has been made. We ought to have a statement of this expenditure or is it possible that the expenditures have been made by the company without submitting a statement to the Government? Have the expenditures been estimated and approved of by the Governor in Council? How many stations have been built, and what has been spent on them? What number of stations have been approved of by the Government, and how many more are required? Sections 31 and 37 deal with equipment. Under the 1893 contract the contractor was to provide a certain quantity of rolling stock, but under the present contract he is supposed fully to equip the line. On the certificate being given to the contractor the value of the rolling stock and other similar equipment will be reduced to money, and the Government will

be bound to pay the deficiency to the contractor. Has any valuation been made up to the present time?

All these are most important questions that we expected to have been dealt with by the Minister in introducing the Resolutions this afternoon and I submit that it would be unfair to the Committee and the country, to proceed until we obtain full information in relation to these matters.

We are committed to the contract. As to the policy of railway extension it is not for us to discuss at the present time. There can be a great deal said against the contract, but I do not intend to refer to this matter this afternoon. My point is at the present time that we should receive more information than we have before we proceed with these Resolutions.

My hon. friend referred to the mistake made in the Canadian House of Commons by Mr. Fielding in estimating the cost of building the new transcontinental railway. That is an entirely different position to that of the Government. That railway was built on different lines to ours for there was no contract there for the building of the whole line. It was built section by section but under our contract the whole of the branches were named and we had no power to stop the work. In the case of the Canadian railway the power was always in the hands of the Canadian Government to stop the work or proceed with it as they thought best. Here we are completely in the hands of the contractor. He can force the work. There is a provision that he build not less than fifty miles a year, but he may build two hundred and fifty miles of railway and demand his money. That is the difference in the two positions.

I think the Committee ought to rise before proceeding further and we ought to have full information along the lines which I have suggested. When we are given this we shall be in a better position to deal with the financial matters involved much more fully.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I may say that I shall be pleased to give my hon. friend all the information that he desires to have.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to receive this information as soon as possible, but there is one matter that can come up immediately In subsection 4 of section 2 of the construction contract of 1910 it sets forth that the terminus of the Fortune Bay branch shall be in Fortune Bay at a place "to be agreed upon." That was four years ago, but no place has yet been named definitely. However, I may recall the mind of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to the fact that in one of his speeches in 1912 he did state that the line would begin at Come-by-Chance and terminate at Terrenceville. I should like to know if that is the intention of the Government or not, or if it is contemplated to extend the line to Grand Bank.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, I may say in reply to the question to which the hon. member for Trinity has very properly referred that up to the present time no terminus has been agreed upon with the contractor, the reason being that there is some difficulty in obtaining a suitable terminus in Fortune Bay. The surveyors have been there and only a month ago I had a conference with the Government Engineer, the engineer of the Reid Newfoundland Company and the hon. member for Fortune Bay as to the route which the line should take. There has been some difficulty in deciding the route, but when I spoke in 1912 no survey had been made at all. Now that the surveys have reached that part of the country we have not been able to de-

cide on the exact point for the terminus. There are some engineering difficulties to be got over. It is not contemplated to extend the line into Burin district. If the line is extended to Burin and Grand Bank that will have to form a separate and distinct contract, which will have to be laid before the House in the regular way.

In reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I agree with the hon. Minister of Finance that his request is reasonable in every way and the Government will be pleased to have the information prepared. We shall furnish all the details that he may require and any further information that may be of value to the committee.

DR. LLOYD—I understood the hon. Minister of Finance to make a reference to a report of the Government Engineer. Has that report been tabled?

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—That report did not deal with the financial side of the matter. It was tabled with his full report about a month ago.

DR. LLOYD—That report makes no reference to the lines to be constructed. It is only a statement of what has been done, but it has no reference to what is to be done. I understand that there has been some correspondence with the Government Engineer on the matter. Is it the intention of the Government to furnish it?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—It was discussed in conversation.

DR. LLOYD—I am satisfied on that score provided the Government will give us full information. The obligation must be met by the Colony and we desire to give our support to the Government meeting its obligation.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I need not say that we are immensely surprised at the facts and figures that have been laid before us this afternoon as to the amount required for the completion of these branch railways. The hon. Minister of Finance got up and in his usual style of speech appealed to the galleries on a matter that calls for our most careful and serious consideration. It is my firm conviction that these branch railways will mean Confederation, and when we are dealing with a serious matter like this we ought to deal with it in a serious way, and enter into all the details and do everything possible to keep down the terrible burden that is being added year after year to the fishermen of the Colony.

The Minister has said as an excuse for the mistake the Government made in estimating the cost of the branch railways at four million dollars when they have already cost us eight millions that a worse mistake was made in Canada. That is a poor excuse at the best. The Prime Minister told us in 1910 that it would not cost more than four million dollars to build these railways.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I did not say that.

MR. COAKER—My rt. hon. friend is not going to get out of it as easily as that. I have the Journal of the House here. He said then that the railways would cost us $4,000,000, and that the annual interest charge at 5½ per cent would be $140,000 a year.

We have spent $6,000,000, and we want $2,000,000 more. In 1915 we will be paying for interest $280,000, if we get the $2,000,000 at the same rate as the former loans. The Prime Minister stated that we would have the five branch railways for $4,000,000; but now we have not enough in $8,000,000. I believe that this country is going towards Confederation. It is getting worse and worse. One of the strongest things against the Morris Government is this Railway construction pol-

icy. They have done good in some things, but they will be known in history as the Railway blunderers. They will go out of power through the blunders they have made. If the people had known that they wanted $8,000,000, they would have told them that they were not wanted. The fishermen are getting their eyes opened. They mean to have a say in public affairs in future. They do without their meals to read the 'Advocate.' The Prime Minister said that the five branch railways would cost four million dollars, and now we find that they cost four millions more. I think that when this matter was before the House the Premier knew they were going to cost eight. The Opposition members said they were going to cost eight million. We were told that we were going to get these Branch Railways for a certain sum, and now we open our eyes to see that they are going to cost twice as much. The Government talk about the industries in the country. What are they doing to encourage the development of the country? There has not been a thing done the last four or five years. Let me tell the Government what they have done to encourage the A.N.D. Co. at Grand Falls. They have to import sulphur to make sulphite pulp. They must have this sulphur; and what do they pay for it? They imported sulphur last year, and paid $17,000 duty. The year before they paid $16,900. The Government made them pay $3,000 duty on alum. Accordingly we find that they are not paying a dividend at Grand Falls. What is the Government doing to encourage these people? They should give up this duty on sulphur.

They are merely wasting this money voted for Railway building. They take $20,000 and spend it at Spaniard's Bay and then spend another $20,000 at Hr. Grace. I think that this Branch Railway Policy will lead to Confederation. We have heard that the Reid-Nfld. Co. was running the railway at a loss. If they lose $135,000 now, what will they lose when they have the five Branch Railways in running order? It will then be $150,000 or $160,000. How long will they continue to do so, when there are no more railways to be built? They must have some object if they are going to lose $135,000 every year. They will tell us to run it ourselves. Then we will go down on our knees and will say, "Come, Borden, and take us out of our misery." The people do not want the Government to make greater expenditures, for they have had enough for another twenty years. I think we would all wish that you had only three Branches instead of five. There is another serious thing in connection with the Grand Falls Company. It is the paragraph in their report in which they say that no further extension of the Company's operations will be made during the continuation of the present Newfoundland tariff. When that goes broadcast throughout the markets, you will find very few men anxious to invest in the country. The Government should let us have all the information they can give. Nothing will make the expense or the cost less, but the Government can make the people understand how it was spent. If the people know the Government are telling untruths, they will be turned out. Take them into your confidence. Let us know what each man got for arbitration fees. Now we have five branch railways started, and not one of them finished. We don't know whether there is going to be another hundred miles to Fortune Bay line or not. We know nothing about Bonne Bay. Why don't the Government give us the desired information? There will be some pity for them if they confess their mistakes; but there will be none for him who brazens it out.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Chairman, I wish to say one or two words in reply to the hon. member for Bonavista. First, I must say how surprised I am at some of the speeches we have heard this evening. No one knows what all the trouble is about. The hon. member for Bonavista has just been thundering about the awful things that will happen to this country, and how we shall get into Confederation. I heard the very same statement in this House thirty years ago from the Opposition. If this country ever joins Canada, it can only happen through the voice of the people. Every public man who has ever been called upon to make a pronouncement on that point, has always stated that if ever that is done it must be done by the will of the people. It cannot be brought about in any other way. The hon. member laid considerable stress on a statement that he alleged I had made four years ago in relation to these Branch Railways. He alleged that I had led the House to believe that the work would be completed for $4,000,000, when I knew it was going to cost $8,000,000. That is a deliberate piece of misrepresentation. The hon. member would be very cross with me if I laid such a charge against him. I would not hear the end of it, if I insinuated anything against him or his associates. If he had read these figures with the desire to put the matter fairly before the Committee, he would know that these figures were based on mileage and the cost per mile without reference to the other requirements of the road. That estimate did not include land or the working equipment necessary to finish that road. It was based on the bare cost of the line per mile—on a cost of $15,000 per mile. Everybody knew and said at the time that this estimate did not include rolling stock, stations, land and all sorts of equipment. Everybody knows that failing in all these things, the road from here to Port aux Basques cost about $19,000 a mile altogether.

My estimate was on a mileage at $15,000 a mile. I made no reference to anything else. I made no reference to additions in the way of rolling stock, fencing, piers or stations. I was making a statement to the House and I assumed that the House would understand what I meant. At that time no surveys had been made. I was wrong in my estimate of the mileage. Sir R. Bond had made an estimate fixing the whole mileage at 190 miles. My estimate was 250. It will really be from 350 to 400. As a matter of fact the error was made because when we came to make the surveys we decided to add a number of harbors here, and there that lengthened the road. However, I did not purpose this evening to go into these matters, because I propose to go into the whole matter fully and completely and I am prepared to show that there never was a better or a cheaper contract for Newfoundland or any other country. Not alone that, but I am prepared to submit it to any intelligent and impartial tribunal with an absolute certainty of their verdict. In 1890 we called for tenders for a road to Port aux Basque. Sir Wm. Whiteway came into office and Sir Robert Bond was with him. They found these tenders for the road to Exploits. The best offer was that of Messrs. Reid and Middleton. They offered to build for $17,000 a mile and 2,000 acres of land per mile. That was the best tender. These men had been working in Canada. They had been building the C.P.R. at Lake Superior. R. G. Reid was a director of the Bank of Montreal and of the C.P.R. They came highly recommended and we were advised by our financial agents to make the contract with them and we made

it. But we made it after getting their terms reduced to $15,600 a mile without any land grant. And we contracted to have this line built to the Exploits for $15,600 and when we got to Exploits we got them to continue to Port aux Basques. And in that contract we thought we were getting a fine thing when we stipulated for labour at $1.00 a day. Four years ago we had to make a similar contract with the same men to build some 300 or 400 miles, and we wanted them built on the same specification. But we stipulated that labour was to be at $1.50 a day. Where we were getting $1 before we are getting $1.50 to-day. Everything has gone up. In 1890 rails were $20 a ton, now they are $30. Locomotives, cars, rolling stock, everything has gone up from 40% to 70% and we could not have expected them to build these railways at the same figure. Labour on the railroad construction represents about 50% of the whole cost—the cost of railway work to-day has gone up 60%, so that had the Reid Company asked an increased price of 25% or 50%, we would have considered it fair. Well they were prepared to do it at $15,600 or they would do it at $15,000 if we would pay them in gold instead of bonds. The old contract was paid for in bonds. But they lost considerably on these bonds and would not be able to float them to the same advantage as a government. So we contracted for $15,000 a mile to be paid in gold, and I say that it is the best contract that has ever been made. I want to know who could do it cheaper. This company can do it cheaper than any other company, and cheaper than in 1890. because they have trains running all over the country, and they can transport men and materials and do the work very much cheaper.

I am prepared to submit this explanation. and these contracts to any competent tribunal, with the greatest confidence in what their verdict would be. They would say that it is the best contract that was ever made in the country.

However, as I said, it is not my intention to delay the House this evening with this matter, because I propose when we go into Committee on this Bill to deal in detail with the whole subject in all its aspects. The hon. member for Bonavista made reference to the A.N.D. Co. The tariff to-day in relation to the items referred to is exactly what it was when we came into power. There has been no alteration in the tariff in regard to sulphur and the other things referred to. There has been no increase and no decrease. The matter has been brought to the notice of the Government by the directors of the Company, by Mr. Jones, and other representatives of the Company that these Companies have not yet been able to pay a dividend. Some concessions were made to local companies in these items some years ago. When Mr. Horwood was starting a match factory he got some concessions, merely to encourage smaller local industries. I have the greatest sympathy, as I stated here the other night, with the A.N.D. Co. I was greatly instrumental in getting them here. When Mr. Beeton had left and given up all idea of continuing, I encouraged him to come back. I worked as hard on that proposition as if I was their paid solicitor. In fact I was charged in the press with being their solicitor.

MR. COAKER—Why should you not work hard on it?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—There is no reason why I should not. I believed in it. I worked so hard that I was charged with being their paid Solicitor. So that I have great interest in these companies and would like to see them succeed. But we must

remember that when they came here they got large concessions. They got a great deal more than other people working lumber and pulp industries in the Colony. They got a fee simple property from this legislature and valuable concessions in other ways. When this Company came here every attempt was made and every possible concession was given in order to get them to stay and I admit that it would be a black eye for this Colony if this industry proves a failure. I said this the other day that while we must protect this Company in every possible shape and form we must still remember that there are other similar industries in this Colony and that if you relieve Grand Falls you must relieve Bishop's Falls and every other concern of a like nature. The Government has had all the facts supplied to it by invoices and over a year ago the Government informed the Companies that they would take the matter up. They are now considering it with a view of seeing whether something cannot be done to reduce the duty on other items that bear heavily on the working and operation of these Companies. I am sorry that the hon. member thought this an opportunity for making the attack that he did. It was uncalled for and in a speech on financial matters any remark of the hon. member's is likely to have substantial effect abroad. Because when he makes a statement now it is not like a statement he might have made five years ago. He is now an influential member of this chamber and that statement made in the course of debate goes abroad and it is impossible to gauge its effect upon the country. We are not injuring these companies. There is no alteration in the tariff one way or the other and when these companies came here these very items of the tariff were discussed and everything that would effect them one way or the other was discussed. At that time your paper attacked the Government for the concessions we were giving these companies.

MR. COAKER.—What paper?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The 'Advocate." The "Advocate" came out with scare headlines that we were giving away the country.

MR. COAKER.—That is not so.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It is so. I will produce the "Advocate" and shew you that it is so.

There was a very strong feeling in the country at the time that the concessions were large. However, those that voted for them and the party that gave them recognized that if we were to have them here we had to give concessions. We had had the the country for years and no one had come here.

MR. COAKER.—Now you are going to put up the duty on them.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The question of relieving them of certain duties is still being considered by the Government. The question of reducing the tariff on sulphur is under consideration. It might have the advantage of giving a start to a number of sulphite mills that could be cheaply operated If so it will mean quite a revenue.

In considering this contract, for railway construction, the point for consideration is whether when they are finished, when we know the exact mileage and the cost, they will be under the cost of the railway to Port aux Basques, and especially considering the increased cost of everything. You cannot get a man to build a house today under 40 per cent. of an increase over the price of thirty years ago. What is true of a house is true of a railway. If it is a question of building roads, as to how or when we should build them, that would be a question for debate. But when it becomes a question of whether we have

made a good or bad contract then any business man can tell you that we have made the best contract on record.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, just one word. One statement made by the member for Bonavista was that the arbitrators on the several railroads in some cases had paid to supporters of the Government several times the value of the land. I take exception to that statement ,because the country and the House has absolute confidence in the arbitrators appointed by the Government. I do not think the hon. member means that. It is a harsh statement to make, and I do not think he intend, ed it.

The hon. member further in his excitement about the A. N. D. Co., made a statement that the amount of duty collected from that company would pay a dividend to the shareholders.

MR. COAKER—I did not say that.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is the impression that you gave the House. Now what are the facts? The capital of that Company is $10,000,000. The amount of duty collected on the articles just mentioned is $35,000. If that were paid over to that company it would not pay them a half per cent. in dividends. Even if it were only $5,000,000 the dividend from $35,000 would not amount to much. I simply wanted to make that clear.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and the Bill: "An Act respecting the raising of a sum of money by loan for the Extension of the Railway System of the Colony" was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill: "An Act to provide for certain Retiring Allowances" was introduced, and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

SEALING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Coaker, the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend 55 Vict. Cap. 2, entitled: 'An Act to regulate the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery' " 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.

REPRESENTATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the Law relating to the Representation in the House of Assembly" 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.

COMBINES AND MONOPOLIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act to provide for the Investigation of Combines and Monopolies" 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.

WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic"

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.

Mr. Abbott gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Stone gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Halfyard gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Targett gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Jennings gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Kent gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Kent gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to move the adoption of certain Resolutions in relation to the administration of local affairs in the Colony.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 25th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 25th.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Petites, where they badly want a telegraph office. The settlement contains about 300 inhabitants who are an industrious and busy people. At present the main line runs about 3 miles from Petites, and the petitioners are very anxious that it should be extended to Petites. I trust that the Government will give this petition every consideration. I ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Random in relation to mail arrangements. They also say that there should be no extra charge for freight during the time that the steamer is plying on the Bay. I hope that the Government will look into this matter and give it some consideration. They also ask that a sum of money be granted to build a draw bridge on the bar of Smith's Sound, so as to enable the public to go to and from. Also that the Government will grant a sum of money for a breakwater at Snook's Harbor. The people there cannot moor their boats with safety. I trust the Government will give these various matters the consideration their importance demands.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker I wish to support the petition presented by Mr. Targett in connection with the breakwater. At the present time, the men have to carry their schooners 18 or 20 miles, to bring them into a place of safety. I heartily hope that the Government will seek to remedy this.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Plate Cove, in Bonavista Bay. It is in relation to the clearing away of ice from a hill on the road there. I hope it will receive prompt attention.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, the Department are in communication with the Chairman of the Road Board about this matter, and we are only awaiting for some information from him before sending on the money. The amount asked for will be forwarded in due course.

MR. STONE asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture & Mines, to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the awards made for land taken at Trinity belonging to Ryan & Co. with plan showing the land taken and the surrounding lands belonging to Ryan & Co.; also, a statement showing in detail, all expenses in connection with same, including arbitrators' fees.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The information asked for is in course of preparation.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minis

ter of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement of grants other than local, expended in Burin District for the year 1913, and to whom paid.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—This is in course of preparation.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing cost of Post Office at Salvage, Bonavista Bay.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table the information asked for.

MR. KENT asked the Minister of Public Works whether anything has been done to carry out the prayer contained in a petition by James Maher and others of Flatrock, in St. John's East, for a road from Powers, on the main Pouch Cove line, to Maher's Bridge, Flatrock; if so, what has been done, will anything be done this year: if not, why not?

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to say that up to the present nothing has been done, but an effort will be made to give the matter attention at an early date.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself ito Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER FINANCE & CUSTOMS —Mr. Chairman, In submitting this, my sixth Budget, I am gratified to be able once more to congratulate the House and the country upon the continuance of the conditions of widespread and abiding prosperity enjoyed by "Our Island Home" to-day and which has been increasing every year to an extent that must be at once a marvel and a pleasure to all of us. The flood-tide of material well-being, which began with the advent of the present Government to power, still maintains itself, and though its ebb has been predicted every year by pessimistic observers, the statistics of trade and commerce, of revenue and investment, of industrial advance and economic stability all combine to prove the falsity of such prophecies and to emphasize that the recuperative power of the country is even greater than the most sanguine expectations could cherish, and that there is every prospect of the land we live in attaining still greater affluence as the years go by.

During the past fiscal year the imports amounted to $16,012,365, against $14,733,190 for the previous year, an increase of $1,278,875, while the exports amounted to $14,672,889, against $13,874,809, an increase of $798,030.

I would ask you to kindly note that this increase in imports this year and the previous two years has been secured in the normal growth of the Colony's trade and not by inflation arising from the bringing in of large quantities of material and machinery for the installation of the paper mills at Exploits Valley, which accounted in the following years for:

1906-7	$ 75.474
1907-8	127,838
1908-9	789,058
1909-10	616,918

In other words, the steady increase in the purchasing power of our people, as shown by the imports since this Government took office attests conclusively the beneficial effects of its policy. The past year or two criticisms were offered in this House of the total value of our imports exceeding our exports and unfavorable comment was made upon the balance of trade being against us. This aroused the suspicion that some of our statistical information was incorrect, and the Deputy Minister of Customs recently call-

ed the attention of the Department, and of the Board of Trade, to the fact that the valuations put on exports of codfish the past year or two were, to use his words, "utterly unreliable and useless," for which condition he says, "the exporters are to blame, and they can only correct this evil by furnishing proper and reliable information." I cite the Deputy Minister's conclusions here to emphasize that there is every reason to believe, in the light of his disclosure, that the value of the past year's exports, if proper figures had been given respecting our fishery shipments would be considerably in excess of the imports; and this is probably equally true of previous years as well.

The Colony's total trade last year was, as the figures show, the greatest on record, totalling $30,685,254, against $28,628,299 in 1911-12, an increase of slightly more than two million dollars, truly a remarkable showing on its own merits and doubly remarkable when we know, on the authority of the Deputy Head of the Customs Department, that our fishery exports were so much undervalued that the figures were utterly unreliable. The Colony's Revenue also showed a proportionately gratifying advance and though there was a very substantial reduction in duties, the largest ever made here, the effect of this for the four months it was in operation did not offset the substantial increase the revenue was making because of the enhanced prosperity of the people.

The Revenue, too, for the past fiscal year, I am glad to say, shows a substantial increase over expenditure, a surplus which, in accordance with the powers conferred by the Public Service Act of last session, the Government devoted to various undertakings designed to greatly benefit the people generally. The Revenue for the fiscal year 1912-13 amounted to $3,919,040.43, against $3,736,455.57 for the year 1911-12, an increase of $181,564.56. The Customs receipts alone increased $140,813.60, of which amount $124,079.69 was due to increased importations, and $16,734 to royalties on the export of iron ore; and you will not fail to note, Sir, that the increase of $124,000 at the Custom House was secured despite our placing tea, sugar, pork and salt beef on the free list last session. This was done in March so no revenue was derived from the imports of these articles for the June quarter, and the Deputy Minister and the Auditor General estimate that the Customs Revenue suffered a loss from this cause of about $110,000. Inasmuch, therefore, as the Customs Revenue for 1911-12 was $286,018.65 over that for 1910-11, it is clear that had these articles been retained on the list of dutiable goods, an increase equally great would have taken place in the last fiscal year over that which preceded it.

Other sources of income provided the remaining $40,000, making up the general increase of $182,584.56; and as the total expenditure for the year was $3,803,561.42, the surplus was $115,479.01.

This surplus, as it was in a form available at the time, was utilized temporarily for the payment of the following amounts for work done during the year and respecting which there were outstanding bills at the time, namely:—

Post Office Department, for extension of telegraphs..	$59,223.16
Public Works Department, improvement to General Hospital	35,999.81
Additions to General Post Office	3,000.00
Public Buildings,Grand Falls	12,852.65
Public Buildings, Freshwater	5,010.00
Public Buildings, Bay Roberts	11.00

Public Buildings, Spaniard's Bay	5.00
	$116,112.12

This, however, was merely a temporary arrangement. We had decided as these amounts were properly chargeable to Capital Account to introduce a Loan Bill this session to liquidate them, and out of the proceeds of this sum we are to reimburse the Surplus Trust Fund, so as to carry out our original intention, as stated last year, namely, to pay the cost of the General Election out of the Surplus, and to use the balance for Public and Marine Works, etc. The application of the Surplus, therefore, will be as follows:—

To pay the cost of 1913 election $51,000.00	
To pay education augmentation grant	10,000.00
Fence around Barracks (Government's share)	1,230.00
For road outlays, including $13,120.10, allocated to February, 1911, and Marine Works the balance, say	54,000.00

It is no exaggeration, therefore, to claim that few countries in the world are able to make such a showing, all things considered, as this Colony is at the present time, for it must be remembered that all our neighbours have suffered greatly from the financial stringency that has depressed the world for the past year or more, but is now happily passing away, whereas there has been no recession whatever in Newfoundland, the activities of our people being curtailed in no Department whatever, and this highly gratifying condition being reflected in the enormous importations and in the increased tribute that has been paid into the Treasury.

For the current fiscal year, of which virtually eight months have already expired, the situation is much more gratifying than many imagined, as I will hereafter show. The amount of taxation remitted to the people a year ago when the duties were taken off certain of the important necessities of life, did not return to the Treasury in increased purchases of duty-paying articles to the extent we hoped for, but I am satisfied there will be an increase in the normal Customs Revenue of $250,000 this year, as against the $380,000 taken off, so it is evident that the policy of remitting taxation has had a substantial degree of success in that there has been this goodly increase, although we know that at the present time $6,500,000 of our imports come in duty free, and that the whole revenue is collected from $9,250,000 worth of other articles, which do not represent the necessaries of life.

As February ends next Saturday we may take it that eight months of the fiscal year are gone, and in these eight are the two—January and February—when the minimum of Customs revenue is received. I estimate that for these eight months the Customs Revenue will be $150,000 short, but the proposals I shall submit to-day are designed to produce sufficient revenue to make two ends meet at the end of June and leave a surplus as well.

Our total revenue for the year which ended in June last was $3,919,040.43, and our expenditure was $3,803,-561.42. For the current fiscal year, ending four month hence, we voted in main estimates last session. $3,736,034.41, and voted the past week supplemental estimates of $244,791.17 a total of $3,980,753.58. To this must be added an outlay of $12,800 under the Audit Act—increasing the total to $3,993,533.58. But then there must be deducted balances which will be dropped at the end of the year. because unexpended, of about $50,000. leaving the total expenditure to be met on account of the year that ends

on June 30th next at $3,944,000 in round figures. Hon. members present are doubtless asking in their minds what is the revenue outlook to-day and from where do we expect to derive the additional sums to make up the needed amount. I shall now proceed to answer that question thus:

The Customs Revenue for 1912-13 was		$3,283,000
To this add average annual increase of	250,000	
Or Revenue for 1913-14 if duties not taken off ..	3,533,000	
From this deduct loss by removing duties	380,000	
Leaving Customs Revenue		$3,153,000
The other revenue for 1912-13 was.	$636,000	
To which add for increase in Postal, Telegraph, Crown Lands, etc.	84,000	
	$720,000	
But deduct Profit of $84,000 on coin last year, and of $35,000 Interest on loan	$119,000	
Leaving 'other' revenue	$ 601,000	
Estimated total revenue on present tariff for 1913-14		$3,754,000

This would leave a deficit on the present tariff of $190,000 assuming my calculations to be well founded; and as to them there are only two items to which exception can be taken. The first is that which estimates an increase in the Customs Revenue of $250,000 this year from natural causes. Well, last year it was $141,000, despite the reduction in duties; and the year before it was $286,000. An average of these gives $214,000 and in view of the Colony's prosperity, the high price of fish, the enlarged imports, the additional output of the pulp mills and iron mines, the increased royalties the latter will give, the augmentation of the revenue by withdrawals from bond latterly, and the payment of duties thereon, I consider myself justified in estimating a receipt of at least $250,000 from this source. With regard to the other point, as to getting an increase of $84,000 in other Revenue, I have merely to say in regard to it that the Department of Agriculture and Mines is my authority for estimating $80,000 increase in the Revenue from Crown Lands, over $40,000 of arrears having been paid in since the present month began.

To meet this temporary shortage the present year and to obviate the possibility of its recurrence next year, we propose

(a) to levy a surtax of 10 per cent on the present duties on imports. This arrangement, on a basis of $3,200,000 of customs revenue, should give us, even if no increase occurred therein next year, $320,000 for the twelve months and at least $120,000 for the remaining portion of the current year.

(b) to increase the duties on champagne, whiskey, brandy, gin and rum by one dollar a gallon, and on ales, etc., by 40 cents a gallon, and on local ales by five cents a gallon, which should give us, for the next fiscal year, $160,000, and

a proportionate sum for the rest of this year.

(c) to increase the duty on imported tobacco by five cents a pound and on imported cigarettes by $1 a pound, and on local cigarettes by $1.72 a pound which should give us an increase of $110,000 for the next fiscal year and a proportionate sum for the rest of this year.

(d) to increase the excise duty on local butterine by one cent a pound, which should give us an additional $36,000 for the next fiscal year, and one-third of it to next June.

(e) to levy a royalty of $1.00 per M. feet on lumber cut by unlicensed mills other than those known as "fishermen's mills" which should give us a sum of $25,000 next year and a third of it this year.

We have already enacted a law against combines, which will enable us to take measures, in the event of any excessive prices being charged on articles sold here, to checkmate this; and we are taking power, in the Revenue Bill to reduce this 10 per cent surtax to a lesser rate if revenue conditions should warrant it at any time. In other words, if we find in the future, that we are obtaining too much revenue we propose to reduce it to 7 1-2 per cent or 5 per cent.

We also propose some lesser changes in the tariff, which I shall describe more fully later. They apply to condensed milk, canned meats, and soaps, the Customs department having reason to suspect that questionable practices are being resorted to in regard to invoices with intent to deceive, so special provision is made to prevent this. We are also proposing to put crude petroleum for motor boats on the free list when used in the Colony's trade or fisheries.

We are, too, providing a resolution to give a drawback of the duty paid on sulphur used in the manufacture of pulp and paper when these articles are exported from the Colony.

For the fiscal year which begins on July 1st, 1914, and ends on June 30th, 1915,I estimate a Revenue of $4,100,000 and an outlay of $3,935,000, which should leave a surplus of $165,000. The Estimates for that year which you have already voted, amount in round figures to $3,840,000, and the additional Estimates, which were submitted on Monday, total roundly $95,000 more. This will make a total of expenditure of $3,935,000. Our Estimate of Revenue of $4,100,000 is based upon the fact that for the last fiscal year, 1912-13, even with $110,000 of duties taken off for three months, the revenue from all sources was $3,919,640, or practically the amount we are figuring to spend for the next fiscal year. We received that amount two years ago. This year, though there has been no duty collected on tea, sugar, pork, and salt beef for eight months, we estimate that the natural increase in revenue will amount to $250,000, leaving a shortage of $130,000 only to be met, on that account. We are of opinion that even if we allowed the duties to remain off these articles next year, and even if we did not provide for natural increase in revenue for the twelve months of 1914-15 should give us at least that $130,000, or make up, in two years, from the natural increase in the revenue, the amount we remitted last session. I will anticipate the argument that we will not have these increases and grant, that for purposes of criticism this may be so, though it must be remembered that, as will be seen by the figures I shall quote later, there has been an increase in the Customs Revenue every year of the past ten, except one

and that in that year the shortage was due to conditions which I need not detail this afternoon. I think, however, that whether we agree or not as to there being a natural increase of $130,000 in the next fiscal year, there can be no dispute that there will be a substantial increase, but in any event we are making ample provision for emergencies; and providing that a surplus can be made up by the alterations in the tariff which I have proposed being operative for the next fiscal year, as well as for the balance of the present one. I am satisfied that it can give us the amount needed for this purpose and that a restoration of the equilibrium between revenue and expenditures will be certain a year hence.

According to the figures of recent years, these increases should give us an addition of about $650,000 to the Revenue and, in the light of the facts and figures I have set before you, I think I am safe in claiming that no reasonable student of our economic and fiscal problems can doubt that we should be in a position next session to look forward with pleasurable anticipations to a return of the conditions of surplus revenues that have been so constant of late years in our fiscal history.

It must be a profound satisfaction Mr. Chairman, to every well-wisher of this country, that its progress has been so marked of late years and that there is every reasonable prospect to believe it will continue to grow still more prosperous for an indefinite period henceforth. The conditions in this country at the end of the calendar year, 1913, are perhaps best attested by the following quotation from the annual report of the Newfoundland Board of Trade for the past year, which was presented at the annual meeting at the end of January, and which I think I may without impropriety incorporate in this review. It reads as follows:—

"It is pleasing to be able to report
"that the year 1913 was undoubtedly
"a very prosperous one. The local
"factories were kept busy through-
"out the year. The value of the out-
"put of the pulp mills on the Exploits
"increased by $800,000, and the ex-
"port of iron ore from Bell Island
"was greater than the previous year
"by 281,935 tons. The increase in
"these industries, together with the
"successful fisheries and high prices,
"makes a very prosperous condition
"for the Colony. It is probable that
"in the history of the Colony, the
"fishing and labouring classes were
"never so well off as at the present
"time, and that commercial credit
"was never before at so high a stan-
"dard."

Men who would have predicted ten years ago that Newfoundland would be enjoying the very desirable conditions that prevail here to-day, as described by the Board of Trade, would be regarded as visionaries; and well they might, because it is questionable if the record of any country like ours can show a progress at all comparable with ours. We are building railroads, providing largely increased grants for every public service, enlarging the activities of the Government to an extent never before attempted in the country, and at the same time reducing taxation on a much more generous scale than heretofore; and yet the Revenue is maintaining itself, there is no flagging in the onward march, and the prosperity of the people has reached a point far above anything previously known. I say, advisedly, that the Revenue is more than maintaining itself, because I regard the present apparent ebbing of the Customs receipts as merely a temporary condition, one that will vanish the moment the touchstone of

to-day's proposals for developing other sources of revenue is applied, and I am confident that still greater results will be achieved in the near future as compared with late years.

The main credit for this unique state of affairs must be given to the railway policy originally enterprised by Sir William Whiteway and developed in its later aspects by our present Premier. It is now only about fifteen years since the cross-country railroad was completed, and in that time we have seen our island home make greater advances than in all the previous years of her history. We have seen her in population keep pace with the neighbouring Dominion, until the past few years, and even to day far exceed the Maritime Provin ces. We have seen her in prosperity more than hold her own with any people in this Western Hemisphere. We have seen the tri-weekly train and steamer grow into the daily train and steamer; we have seen branch railways completed and opened for traffic, and an amazingly large business been done on them; we have Coastal and Bay steamers added and added, and do an enormous business, and still the cry is for more. We have seen an enormous volume of freight carried by every agency we possess until all classes marvel at its never-ceasing expansion. We have seen the wage of the workingman grow from a dollar to a dollar and a quarter and then to a dollar and a half a day, and we have seen a transformation from the time when labor was a drug to the time, now happily present with us, and I hope long to continue with us, when every labor-employing agency in this Colony is seeking for more men and unable to obtain them, so many are the directions in which our people can find employment. Every year witnesses a still larger operation of the mining areas by the Companies which control them, and this year promises to see the largest advance of any, because the Dominion Company, like its neighbor, the Nova Scotia, is proposing to sell stocks of raw ore instead of smelting it all as heretofore, this probably increasing the total number of men working at Bell Island from 2,000 to 2,500. The pulp and paper companies are calling for increased numbers of men and finding it difficult to obtain them even at higher wages. The railway contractors have at no time, during the past two or three years, been able to obtain enough men for their needs, and industrially otherwise the condition is the same. A like gratifying situation prevails with regard to our fisheries. Hon. Mr. Goodridge, one of the best known and most experienced of our merchants, in an address the other day in his place in the Legislative Council, declared that the wages being earned by our fishermen at the present time far exceed any in the past, and the advance in the farming industry has been so noteworthy as to compel the attention of all and every interest among us and to occasion considerable debate in this House already, the net result being a recognition of the fact that a more notable progress has been made the past few years in this direction than ever before. For the most of this the railway policy should be accorded the greatest credit It has opened up the country, rendered our dormant resources available for development, brought the people of every section into closer communication with every other section, and thereby stimulated industrial activity in every fashion. The Bonavista Branch Railroad is now completed and in full running order. Trains are running on the Trepassey Road as far as Renews this winter, and in the early summer there will be daily communication

with Trepassey. This year, too, will see the Bay de Verde and Heart's Content branches in full working order; and as these lines are completed we may look for a continuation of the same results that have shown themselves thus far.

It may not be amiss, in order to show the progress the country has made of late, to set out here the figures of imports and exports for the past decade. They are as follows:

Year Ended June 30.	Imports.	Exports.	Ttl. Trade
1904.	9,448,664	10,381,897	19,830,561
1905.	10,279,293	10,669,342	20,848,635
1906.	10,414,274	12,068,276	22,500,550
1907.	10,626,040	12,101,161	22,727,201
1908.	11,016,111	12,315,769	23,331,880
1909.	11,402,737	11,848,913	23,251,650
1910.	21,799,696	11,824,997	24,624,693
1911.	13,383,910	11,975,747	25,359,657
1912.	14,733,490	13,874,809	28,608,299
1913.	16,012,365	14,672,889	30,685,254

A study of these figures will show how remarkably the Colony has advanced during the term the present Government has held office and if corroborative testimony in this respect is desired, it will be found in the very interesting and informative speech made by Hon. John Anderson in moving the Address in Reply in the Legislative Council on the day the present session opened, in which he set out the striking fact that, whereas the trade of the Colony in four-year periods increased in 25 years from $51,636,352 to $111,188,281, an increase of, roundly, $60,000,000, no less than $21,000,000 of that increase was effected during the past four years, the term of the present Government. In other words, the average of our total trade between 1889 and 1892, the first term of the Whiteway Government, was $12,959,088 a year. The average for the next four years, from 1893 to June, 1897, with the Whiteway Government again in power, was $12,579,639. Between July, 1897, and June, 1901, with the Winter Government in office for three years and the Bond Government for one, the average was $13,906,162. For the next four years, from 1902 to 1905, the average was $19,156,215. For the second term of the Bond Government, from 1906 to 1909, the average was $22,652,203.75, and for the past four years, with the Morris Government in power, the average was $27,797,070.

A specially gratifying fact of late years has been the increase in the Colony's trade with the Mother Country. The imports from Britain amounted to $4,405,103, and the exports thereto totalled $3,427,026. These figures represent a very marked advance on previous years, our imports from Britain not exceeding $3,000,000 any year until 1910, prior to which time they were constant at about two and a half millions. They jumped to $2,940,0000 in 1909-10; increased to $3,092,000 in 1910-11; advanced a million dollars in the next year, when the total was $4,024,000; and made another notable advance last year, increasing to $4,405,000 in all. In the same way the exports to the Mother Country rarely exceeded two million dollars, until 1910-11, prior to which time the average would be about one and a half millions, but in 1909-10 the figures advanced to $1,824,000; in 1910-11 it further advanced to $2,345,000; in 1912 it increased to $2,892,000, and last year it made a similar increase, going to $3,427,000. Naturally the exports of pulp and paper to the Mother Country explain, in a very large measure, the increase in the exports from here, but the very remarkable increase in the imports is, of course, to be attributed to the greater prosperity of the people, and the vastly increased purchases of various articles obtained from the Old Country.

Our trade with the United States and Canada also shows a gratifying increase, though not to anything like the extent that is apparent in relation to the Mother Country. A further gratifying fact is that the increase in the Customs duties has continued in spite of the fact that substantial reductions in duty have taken place each year, culminating in our removal of nearly $400,000 at the last session by remitting the taxes previously paid in on tea, sugar, pork, and salt beef. The Customs Revenue for the past ten years makes the following exhibit:

Year ending June 30	Customs Revenue	Increase	Decrease
1904	$2,232,058	157,066	
1905	2,295,959	63,901	
1906	2,335,238	39,278	
1907	2,354,056	81,182	
1908	2,472,074	81,982	
1909	2,425,393		46,681
1910	2,743,364	317,971	
1911	2,898,615	155,251	
1912	3,142,491	243,876	
1913	3,283,304	140,813	

I would invite the hon. members to carefully study these figures when they have the printed Speech before them and note especially the far larger increase in the Customs Revenue, each year since the present Government came in, than during the term of their predecessors.

The revenues from the Postal and Telegraph Departments, and from the various other sources that yield contributions to the Colony's income every year, have also shown substantial increases during the past ten years, and we are hopeful that, in the not distant future additional sources of Revenue will be called into being that will still further add to the amounts which will be available in carrying out the public services on a scale that will ensure to our people the maximum of advantage.

A fact of striking significance is the Revenue derived from the pulp and paper industry in the Exploits Valley, Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls having been created Ports of Entry within that period.

Year ended June 30	Botwood	Bishop Falls	Grand Falls
1903	$ 5,213	.....	.....
1904	12,035	.....	.....
1905	5,247	.....	1,986
1906	1,845	.....	2,731
1907	981	.....	8,163
1908	373	.....	14,764
1909	10,121	.....	49,324
1910	25,549	3,456	101,374
1911	6.891	3.676	123,346
1912	5,776	6,721	106,764
1913	7,188	12.594	134,976

The explanation of the large duties paid at Botwood in the first part of the ten years is that it was a lumbering centre on a large scale. Of late years, again, they have increased. while Grand Falls and Bishop Falls in their turn have largely increased in the payment of duties, so that it is fair to estimate that the enterprises are responsible for an annual return every year of at least $130,000 to the Revenue, this being a direct result of the establishment of the pulp and paper industry amongst us.

The output of pulp and paper from Newfoundland to date is as follows:—

Year ended June 30, 1909.

	Tons	Value
Paper		.....
Pulp		.....

Year ending June 30th, 1910.

	Tons.	Value
Paper	7,866	$ 352,155
Pulp	6,853	69,164
		$421,319

Year ended June 30, 1911.

	Tons	Value
Paper	26,821	$1,201,656

Pulp	21,177	251,048
		$1,194,747

Year ended June 30, 1912.

	Tons	Value
Paper	26,821	$1,201,656
Pulp	41,102	,361,149
		$1,562,805

Year ended June 30, 1913.

Paper	44,424	$1,990,229
Pulp..	51,487	436,352
		$2,246,581

Six months ended December 31, 1913.

	Tons.	Value
Paper	33,716	$1,606,051
Pulp	44,398	319,053
		$1,925,104

It has already been noted that the export of pulp and paper for the last fiscal year amounted to over $2,400,000 and as the exports for the six months of the current fiscal year, which ended on December 31st, reached $1,900,000, it is evident that the figures up to June next will show a very remarkable advance upon those up to last June.

A study of the returns in the same way with regard to Bell Island works out as follows:

Year ending June 30	Customs Duties.	Ore Royalties.
1903	5,339	
1904	4,411	
1906	5,551	
1907	27,411	
1908	41,637	
1909	28,702	
1910	49,677	*22,202
1911	41,188	88,482
1912	53,701	76,087
1913	54,429	92,821

*Six months only.

We put the ore-tax in operation at the beginning of 1910 and the results up to the end of December last are a receipt of about $340,000, estimating $60,000 for the last half-year, as the shipping of the ore is not carried on during the winter months. The figures of output for the past ten years are:—

Year ended June 30.	Tons Ore.	Exp. Value
1904	526,285	$ 526,285
1905	635,350	635,350
1906	768,430	769,430
1907	809,700	890,670
1908	943,460	1,037,806
1909	880,120	962,132
1910	1,059,880	1,165,867
1911	1,175,185	1,292,702
1912	1,076,930	1,118,622
1913	1,243,200	1,367,520

The annual report of the Reid-Newfoundland Company, tabled in the House recently, shows how the prosperity of the people generally is reflected in the increased development of the traffic by that great public utility. A statement for the past three fiscal years shows:—

	1910-11	1911-12	1912-13
Tons of freight carried	130,510	130,817	151,574
Miles run by passenger trains	209,624	201,103	337,017
Miles run by freight trains	43,068	239,380	270,807
Miles run by mixed trains	273,649	65,215	154,620
Passenger traffic earnings	$286,484	$279,847.69	$335,334
Freight traffic earnings	249,731	260,799.52	292,794
Mail traffic earnings	42,000	45,985.26	48,150
Other earnings	48,088	47,165.34	63,952

The deposits in our Savings Bank at the end of December were $2,794,117. The four Canadian Banks now doing business in the Colony had on deposit and in their savings branches deposits at interest to the amount of $8,631,718 against $7,975,006 the previous year, an increase of $656,712 during the twelve months. The value of the debentures and bonds of the Colony held in Newfoundland on December 31st, 1913, was $3,796,848 against $3,763,111 the previous year, an increase of $33,437, and the reserve or re-insurance value of life insurance policies to protect policy-holders, is now $1,561,295 against $1,437,212 last year, an increase of $142,083.

The figures respecting the Post Office Department are of special interest. They show that the Revenue for the Postal Branch was $110,334.03 against $108,814.20 the previous year, an increase of $1,519.83; and the telegraph revenue $93,652.75, as compared with $91,257.58 the previous year, an increase of $2,395.17. The total revenue, then, in this Department was $203,986.83, against $200,071.70, a total increase of $3,915.05. The expenditure of the postal branch was $123,249.67, against $120,108.35. The telegraph expenditure was $124,048.72 against $119,930.09; and that for Marconi royalties was $7,069.99 against $2,433.33. On account of construction of telegraphs the disbursements were $71,223.66 against $38,631.66, and for Marconi construction $4,814.25 against $10,308.76, making a total outlay for all services under this Department of $661,178.43 against $603,360.15, a total increase of $57,818.28.

The returns for this increased expenditure have only begun to show themselves in part, as the erection of telegraph lines, the improvements in present lines, the providing of additional mail steamers, new post offices, new telegraph buildings and equipments do not begin to figure at once, nor do the monetary returns become immediately apparent. However, during the fiscal year there was an increase in the number of letters handled of 150,000; in the number of post offices of 43; in the number of Money Order Offices of 23; of Telegraph Offices, 22; and in the sale of Postage Stamps of $2,472.40, this being a normal increase not swelled, as in previous years, by sales of special issues of stamps. The figures respecting the Money Order Branch likewise show a substantial betterment. The total number issued was 68,383, an increase of 7,966. The value of Orders issued was $891,955.99, an increase of $94,662.53, and with the prospect that this year there will probably be a further increase to almost a million dollars, while the total number of Orders paid was 61,135, an increase of 7,221, and the value of the orders paid was $946,787.80, an increase of $126,408.94. In other words, the financial transactions of this department considerably exceeded a million and three-quarter dollars the past year, and the growth in the utility of the service is being constantly shown, making it clear that the public are availing of the system to a greater extent than previously. A similar situation exists in regard to the registration branch. There were registered at the G.P.O. 27,273 packages, an increase of 3,711; official letters, 14,368, a decrease of 3,906; received from other offices were 31,478, an increase of 1,334; and delivered in St. John's, 112,136, an increase of 6,427. These figures, however, do not give the total number of letters and other articles mailed and despatched under the registration branch within the Colony, as, under the present system of handling our mail, almost the whole of the registered letters and packages outside of St. John's, are carried to their destination without passing through the St. John's Office at all.

In the Parcel Post Department 125,-387 local parcels were handled, an increase of 6,067 over the previous year and some 25,583 parcels were received from abroad, an increase of 69; and customs duties were paid on all of these to the amount of $35,256.24, or $3,947.79 more than the the previous year; while, in addition, duties amounting to $3,461.89 were collected on parcels containing dutiable articles received outside of the regular parcel post packages which were held for Customs examinations, and 6,409 parcels were despatched to foreign countries, an increase of 202 over the previous year. It may not be amiss to remark here that the Postmaster-General states that Newfoundland is ahead of other and more wealthy countries in the matter of an inland Parcel Post system, and it is only now that Canada and the United States have made a start to give the people of these countries this great benefit. He urges the further extension of this service by reducing the rates on parcels within the Colony, and thinks that by so doing and with the railway and steamship Companies providing increased facilities in the carriage of this mail and by reorganizing the staff it would be possible to handle the increased business that would result from lower rates and, as in the case of the reduction of the postage on letters, before long bring about an increase of revenue at the same time. He observes that the Parcel Post system does not materially interfere with steamer or railway traffic, and for the transmission of small packages is much preferred, and the reduction he suggests would be a great boon, especially to the largest class of our people, and he suggests an insurance scheme for those who might desire to avail of it. The total value of sales under the postage stamp branch, including stamps, post cards, wrappers and envelopes, amounted to $111,172.11.

It is equally gratifying to note that the increase in the receipts of the telegraph branch shows a steady advance, though reduced rates for certain business have been given and the daily mail across country enables much to be done by that mail that would otherwise be telegraphed. As a result of the erection of so many branch lines, and the increase in traffic mentioned, the existing main lines were found inadequate, and double poles were put up and three new lines constructed between St. John's and Clarenville, St. John's and Bishop's Falls, and St. John's and Deer Lake, making nine main lines to the head office in this city, as there were three other calls, one to Bell Island and two to the Branch offices in the city, each with two operators. During the year 206 miles of telegraph line were erected, 18 knots of cable laid, 22 new offices opened, and there are now 2,-073 miles of land lines, 32 local cables, or 54 knots in all, and 200 telegraph offices in operation. The Postmaster-General likewise instances the growth of telephone business, several installations having been made in the past year, and he urges that it be systematized and an expert put in charge. He speaks of improvement in the efficiency of the Marconi system, and states that a revenue of about $12,000 annually is derived therefrom.

We invited the adoption of the House Monday of resolutions providing for a further loan of $2,000,000 to complete the branch railway system, which will entail an addition to our interest charge of $70,000. In connection with the railway branches, I should like to offer some remarks concerning the cost of the same, comparing the terms of the contract of 1909 with those of the contract of 1890. Some criticism has been made against our paying the railway con-

tractor in cash instead of in bonds, but I submit that it is not valid nor will it hold water. On the contrary I maintain that the country has got quite a good bargain in the contract made five years ago for the construction of these branches. During the past twenty years the cost of rails has increased from $20 to $28 per ton; the cost of first-class cars has increased from $6,288 to $11,000; the cost of locomotives has increased by 35 per cent., and so with every other item of material required in the construction, operation and maintenance of a railway system, and we know, on our own account, that the price of labor has been increased by fifty cents or from $1.00 to $1.50 per day, and we incorporated this in the contract. Therefore, it is no exaggeration to say that if this country had entered into a contract with any other contractor than the Reid Co. for the construction of these branches it would have had to pay, and would feel quite satisfied to pay, a much higher price per mile for the line than we are paying.

The reason, of course, which has weighed with the Reid Co., in giving us the very low figure for which we have got the branch railways built is that through the agency of its trunk line and its steamers, the Company has been able to gather men, supplies and equipment, etc., and also to handle the problems of construction much more cheaply than any other concern could. Moreover, up to the present time there has been absolutely no loss whatever sustained by the Colony through paying the Railway Co. in cash as we have received for our bonds a sufficient amount to make an equivalent of the former contract, in addition to which the country has got back the increased revenue following upon the greater wage paid to the workman on the line. It has been suggested in some quarters that owing to the recent financial stringency, the Colony might find it difficult to float the loan which we are now proposing at figures approaching the favourable ones of the last two loans, but in view of the manner in which the stock and financial markets have recovered latterly from the previous depression, and that in the London market to-day various loans are being over-subscribed, I think it is reasonable to assume that when the Prime Minister proceeds to London with this object in view, he will find no difficulty in placing the loan on at least as favourable terms as its predecessors. I do not know that I can set the case for the branch railways before you in any better form than it was put up by the Premier in his Manifesto to the electors last year which was as follows:—

"In 1882 before we built a mile of railway in Newfoundland, our revenue was about $1,000,000. Today 1913. our revenue is $4,000,000. In 1882 wages were 80 cents a day, fish was $3.00 per quintal and the people were flying out of the country. Today wages are from $1.50 to $2.50 per day. fish is $6.50, and our people are returning to the country. Since 1882 we have been able to place flour, cordage, hay, agricultural implements, machinery, motor engines, gas, gasolene for fishermen, and a number of other articles on the free list. In the face of these convincing facts will anyone say that railway construction has not been the saviour of Newfoundland? Why, if all this prosperity and advancement has been accomplished without placing these articles on the free list, but continuing our old tariff, it would have been a splendid result; but to have achieved it and reduced taxation to our people $800,000 annually, almost staggers one. With regard

to branch railway expenditure, the whole of the interest charge so far is only $210,000, and we obtain half of this by the royalty on ore exported from Bell Island, and the other half by the increase in Crown Lands revenue that has followed upon our policy since taking office."

As he very well says there, the country is getting towards paying the cost of the interest on railway construction, the magnificent sum of nearly $100,000 a year from the Bell Island Mining Companies, and the enhanced revenue in the Crown Lands Office represents a contribution of $120,000 towards the same purpose. In order to make this latter fact clear beyond any question or dispute, I give herewith a table showing the receipts of the Crown Lands Department since 1901, the first full year under our predecessors. These figures are:—

CROWN LANDS REVENUE.

Year ended June 30th.	Timber	Mineral.	Total.
1901	$ 4,723.47	7,072.40	11,895.87
1902	6,742.00	7,500.09	14,242.92
1902-3	18,325.25	8,379.00	26,704.25

Year	Timber.	Mineral	Agric.	Total.
1903-4	29,922.62	9,336.55	2,098.37	41,357.54
1904-5	32,785.10	10,093.00	1,754.55	44,632.65
1905-6	29,587.84	15,728.07	2,722.84	48,308.75
1906-7	28,905.63	13,650.00	16,745.05	59,300.68
1907-8	30,026.25	13,960.00	2,607.12	46,503.37
1908-9	38,082.12	14,320.00	1,372.53	53,774.65
1909-10	187,430.96	60,690.00	3,133.05	251,234.01
1910-11	155,714.65	34,288.00	2,331.80	192,334.45
1911-12	89,068.70	28,299.00	2,341.17	119,708.87
1912-13	74,288.01	24,560.00	6,220.98	105,068.99
1913-14	99,591.48	22,960.00	6,883.55	*129,435.30

***To end of January**

By reference to the foregoing it will be seen that for the five years of the Bond Government's second term. as I have given them the benefit of the advantage of the enhancement of Revenue as compared with their first term, their average annual receipts from Crown Lands amounted to $50,468.15. the highest figure ever obtained by them in this Department being $59,300.68 for 1906-7. For our five years,however, including the present year, the figure for which is estimated, the average is $167,556.05. In other words there is an annual average increase in the Crown Lands Revenue for these five years of nearly $120,000.

Assuming the cost of the railways. therefore, at $8,000,000, and the interest at $280,000 a year, we are getting $100,000 of that from Bell Island, $120,000 from Crown Lands, $10,000 from Cables, and the rest from the duty on the increased importations due entirely to the better conditions arising from the labor provided by the railway enterprise.

A favorite source of complaint by some dissatisfied elements in the country is that the Government,since taking office, has made its expendi-

tures on a most lavish scale, and they have sought to create the impression abroad that this is due to the fact that we have spent most of this money in increasing salaries and providing for political supporters. There never was a more utterly unfounded charge made against an Administration than this, as I shall show by the following summary of the estimated expenditure for 1908-9 and 1914-15. I might observe that the Estimates for the former year were prepared by our predecessors and were presented by us to the 1909 Assembly without any change whatever, except that we made provision for an increase of $30,000 in the Education Vote, $4,000 for a Tuberculosis Commission; $3,000 for preliminary surveys for the branch railways, and $15,000 towards Harbor Grace public building. The comparison is:

Head of Expenditure	1908-9	1914-15	Increase
Public Debt Interest	$871,512	$1,124,063	$252,551
Civil Government	148,798	264,858	116,060
Administration of Justice	183,612	199,493	15,881
Education	264,123	366,724	104,601
Public Charities	278,814	400,274	121,460
Lighthouses	73,651	109,175	35,524
Agriculture and Mines	31,420	56,200	24,780
Marine and Fisheries	92,940	103,040	10,100
Roads and Bridges	172,396	189,679	17,283
Postal and Telegraphs	423,620	701,538	277,918
Customs	213,541	260,715	47,174

The increase for these and the lesser services amounted in round figures to $1,000,000.00 or about $167,000 a year for the six years covered by this comparison.

I now propose to show how these increases have been made up.

This increase of $250,000 in public debt interest, as noted above, is represented by the interest on the loans for the construction of the branch railways, and on the loans for the various local public services that we have raised, first to pay off the deficit of $200.000 which our predecessors left us as a legacy when they went out of power; to complete the Museum and the General Hospital; to provide new and improved school buildings, and, since that, for other public services.

In the next line the principal items in the increase of $116,000 under the head of Civil Government, are $60 000 for Old Age Pensions, $5,000 for Marine disasters, $4,000 for branch railway surveys, $20,000 for extra cost of fuel and light and other expenses arising from the increased number of public buildings, and the insurance of the same: and another $20,000 for repairs; the increase in all the salaries under this head, in spite of the growth of various public services being only $12,000 or an average of $2,000 a year.

We have, in round figures, increased the outlay for the Administration of Justice by $16,000, and of that $13,000 has gone to increasing the salaries and allowances of the Constabulary and Fire Departments and $3,000 to the Penitentiary, where the cost of maintenance and operation has grown with the cost of the articles required.

The whole of the $105,000 under the head of education has gone for educational purposes and represents a much larger outlay than has ever been made

by any Government in this country heretofore. The same is true of the $121,000 of an increase in the Department of Public Charities. Of that amount charitable institutions have got $6,000; the Lunatic Asylum $12,000; Poor Asylum, $3,000; Hospitals, $26,000; Public Health Service, $7,000; Tuberculosis campaign, $24,000; medical attendance on paupers, $6,000; permanent and casual poor, $25,000; orphanages, $3,500; conveyance of sick poor, $4,000; conveyance of sick fishermen from the Labrador, $1,500, etc.

The increase of $35,000 in the Lighthouse Department is due to the construction of new lighthouses and fog alarms, and the improvement of existing ones, there having been, as hon. members are well aware, no fewer than 77 lights and alarms added or improved since this Government took office, and all of this money has gone in providing for the salaries for keepers and maintenance of these establishments.

The increase of $25,000 in the Agriculture and Mines is represented by $15,000 for exploring the coal areas; $8,000 a year for a fire patrol; and $1,000 for rent for Colony's court in the Imperial Institute. I might observe that there has, perhaps, never been a better expenditure made in this country than the outlay of $8,500 a year for the maintenance of the fire patrol service. It is paying for itself countless times over by the protection it is giving to our valuable forest areas. It is a well known fact, which every person financially interested in the lumbering and pulp and paper industries of this Colony will endorse, that this is the correct policy for the Colony to pursue, that it is a service the advantages of which are apparent to everybody.

Of the $10,000 under Marine and Fisheries, $5,000 goes to the propagation of lobsters; $12,000 for dredging $1,000 for public wharves, and $2,000 for the meteorological service, but a special vote of $10,000, made by our predecessors in 1908-9 for fog alarms and lighthouses, have been dropped.

Of the $17,000 for roads and bridges $7,000 have been apportioned to local roads and $10,000 to improving the ferry service, rendered necessary by the increasing requirements of the country.

Under the head of Postal and Telegraphs is the largest increase, except that of Public Debt, but out of this sum $157,000 represents increased ocean, coastal, and railway mail subsidies. The increase in the service in St. John's, and on the railways and steamers accounts for $21,000; new outport post offices and the establishing of many money order offices with consequent addition to salaries, new courier roads and the greater cost of maintaining the same represent $32,000 more. The increase in the telegraph service through the extending of the lines and the consequent enhanced volume of business, represents salary outlays of $41,000 and $44,000 for maintenance, and the Commercial Cable Company, is paid $6,000 a year for the adjusting of charges for the exchange of traffic.

In the Customs Department there is an increase of $47,000, of which $7,000 represents the increased votes to pay refunds of coal duties and water rates; $4,000 for duty refunds; $3,000 for commission on duties; $2,500 for the Labrador service, the balance going in providing in the regular estimates for a variety of service in St. John's and the outports that were formerly charged to contingencies, and the abolition of which practice by us now was commended by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House a few days ago.

The remission of duties by this Government a year ago was bitterly criticized by our opponents and we were told that it was an invitation to disaster, but disaster has not, however, followed. On the contrary, we have had a very substantial increase of revenue during the year and while it is too much to hope that the whole amount would be returned to us in a single season, we have expectation that this result will follow in two years. In the meantime we are providing, as was done here in 1899, to cover any contingencies that may arise, and we confidently expect that the result which followed then, the securing of a substantial surplus in that period will be our good fortune again next year.

The duties were taken off these necessaries of life in response to a definite promise made by the People's Party when facing the country in 1908, and as soon as circumstances admitted, having regard to the other public services that had been inaugurated, we made good our promise. That it was no mere electioneering dodge, as has been charged against us, is attested by the fact that the measures which we are now proposing to take in order to restore the equilibrium between Revenue and Expenditure will conform to the principles embodied in last year's enactment, namely, that the people should have their necessities of life untaxed and we hope that, as years go by, it will be possible for us to make other tariff changes in the same direction.

The Government had a choice of doing one of two things—either increasing taxation on other items or of endeavoring to secure the same amount of revenue in some other way. They chose the latter course because they were satisfied that it was the more equitable, all things considered, and would lessen the burden on the poorer classes. It should not be forgotten that, in all reductions that have taken place for some years past, except in those of salt, lines, and twines,the well-to-do people have shared in the advantage just as have their poorer neighbours. Flour, tea, sugar, pork, beef, all these items are used by well-off citizens, and if, in the city the consumption of kerosene oil and molasses is not very great, in the outports virtually everybody has to use oil for lighting, and the consumption of molasses is a large item. The changes we are now making will affect all classes according to their outlay, and their purchases. The poorer people will enjoy, as heretofore, their necessaries of life untaxed and their outlays for the articles that are now on the duty-paying list will be much smaller than those of their better-off neighbours. In other words,the wealthier a man is the more he will contribute in proportion to the revenue in the future, and the smaller share of the burden will be borne by the poorer people who are least able to carry an excessive weight in that direction. Another reason why this new scheme we propose should be of advantage to the poorer classes is that the poor man benefits only indirectly by many of the services, such as roads, bridges, post offices, telegraphs, etc., as these are in the very nature of things of more convenience to and utilized more by the rich man than the poor, and, consequently in the plans we are submitting for the raising of more revenue, it is only fair that the better-off classes should pay a proportionately larger share than their poorer neighbours. We trust, however, that the natural increase in revenue of the Colony and the ever-growing prosperity, both of the country and the people, may enable us, in

a year or two, to come in here with proposition for wiping out again the changes, for dropping the additions we are now making and for enabling us to effect other reductions.

The present administration, while its aim has been to carry out the public services with economy and discretion, and keeping within the limits of revenue, has been able to accomplish substantial results and give every possible monetary aid to the betterment of the services from which the people derive direct benefit. Thus, since taking office in 1909, we have increased the education grant by a larger amount than was ever given in a similar period; we have spent, in the five years, $200,000 on agriculture, with results that are apparent in every settlement in the Island; we have disbursed a sum of $120,000 in Old Age Pensions; we have raised the allowances to widows by twenty-five per cent.; we have given to the people in extraordinary road grants over and above the regular appropriations $600,000; we have provided for lighthouse expenditure some $250,000 on capital account and increased the votes for the maintenance and upkeep of this service proportionately; we have provided a dredge at a cost of $50,000, which has been doing excellent service the past two seasons; we have provided $100,000 for Hospital improvement, and have secured hospitals in the outports as well as at St. John's, and we have provided for the public health service a sum of $25,000 a year, and are planning to set on foot a sanatorium policy in the spring, which will do much, it is hoped, to lessen the mortality and suffering that follow the ravages of the dread white plague. This policy we propose to pursue and expand as the financial resources available will permit. No Government can stand still or disregard its obligations in these respects, and while we propose to borrow for the purpose of paying for great capital expenditures such as the construction of railroads, lighthouses and other public works, as this policy is considered by every country to be justifiable and expedient, we propose that our revenue shall suffice to meet our increased interest charge as well as the increased and steadily increasing expenditures incurred in connection with all the great spending Departments of Government everywhere. To accomplish this task within the compass of the Revenue without unduly adding to the burdens of the people, especially the burdens of those least able to bear them, has always been the aim and policy of the present administration, as set out by its leader when he first took the field at the head of the Party. How he has performed that duty is told by the encouraging story of progress and development, combined with wise and economical financial administration, which can be gleaned from the history of this Colony the past five years when, with clear head and steady hand he was called upon to guide the fortunes of the People's Party and the Government of this Ancient Colony as its Prime Minister.

I have some tables here giving the position of sundry accounts in the various banks which are identical with the material in the Auditor-General's report, so will not burden the House with them now, but have them printed with the speech to-morrow, when they will be available to hon. members for perusal and reference.

They are as follows:

The position of the Surplus Trust Fund was, at the close of the fiscal year 1912-1913, as follows, viz.:—

DR.

To total amount received from 1901-1902 to 1911-1912 inclusive, as per my last report $1,157,328.46

To received from 1912-1913 Account	115,479.01
	$1,272,807.47

CONTRA.

Expended on roads to June 30th, 1913 ... ..$	486,464.33
Lighthouse Construction.	45,000.00
Harbor Improvements and Marine Works..	221,899.05
Outport Government Buildings	41,236.47
Extension Marconi System	14,000.00
Extension Tel. System...	59,223.66
Completion Fever Hospital	3,000.00
Construction Museum (in aid of)	30,000.00
Extension and Improvement General Hospital (in aid of)	66,254.29
Encouragement Herring Fishery	26,045.03
General Elections, 1908..	40,328.59
To cover part deficit Current Account, 1908-'09	6,786.92
Festival of Empire (in aid of)	10,213.90
Government Bonds for Old Age Pension Fund.. ..	200,000.00
Education	10,000.00
Addition to General Post Office	3,000.00
	$1,263,452.24
Balance	9,355.23

The following statement shows the expenditure under the several service loan accounts on the 30th of June last, viz:—

	Raised	Expended	Balance
Loan Act, 1898			
(a) New Market House	$10,000.00		$10,000.00
Loan Act, 1911			
(b) Marconi Installation	13,691.24	4,813.25	8,876.99
Gnl. Hospital Improvements			2.19
New Poor Asylum	149,402.70	633.75	148,768.95
Public Building, Hr. Grace	9,112.00	7,775.17	1,336.83
Lighthouse Construction ..	353.24	353.24	
Agricultural Bounty Act			
(c) For Bonuses	974.69	35.00	939.69
Railway Act, 1910 and 1912.			
d) Balance & raised in 1912-13 .	2,715,588.85	1,425,225.00	1,290,363.85
	$2,902,748.34	1,442,459.84	$1,460,288.50

The explanation of the foregoing is:

(a) This sum of 10,000, raised in 1898 for the erection of a new market House, still remains to the credit of the loan, in the Bank of Montreal.

(b) The total sum of $384,000 has been subscribed to the 30th of June last under this Act which authorized the raising of $520,000 for certain public services.

(c) The balance of the Agricultural Bounty Loan is self-explanatory.

(d) The expenditure on account of Railway Loans for 1912-1913 is made up as follows viz.:—

To Reid Nfld Co., for construction and equipment	$1,371,225.00
To Agriculture and Mines Department for sundry persons and arbitration awards for land	54,000.00
	$1,425,225.00

The several amounts authorized by, and the expenditure to date under, this Loan Act, are as follows, viz.:—

School Buildings	100,000.00	.....	.....	.....	100,000.00
New Poor Asylum	150,000.00	597.30	633.75	1,231.05	148,768.95
Lighthouses and Marconi	100,000.00	85,955.52	5,167.47	91,123.01	8,876.99
Dredge	50,000.00	50,000.00	.....	50,000.00	.....
Municipal Council	32,000.00	32,000.00	.....	32,000.00	.....
Hr. Grace Public Bldg. ..	15,000.00	5,888.00	7,775.17	13,633.17	1,336.83
Improvm't Gen. Hospital	73,000.00	69,374.38	3,623.43	72,997.81	2.19
	$520,000.00	243,815.20	17,199.84	261,015.04	258,984.96

With regard to the foregoing some further explanation is desirable, viz.:

School Buildings:

This $100,000.00 has been raised by Temporary Loan from the Bank of Montreal at four per cent. interest, the same as is provided by the Loan Act.

Lighthouses and Marconi:

The balance shown is on account of Marconi installation.

New Poor Asylum:

This expenditure is really on account of new Lunatic Asylum. The Auditor General has requested the Government to amend the Act so as to make the Loan applicable to the latter Institution.

The following is a statement of the Conversion Loan, 5th, Edward VII., Cap. 1:—

	Balance from 1911-12	Raised in 1912-13	Expended In 1912-13	Balance 1913-14
Conversion of Debentures	$4,294.79	$631.00	$4,576.64	$349.15

This is the Loan Act relating to the conversion of Debentures into coupon-bearing Bonds. Under it, $63,095.64 in Debentures was redeemed during the year under report and exchanged for Bonds. The adjustment of differences between the amount of debentures surrendered and the bonds issued, is represented by the balance in hand, w hich thus shows a pro tanto reduction of the Public Debt. The aggregate of debentures converted since the passing of the Act is $2,088,270.41, leaving $86,910.16 still to be converted.

The following is a statement of the Temporary Loan Account:

TEMPORARY LOANS.

	Raised	Expended	Balance
Loan Act, 1911:			
School Buildings	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	.....
Loan Act, 1912:			
Lighthouse construction	100,000.00	48,480.39	$51,519.61

The explanation relative to the loan for School Buildings has been already given. The Act of 1912 authorizes the raising of the sum of $250,000.00. Of this, $150,000.00 is for the extension of the Telephone System of the Colony. Nothing has been expended on this service. $100,000.00 is for the erection of Lighthouses and Fog Alarms. In order to meet immediate requirements for Lighthouse Construction, the amount authorized for this service has been raised by Temporary Loan from the Bank of Montreal at the legal rate of four per cent. None of this loan has been subscribed.

The funded public debt of the Colony was increased by the sum of $2,093,199.26 during the year 1912-1913, viz.:—

Under Act 2, Geo. V. Cap. 18, Railway Construction ..	$1,946,666.66	
Under Act 59, Vic. Cap. 5, Carbonear Street Act	1,782.60	
Under Act 1, Geo. V. Cap. 32, Public Service	75,500.00	
Under Act 5, Ed. VII., Cap. 1, Conversion of Debentures	69,250.00	
		$2,093,199.26
And Reduced Under,—		
5th, Ed. VII., Cap. 1, Conversion of Debentures	63,095.64	
9th, Ed. VII., Cap. 3, Cancellation of Debentures, surrendered by the Savings Bank as payment to the Colony of portion of the Profit and Loss Account of the Bank	50,000.00	
		$113,095.64
Net Increase for the year being		$1,980,103.62
Add the balance on 1st July 1912		27,489,956.92
Giving a total of		$29,470,060.54
To this should be added the Temporary Loan from the Bank of Montreal referred to already		200,000.00
Total		$29,670,060.54

To arrive at the net public debt of the Colony, it will be necessary to make certain deductions from this, viz.,

Gross debt		29,670,060.54
Less:		
Owed the Colony by the St. John's Municipal Council ..	$1,425,341.22	
Script of the Hr. Grace Water Co., held by Government	13,700.00	
Paid off by the operation of the Sinking Fund, established under 56th Vic., Cap. 13, as on June 30th, 1913	645,742.61	
		$2,084,783.83
Net Public Debt		$27,585,276.71

The balances to the credit of the Colony at the close of the fiscal year, 1912-1913 were as follows:—

In the Bank of Montreal:	
Surplus Trust Fund	9,355.23
Agriculture Bonus	939.69
5th Ed. VI., Cap. 1 (Conversion of Debentures)	349.15
61st Vic., Cap. 19 (Market House)	10,000.00
1st Geo. V., Cap. 32 (Loan Deposit Receipt)	123,484.96
Reserve Fund	500,000.00
In the Bank of Nova Scotia:	
Railway Loan money deposited at 3½ p.c. interest ..	418,263.85
In the Royal Bank of Canada'	
Railway Loan money deposited at 3½ p.c. interest ..	872,100.00

In the Harbor Grace Water Company:	
For Stock	13,700.00
Debt Due by the Municipal Council	1,425,341.22
Amount to the credit of the Colony	$3,373,534.10

And to its Debit:

In the Bank of Montreal:	
Temporary Loan Account, viz.: Loan Act, 1911, School Buildings	$100,000.00
Temporary Loan Account, viz.: Loan Act, 1912, Construction Lighthouses and Fog Alarms	100,000.00
Cost of Importation of Copper Coin	1,055.88
	$201,055.88

I have already referred to the foregoing with the exception of the sums to the credit of the Colony in the Bank of Nova Scotia and the Royal Bank of Canada. This money represents the balance of the Loan of £400,000 sterling, raised in London for Railway Construction under Act 2, George V., referred to in the statement of the Public Debt.

In addition to the foregoing there were at the close of the year under report the following credit balances to the several Departmental Trust Accounts in the Bank of Montreal Viz.:—

Post Office Department:	
For extension Telegraph System in Twillingate District	$308.90
Colonial Secretary's Department:	
Constabulary for purchase of machinery	1,372.48
Education, Balance of votes to credit denominations ..	1,766.05
	$3,138,53
Agriculture and Mines Department:	
Railway Arbitration Awards, Balance from 1911-12 ..	3,902.98
Received from Treasury, 1912-13	54,000.00
	$57,965.98
Paid out in Awards in 1912-13	57,760.98
Balance to 1913-1914	205.00
Marine and Fisheries Department:	
Marine Works to cover allocations issued, the work on which was not completed at the close of the year .	$616.80
Musgrave Harbor Breakwater; balance on July 1st, 1912, was $2,066.29; $2,000.00 of which was spent in 1912-13 for public wharves, District of Fogo, leaving a balance of	66.29
	$683.09
Treasury Department:	
Treasury Cash Notes, viz. Balance July 1st, 1913	$97,476.80
Cash received from Departments for purchase of Notes	325,110.00
	$432,586.80

Notes redeemed and cancelled	306,205.50
Balance to 1913-14	$126,381.30
Outstanding Letter of Credit cheques of the several Departments for 1910-11, 1911-12, being provision for payment of same	3,445.14
	$129,826.44

Public Works Department:

Departmental Trust for unallocated road grants	$978.87
Cash Notes, for redemption of balance of old issues of Cash Notes from the Public Works Department still in circulation	4,476.61
	$5,455.48

Savings Bank:

Cash to credit of Teachers' Pension Fund	6,616.15
Total	$146,233.59

The Teachers' Pension Fund, established under the Education Act of 1912 at present stands as follows:—

Bonds of the Colony in the custody of the Savings Bank	$60,000.00
Cash to credit of current account in Savings Bank	6,616.15
	$66,616.15

The Old Age Pension Fund amounts to $200,000.00 in Bonds of the Colony in custody of the Treasury.

Copper coin to the value of $3,440.00 was, on the 30th of June last, held by the Treasury for issue.

The Treasury Cash Notes Stock account stood on the 30th of June last as folows, viz:—

Balance from 1911-12	53,750.00
Received from Manufacturer in 1912-1913	390,512.50
	$444,262.50
Issued in 1912-1913	387,000.00
Balance to 1913-1914	$57,262.50

The Auditor-General reports that he has checked the stock in hand and found it correct, and in his report he goes on to say:—

"The Register of Life Insurance Companies' securities has been examined by me and compared with the receipt list given by the Bank of Montreal, in which Bank these securities are deposited, and I have found the entries correct.

"In July last I audited the accounts of the Harbor Grace, Carbonear and Placentia Water Companies. Their accounts were found to be correct. The Harbor Grace Water Company still experiences a difficulty in keeping its expenditure within its revenue.

"I have verified the following stocks as on the 30th of June last, viz.:

Postal Stamps	$283,443.54
Inland Revenue Stamps	126,055.20

"Under the provisions of Section 3 of the Registrar Supreme Court (Fund) Act, 1913, I have examined the accounts of the Registrar of the Supreme Court and found the same correct. The debentures and other securities, to the amount of $223,450.00 I have checked and found correct. The amount of cash held by the Registrar was $31,872.71. This also I found to be correct. This cash is deposited in

the Newfoundland Savings Bank.

"I have examined the accounts of the Commissioners of Pilots to date of present report and have found these correct.

"Under the provisions of Section 3 of the Act, respecting companies operating Marine Docks in the Colony, application was made to the Government to pay to the Harbor Grace Marine Dock Company the sum by which the profits of the Company for the year ending June 30th, 1913, proved to be less than five per cent. upon the actual capital of the Company paid up in cash. Acting under the instructions to me set forth in Section 3 of the said Act, I examined the accounts, etc., of the Company and found that the sum required to give a dividend of five per cent. amounted to $213.68. I gave my certificate for this sum and it was paid to the Company from the vote for General Contingencies."

I now beg to table the Resolutions for effecting the changes which we have proposed and, when we come to consider them in detail, I will explain them fully. In the meantime I beg to move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again on Friday next, so that hon. gentlemen may, in the meantime, have an opportunity of perusing the figures as given in the Budget, and in the accounts which are being laid on their desks.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted, and that the Committee have leave to sit again on Friday next.

LOCAL AFFAIRS RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, Mr. Kent moved the following Resolutions in relation to the administration of local affairs in the Colony.

Whereas the present method of appointing Road Boards in this Colony is unsatisfactory,

And Whereas it is desirable to establish a better system of local administration,

Resolved that in the opinion of this House the several Electoral Districts of the Colony should be divided by law into a fixed number of administrative districts and the local affairs of such administrative district should be controlled by a local board elected by the electors in such district duly qualified under the Election Act 1913 and that the local, special and other grants for public and marine works should be allocated to and expended by such boards, except in case of works presenting special engineering difficulties

Resolved that it is the duty of the Government to prepare and introduce into the legislature during the next session legislation for that purpose.

Resolved that pending the preparation and enactment of such legislation all the members of Road Boards in the several localities where such boards are established should be elected at a public meeting of the electors in that locality and be appointed by the Governor-in-Council upon receiving from a Justice of the Peace or other person presiding at the said public meeting a certificate that such meeting had been held and giving the names of the parties so elected and that the board so appointed be the road board for that locality until the 30th of June, 1915 when the new legislation would come into effect and that all vacancies on said boards be filled in the same manner and that all local, special and other grants for public and marine works be allocated to and expended by such Board, provided, however, if the Government Engineer shall certify that any special

work presents engineering difficulties such special work shall be executed through and under the supervision of the Government Engineer's Department. Any such meeting may be held by a Magistrate or a Justice of the Peace on the order of the Minister of Public Works at the request of the members representing in the Legislature the locality desiring the election of the board.

Dated at St. John's this 25th day of February, 1914.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, these resolutions which I propose submitting to the House deal with the question of Local Government or administration of local affairs. I have brought it before the House in the form of resolutions, rather than as an enactment, merely to affirm the principle that some reform in the manner of administration of local affairs throughout the Colony is necessary. I do not propose any legislation on the matter now; I simply ask that the attention of the House be directed to the matter and that the reform of the present system be taken into consideration, with a view to dealing with this question at the next session. Several attempts have been made from time to time to deal with the question of organizing the administration of local affairs throughout the Colony. For some reason or other none have been put into operation throughout the Colony. The resolutions which I am moving I shall read for the Committee. (Hon. member reads the resolutions.) The organization of this country for administrative and judicial purposes is extremely incomplete. I have referred to this matter before in this House. To-day the Road Boards are nominated by the Government, except in one or two places where advantage has been taken of the Act dealing with local affairs. Most of the Road Boards are appointed because some of their friends happen to have a political influence with the Government in power. That is a system that has prevailed for years and years, but I think that the time is come when we should face the position and do something definite and satisfactory with regard to the handling of the local affairs of the different districts. This system which I propose would have many advantages. In the first place it would give every man in the district a personal interest in the management of local affairs in his district. You will be thus promoting a public spirit that cannot but be to the good of the people. Such a Board would see that the money was well spent. The system of elective Road Boards has been tried and in some places it has shown a great advantage over the system in force before. This principle is practically universal in other countries. In every part of the Dominion of Canada, for instance, you have the Provinces divided into their various administrative districts, their counties and sub-divisions of the counties. For over half a century this system has prevailed. I know that the question is not free from difficulties and that is one of the reasons why I wish to place the matter before the Legislature at this session so that it may be possible for the best means of dealing with the matter to be discussed and possibly legislation introduced next session. The peculiar circumstances of this country will have to be considered. It will be somewhat difficult to devise machinery to carry out the intentions of the first resolution. The second resolution asks that legislation be brought in next session to deal with the matter. The third resolution is an interim arrangement for the present year. The whole idea is to avoid the political complexion that hangs round the appointment of Road Boards. The people of the various settlements should have control of the

expenditure of moneys in their own locality.

I make no detailed suggestion as to the manner in which the public meetings are to be held or the manner in which the members are to be elected. These will have to be gone into in full and the Minister in charge of the Department will be able to give instructions in all cases. The authority for everything here is contained in the Consolidated Statutes under the title "Roads and Road Commissioners." That gives the Governor-in-Council power to proceed in the manner suggested in the 3rd resolution.

I do not intend to detain the House unduly but I would like to refer to the Act of 1897, the effort made by the Whiteway administration to deal with this question. An act was passed in that year repealing the act which was in the Consolidated Statutes providing for the division of the country into districts and for the election of members of local councils. That act was never availed of. It was repealed in the following year by the Government of Sir James Winter who also passed an act for the administration of local affairs. That act which left the administration largely in the hands of the Governor-in-Council was never carried out or brought into effect. There are some boards in some parts of the country acting under the provisions of that act and the amendments passed in the following year. But we need some defined divisions of the country for the purpose of local administration.

In moving these resolutions I do so not in any spirit of contention. I move them simply for the purpose of accentuating the disorganized condition of the administration of local affairs and in the hope that some remedy will be provided whereby the country will be organized as in other countries. And I think that in the next twelve months some machinery ought to be defined and brought in here for the approval of the Legislature. As to the machinery itself I make no proposal here as I recognize the difficulty of it. I merely point out the fundamental principles upon which this machinery should be based. The country should be divided into districts for administrative purposes, that these districts should be placed under boards elected by the people in the districts. As to the extent of the powers of the Boards and other similar points, these are all details of the measure which will have to be worked out. I recognize that there are matters of great delicacy and difficulty. The only matter upon which I express my opinion is that the Government funds that relate to these localities should be expended by these different boards. That would entail some provision as machinery for dealing with the moneys and for checking and auditing the returns. All these matters would have to be dealt with in the measure that may be proposed. I beg to move the adoption of these resolutions.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I think that the House is under a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for the very fair and reasonable and I think convincing form in which he has brought this matter to our notice. And I do not think that I could describe it any better than he has done by the phrase that it accentuates the necessity for reform in this particular branch of the Civil Service. I think we are all agreed that there is room for reform in this branch if it can be accomplished.

I do not know of any principle dearer to the hearts of everyone who has lived under constitutional rule, whether in the larger portions of the Empire or in the smaller, than the right of everyone to have a say in the expenditure of those moneys for which we are taxed. All over the world there

is a desire to have the right of election of those who tax and who decide the expenditure and allocation of public moneys. And this system asked for to-day is merely a manifestation of that principle.

For the last seventy years, since the granting of representative government to the Colony the mode of expenditure of public moneys by Road Boards appointed by the Governor-in-Council has been in vogue and it existed even within the city of St. John's, except for the last twenty years. With the exception of St. John's and a few settlements in the outports that have availed of the act within the last four or five years, nearly every settlement in the Island has expended its public allocations by boards appointed by the Governor-in-Council. They have been appointed in this way for a number of years. The members for the district would draw attention to the need of a board and one would be appointed or a new board would be appointed to replace the old one. Then would come a change of administration and the new administration would naturally ask for a change. Very often this request is acceded to. Sometimes it is not. And that system has been going on in the country for years. And they looked after the expenditure of marine votes and special grants and main line grants. That went on for a number of years and everyone admitted the need of reform. But the question was how to do it. The question was to get a simple and satisfactory board that could be elected or appointed by the people that would not have the objectionable feature of being mixed up in politics. The first attempt to reform was made by a Bill brought in by me in 1890. In that bill provision was made to enable the smallest hamlet to elect its own board and it went even further because it gave this Board power to expend its money for the relief of the poor. That act was not availed of because there was no machinery in connection with it, except such as would make it difficult to experiment with. It can be understood that when a legislature passes a Local Government Bill it has to create machinery, make provision for the holding of the meeting, the responsible character of the person holding it and the necessary machinery for the election. The consequence was that that act was not availed of.

In 1897 that act was amended and somewhat simplified. I cannot remember whether I introduced that act or whether it was Sir R. Bond. In any case the public, whether from want of interest in the matter or from some other cause, never availed of the act. The next year an amendment was made by Mr. Morine under the Winter Government and still further modification was made. The act was further simplified, the machinery was simplified and made as easy as possible and I do not know that anyone availed of that act. It may be that one or two Boards took advantage of it. But out of 1300 settlements in the Island there were not more than one or two Boards created under the Act. In 1899 there was another amendment but since then nothing has been done because everyone realized the difficulty of introducing a measure that would give satisfaction and be of a simple nature in the carrying out. I agree with the hon. member that there are very great difficulties in the way of carrying out such a measure. I want to say that we are in entire sympathy with him so far as the Government is concerned in accepting this proposal and in supporting these resolutions. And between now and the next meeting of the House every effort will be made to provide a bill to give self-government to the outports, but I hold out no hope of anything being accomplished that will be satisfactory ex-

cept so far as the larger towns are concerned. However, the attempt will be made. It is not because there are difficulties in the way that we should shirk the issue, because these difficulties may be overcome. But it will take a great deal of work and a great deal of money. Let me point out one difficulty. My hon. friend proposes that road grants, special grants and other grants for public and marine works should be expended by these boards. You appoint a Board for King's Cove say, and you hand over to that board all the money that that district is entitled to. You will then have to define the jurisdiction of that board. That is going to be one great difficulty. Then you have the allocation of special grants. Take Burin. They now are voted $1,000 to the district as a special grant. We vote about half that amount to Fortune and Ferryland. We vote $1500 to Bonavista. Twillingate gets $2,000. It has three members with 24,000 people. That money has been expended in the past by the members. Twillingate has 160 settlements. How are you going to expend that $2,000 amongst those settlements. If you allocate it per capita it will be of no value because no settlement will get more than $9.00. In the past the members allocated that sum amongst one or two important works in the district and something substantial was the result. Take Burin. Begin at Flat Islands and go up to Fortune, up Fortune Bay to Garnish. There is 150 miles of coast. They have a marine grant of $700 for 85 settlements. Is it proposed to divide up this grant according to the population of the settlements. Each settlement would get about $7.00. What value is $7.00 to Burin to put up a public wharf. Will one settlement that does not need the money hand it over to another? Of course not. They will spend it if you give it to them. I merely mention this to point out a difficulty in this way. Another point in connection with Burin. There is one settlement there Grand Bank one of the most prosperous in the Island with 1600 people. The longest walk there is half a mile. You can go from one end to the other in 10 minutes. What are you going to do there. With that population they are entitled to one-quarter of the grant. What are you going to do with a district where you have some settlements of only a few people with roads five and seven miles long and others with enormous populations and no road longer than half a mile. Are you going to divide it per capita without regard to the needs of the district. The same is true of Bonavista. In that district you have over 150 settlements only about 80 of which have a population of more than 200. There would be considerable expense in connection with the holding of elections—though that is a matter which could be got over—but the real difficulty would be in connection with the division of the special grants. It would not be so difficult as regards the main line because these main lines go right through the country but when you come to divide up the local grants, which are per capita, and the special grants, which are after all also per capita, then the difficulties commence. I sympathize with the proposal, and as far as the Government is concerned we welcome it. It is only a further affirmation of the statement made by me in the House a few days ago that we were prepared to accede to the request of any settlement that desired an elective Road Board. It is only a year ago since an election took place on Bell Island. There you have a large, prosperous settlement, with a very large population and entitled to a very large per capita share of the grants of the district. The same thing was done up at St. Lawrence not very long ago, and also in the town of

Bonavista and in many of the settlements of Bonavista Bay, and also in Bay St. George and other districts. So that a beginning has been made. The difficulty will be,however,to carry out the election in the more remote settlements and in settlements where the population is scattered. It may be that the legislation will ultimately come down to this: That you will have to continue the present system of appointment of Boards by the Governor in Council in the smaller places, and provide for elective Boards in the larger places like Bonavista, Twillingate, Greenspond, Catalina, Trinity, Placentia, Burin, and in fact in every settlement over a certain population.

The Government will approach this resolution of my hon. friend with a desire to try and accomplish that which up to the present time it has not been found possible to accomplish. The system has been a failure up to to-day owing to the difficulties of working it out, and my hon. friend, no doubt, appreciated this when he moved the resolution. We have a country here larger than Ireland, with a population of only 240,000, and with 1300 settlements scattered all round the sea coast, sometimes ten or fifteen miles apart, and many of them containing only ten or twelve families. There have been abuses in the past in relation to the present Road Board system—political abuses and personal abuses—but is not the same true of every body and of every council? Can you have any body or any council that will not be tinged with politics? Is there a town in the world whether under municipal government or a corporation that is not right up to the neck in politics. We have a Municipal Council here in St. John's. Will anyone say that that is a non-political organization although it is elected by the people? I am not going to say here to-night whether it is or not. It does not suit me, nor is it my purpose to in any way contest the right of the men composing that Council to take part in politics. What I do say is that you can appoint no body, elect no Council that will not be tinged by party politics. The members of that body will take part in politics and not being more than human, they will allow themselves unconsciously to be affected by party feelings and proclivi ties and they will expend the moneys under their control in the way which will most benefit their party. So don't let us run away with the idea that even if we can bring about this measure if we can establish elective boards that we are going to have boards absolutely free from politics. Now, I accept, Mr. Speaker, the good faith in which this resolution has been moved by my hon. friend and between now and the next session of the legislature, if we are in charge of public affairs, we shall be glad to submit a measure to the Legislature which will endeavour to carry out the views sug gested here.

HON. MR. EMERSON.—Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one or two words in reference to the resolutions before the House. First, I may say that I am in entire sympathy with them because in them I can see the dawn of a new era when the unpopularity which is generally attached to the appointment of Road Boards will be removed from members of the House of Assembly. Personally, I shall welcome the day when this condition of things exists and the people elect their own Road Boards. When I took hold of the district of Fortune in 1909 I found nine or ten road boards governing all that section of the country. I decided that to the best of my ability the people who would be appointed to serve on the different boards would be acceptable to the people of the various settlements. I gave every place its own road board. I endeavoured as far as I could with-

out going to the formality of an election to ascertain who would be most acceptable to the people generally.and these I had appointed. I may say that I do not personally know a dozen of the men who compose the Road Boards of Fortune Bay. I did away with the Commissioner business except in isolated cases. I do not think that for the last five years there have been five commissioners appointed to spend any public moneys in the district of Fortune. All the monies have been spent under the control of the road boards. Any application which came to me for grants I always replied to by referring the people to the Chairman of the Road Board stating that if the Board thought that the expenditure was necessary that it would be made. My idea was to throw upon the Board as far as possible the responsibility of the expenditure of public monies. I think I can say that while to-day in the district of Fortune we have not got elective road boards, that yet the people who are acting as members of the various boards hold their positions with the goodwill of the rest of the people. They have been selected by the people without any distinction being made as to what side of politics they were on, who they were or what denomination they belonged to. It made no difference to me. As long as the people wanted them, I appointed them. I only hope between now and the next session we will be enabled to carry out the object of these resolutions. I see no difficulty whatever in relation to the per capita grants. Of course, as the Prime Minister pointed out large expenditures have sometimes to be made in one settlement and the special grants are usually applied for this purpose but I think some means ought to be devised for arranging for this. Any system which tends to remove from the members of the House the responsibility attached to the appointment of road boards would be heartily supported by me.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I second the resolution proposed by my hon. and learned friend the leader of the Opposition. I am very pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Fortune. When I was enquiring last fall regarding the election in Fortune Bay I asked the people what chance Mr. Emerson had of being returned and the reply was that Mr. Emerson was a fairly popular man but that the Government was very unpopular. Now, I have the secret of the whole thing. Mr. Emerson did not believe in the Commissioner system and he cut it out and gave the people power to spend their own monies and facilitated them in every way he could in connection with the expenditure. That, of course, accounts for his popularity. Now, the reason this resolution has been brought forward is that the F. P. U. have been insisting for the last year or two upon something of this nature being brought before the House. The Northern men are up in arms against the present system. It is not what they want and it won't suit them. The Government will give elective boards so long as the men appointed are approved of by the Government. When the men named are not satisfactory to the Government, they are not appointed or else the appointments are cancelled. For the last two or three years, the Government have been doing exactly as they please in connection with this matter. What we want is a legislation which will enable the people to elect their own boards and which would prevent the Government from in any way interfering with the choice of the people and from taking away the boards which have been appointed.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Can you name a board which has been taken away?

MR. COAKER—I'll name half a dozen for you to-morrow.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Suppose you name one to-night.

MR. COAKER—I have not the names now, but I will give you half a dozen to-morrow.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Give me one now.

MR. COAKER—Well,Clarke's Beach Now, you investigate that. It seems that no one can tell the truth in this House, but the Premier. Every statement which we make is questioned.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I never made any such statement as that. I have the right to call the Hon member's attention to any statement which he makes and to ask him for an explanation. I have merely asked him to give me the name of a board which has been taken away.

MR. COAKER—Well, I have given you the name of a Board. We want all public moneys to be handed over to those elective boards. We don't care how you allocate it as long as we are certain that it goes into the hands of the boards. Now, here's a letter which appeared in the Daily Mail today.

NOT THE MAN.

(Editor The Daily Mail.)

Dear Sir,—In your editorial of 14th inst. J. F. Sheppard's name appears very conspicuously in connection with the expenditures of public mo neys in and around Spaniard's Bay.

The idea is prevalent that I am the man; I beg to say that I have never received any pecuniary recognition from Mr. A. W. Piccott, M.H.A. Neither have I been favored with the authority to extend any moneys whatever by the present or any past government.

You will please do me justice of giving this the same prominence in your paper as the article referred to.

J. F. SHEPPARD.

Spaniard's Bay, 23, 1914.

It will be noticed that Mr. Sheppard denies absolutely ever having received money. I just quote this as an illustration of the way in which monies are handled in the outports. Somebody received this money, but nobody knows what happened it. The people are being aroused by the revelations which have come out during the last few weeks and are insisting that they will not stand for this sort of thing any longer. Now, our men are coming up here in a few days to go to the sealfishery and we are going to have a mass meeting in the C.L.B. Armoury. Then we will let you know whether your road system is as popular as you think it is. In one small place in Green Bay containing fourteen voters, $600 was spent last year. The money was given to a prominent supporter of the Government and during the last four or five years, with this exception, if there was $20 spent there, there was $2,000. It is the system which we are objecting to. If you have money to give to the people, then let the people spend it. I know of cases where men have got $50 or $60 to dig a well. They would dig a hole and then cover it up again and say there was no water there. In other cases, men have been known to dig a hole and put salt water in it. Now, there is not much use in bothering about what is going to be done with this money this year, because it is all spent. According to the Budget Speech just delivered, half a million dollars more taxation is to be put on. Last year you took off $380,000 and now you are putting on half a million. I have told the people who have written me that it is no use worrying about this year, because the

Government has no money, but to wait until next fall.

Now, the Premier has stated that he brought in this bill providing for elective road boards in 1898, but that up to the present only one or two places in the whole island have availed of it. I am sorry to hear him make that confession. It is certainly extraordinary that a man of his ability and experience could not draft a bill of this sort which would be brought into practical operation.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It was brought in at the request of your leader and supported by him.

MR. COAKER.—He did lots of things that I don't believe in.

Now I would like to refer to the manner in which members on this side of the House are sometimes contradicted by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I don't care how many quarrels we have as long as we don't forget ourselves but I hope that we have heard the last of the statement that we cannot tell the truth.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I never said that.

MR. COAKER.—We have had an argument about that already.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I asked you to name a case in which an elected Board had been taken away from a place by the present Administration. If you are prepared to show a case I will apologize.

MR. COAKER.—Well, Clarke's Beach.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I know nothing of it. I hear it to-night for the first t'me; and the Government know nothing about it.

MR. COAKER.—I am sorry to say that it is a fact. Of course, it cannot be expected that a man like the Premier can be aware of every little thing that is happening.

Now, the reason why elective road boards have not been a success in the past is because the question has not been dealt with in the proper way. It is alright for a lawyer to sit down and draft a bill, but unless he knows conditions in the outports he cannot be expected to draft one that will meet the situation; but if he was prepared to go into the matter and ascertain what the people want, he would be able to do it. If he were as much interested in it as he would be in getting something for himself, we would find good workable laws on the statute book.

It being now 6.30 p.m., Mr. Speaker left the chair till 8 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair at 8 o'clock.

MR. COAKER (Continuing).—We cannot carry out the intention of those resolutions without defining the sections over which the Boards would have jurisdiction. It would be a very simple matter on the south side of Bonavista Bay. In the neighbourhood of Bonavista, Little Catalina, and English Harbour north and south there are about ten thousand people, and there would not be very much trouble in defining the sections in that part of the country. Magistrates would be the best judges to define the sections; they could preside over the meetings and explain the proceedure and conduct the business of the meeting generally. In the case of marksmen the Magistrate could mark the ballots. All District moneys could then be sent to the elective Boards who would be responsible for the expenditure in a proper manner. The money for public charities should also be given to the Board. The local moneys could be divided on a per capita basis and the main line money spent on the roads as specified in the Road Act. There are very few main lines in the northern districts particularly in the district of

Twillingate, where only one main line is to be found on Twillingate Island leading to the Coves and Arms. The Boards will be looking for an increase in the present Grant. It would be impossible to divide a special grant on a per capita basis and the Boards would not object to its being allotted by the member to places where it was most required, only when it was allotted to any particular place the Local Board should spend it. Handing all moneys over to the Boards for expenditure would remedy the vicious system which has existed so long in this country, namely, the giving out of road moneys to private individuals. It would take a vast amount of responsibility off the shoulders of District representatives, would allay political feeling and educate the public to a sense of responsibility. We would also like to see proper provision made for the auditing of accounts and power given to the auditors to investigate any frauds or wrongdoings. The Department of the Auditor General has not time to go into these properly. I am glad to find the Premier is in favour of these Resolutions, and every effort should be made to improve upon the present unsatisfactory condition. The fault of the present condition of affairs does not lie at the door of the present Government, but is a growth of years, and now that this Legislature is composed of men experienced in local matters very little trouble should be encountered in bringing about the better state of affairs in the expenditure of public moneys.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting these resolutions and I think that the difficulties that have been pointed out in the way of working out of a good scheme have been very much overestimated. One of the reasons I support these resolutions is that they strike at a system that is responsible for a great deal of evil and I refer especially to these special grants. I am sorry to have to refer to it but it is the subject most connected with the question before the chair and one cannot say anything without touching upon it. Since the publication of the public accounts there has been a tremendous amount of feeling aroused with regard to some grants and I have asked questions regarding them. I asked for returns in several instances and no returns are in. One in particular referred to Back Harbor and two grants at Moreton's Hr. The two grants were made to a man named Rideout and another of $500 to a man named Redman. The last answer received from the Department was that there were no returns to hand. It seems to me a very bad system where such a thing as that can happen with public monies and especially as the grants were sent out as long ago as last April. And I am very much afraid that when these matters come to be investigated you will find that no work has been done. I make that statement and it is a serious statement to make but it is a fact. I have a letter here written in reply to one of mine. My letter read: "I want information with regard to the expenditure of that grant of $500 and be careful in answering my letter to give the facts. Do not send any information but what you know." And this is the reply: "In reply I may say that I do not know how the money was expended. There has been a great block built here which he claims as personal property and he employed men to work on it who owed him for goods bought at the store." The statement is to the effect that nothing has been done of a public nature with that large grant and if the resolutions before the House mean the abolition of that business they are worthy of consideration. In Twillingate there are a great number of these grants given out for

no purpose in the way of public benefit. Although the Prime Minister says that the special grant for Twillingate is $2,000, I think over $10,000 was spent there last year.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I was speaking about the regular special grant. Last year there was a surplus grant. The total vote was $200,000 and that was divided per capita amongst the districts.

MR. JENNINGS.—Well certainly this money was not allocated to persons who spent it for the benefit of the District. This system has been the bane of political life and these resolutions are intended to call attention to the evils that exist and suggest a remedy. I think they will do that and having done that I think the difficulties suggested will be found not so important as they appear at first. I think the resolutions will confer a benefit on the country and because of that I heartily support them.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, these resolutions merit the serious consideration of all interested in the well being of the country on both sides of the House. It is our duty to vote the money for the public services and it is also our duty to see that this money is expended in the proper direction for the benefit of the community for which it is allocated and not for the personal advantage of any individual. We all know the system. We all know its faults. No one administration is to blame for it more than another. Some Governments may have a little more money to send out one year more than another. The matter has now become so bad that it cannot be tolerated very long and I hope these resolutions will bring about a change in the administration of local affairs. We are now face to face with a condition of affairs that cannot continue very long. Legislation must be introduced to destroy the present system and put in its place something that will be effective. It is easy to construct legislation that will meet the situation and it should not require very much executive ability to devise some means to bring about a reform in this direction. If you allow this thing to go on it will stand to the end of time as long as there is party government. The reason for it is party favoritism. And the idea behind appointments is not whether it is good in the public interest but whether it is in the interests of politics. We want to get over that so that any money that is spent will be spent for the good of the locality. We want these resolutions to take effect right away. I do not know how the idea got abroad but I think the idea prevails that a road board cannot be formed without costing money. And from what the Premier says it would appear that nothing can be done in the near future because of the difficulty of putting it into execution. I do not think it will cost very much to have the machinery for election and there ought to be no difficulty in holding meetings under the direction of the Magistrate or Justice of the Peace if the machinery is made effective and simple. I know that in many instances where commissioners have charge of grants they are properly expended but we also know that thousands and thousands of dollars are wrongly expended. We want to cut out personal grants. We want equal rights for all in regard to the expenditure of public monies. Let it all go to the boards and if a well or other water supply is needed for that locality let it be dug in a place suitable for the public. We know the abuse of granting small sums of money for wells. It has become a positive absurdity. In one locality a well was dug a few years ago and two years later two other wells were dug not

ten yards away from the first. It is a crying waste of public money.

I do not wish to occupy the time of the House because it is apparent to everyone that reform should take place in the expenditure of public grants and I think these resolutions are a move in the right direction.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker just one word. In the first place I want to thank the Prime Minister for the manner in which he has received these resolutions. As I stated in introducing the resolutions my main object was to ascertain the nature of the reform necessary in the matter of local administration and to bring about a better system of dealing with public monies in different localities and to bring home a sense of responsibility in the expenditure of grants. I believe if the resolutions bring about a workable statute in the next session of the Legislative not only will it accomplish the object of creating a better system of public expenditure but it will mean a great deal of saving of public monies that at the present time are wasted. If it does this we shall be more than amply repaid for the trouble and pains to which we may be put. The difficulties have been pointed out. No person recognizes these difficulties more than I. I do not intend to refer to them at length now. The Premier pointed to the question of the special grant. That is of course a difficulty. To divide it up amongst a lot of sections would be to treat a special grant from the wrong point of view. It ought to be divided up among the different districts, but to divide it up among the different works is treating a special grant as it ought not to be treated. The allocation and expenditure of money by local authority according to the needs of the district would create a larger outlook than that of the mere local council. The special grant is intended for the general needs of the district and the Governor-in-Council or other authority which has the apportionment of these grants would still allocate the money to be expended under local supervision by the Council. I think that if approached from a business point of view it will be found that all the difficulties will vanish. It is true that in the past difficulties have presented themselves to us but we are learning by experience. For instance take our people as a whole today. They are more alive to local interests. They are beginning to feel a sense of local responsibility and he requires to be made to feel more and more that with local responsibility he will undoubtedly improve and that a condition of affairs will come into existence more advantageous than the dependence upon these family grants from politicians as has been in the past. These things have passed away, these special commissioners for grants of that kind should be done away with and all the money expended under the supervision of men responsible to the people in the locality who will see the local needs and supervise the work.

The auditing of the accounts will have to be under the Audit department of the Government. The Auditor General has from time to time suggested the matter of auditing of Outport Customs Accounts. There are a number of other accounts that might be placed under a special department of the Auditor General. Other good effects of this scheme of local government will be the elimination to a large extent of the political complexion of boards. I do not mean that a man should be appointed because he has no political opinions. I would not give twopence for such a man as that. He would not be worth putting on a board of this kind. He would have no feeling over local affairs, if he had no opinions on the public policy of the country. What I mean is that it

would prevent the removal of members from the Board because of their political bias.

In conclusion I may say that the members of the Opposition are taking an interest in this matter and if we can be of any assistance in bringing the matter of local administration to a satisfactory outcome in the way of legislation we are prepared to do so. But if no legislation is introduced by the Government next session it will make it necessary for members on this side to take the initiative. The only object of these resolutions is to point out the need of reform and to suggest to the Government the necessity for legislation next session.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to the history given by the Premier and I think it a very good sign for the country to see both sides of the House agreed upon doing something in regard to the control of road monies in the various districts. That there is need for reform is evident. I have only to add that in the small experience I have had in the district of Port de Grave I find things very much in the same state as in other districts. In many cases money has been sent into the district that the district knows nothing of and this has created great dissatisfaction. There should be no system by which their money is spent without their knowledge. I have seen many examples of misuse of public monies and I think it is a well grounded principle that the money should not be spent otherwise than with the control of the people. Otherwise it is certainly a system of taxation without representation if the people are taxed for money in the expenditure of which they have no voice and over which they have no control. There has been at so many times money sent into the district and not properly spent that at a conservative estimate I should say that at least $20,000 has been mis applied. This has not intentionally been brought about but the system has been wrongly worked for a number of years. And what hope have we while such a system is continued that we will have honesty in affairs of this kind. It is only natural that if one man is going to get $5.00 to spend for his own private purpose, that another should expect to get the same. My opinion about a reform such as this is that it will give the people a more direct interest in the affairs around them and they will begin to realize that in future it is their own concern how the money is spent and if they do not take an interest in it they are alone responsible for its misuse. I noticed the Premier asked whether there were any instances of the control being taken from elected boards and others appointed in their place. I was informed in North River the people asked for the election of a Road Board. The Road Board as elected was in existence four months when some dissatisfied persons circulated a petition and sent it on to the Government and another Board was appointed in its place. I think that these elective Boards are the only satisfactory solution to the difficulty and they must have complete control of their local expenditure. I have much pleasure in supporting the resolutions before the chair.

MR. COAKER.—That was the Clarke's Beach case I referred to.

MR. LeFEUVRE.—Mr. Speaker, I am very much surprised to hear such remarks about the dishonesty of Road Boards and commissioners and it strikes me those on the other side have not much opinion of the honesty of their constituents. This elective idea appears to me to be very clumsy and slow. And then what guarantee have we that those elected are going to be any more honest or as honest

indeed as the present Boards. I do not find fault with the present Road Boards and commissioners. There is not much money expended wrongly or misappropriated in our district and I do not know whether the people want elective boards. Every district that wants them now can have them but very few have asked for them and those that have them I do not think are more satisfied than those that have not. The only difficulty I see is the getting of the money. I have complete confidence in the Road Boards in my district.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, Mr LeFeuvre seems to think that we are reflecting upon the men who spend the money and he seems to think that there is not much money wrongly expended. That may be because he does not know how it is expended. All he wants to know is that the money is going out and he does not trouble how it is being spent. It does not matter to him if some get it all and others do not get any. With regard to those districts that have not got elected Road Boards I think that is the business of the members of the district to look after that kind of thing. Probably in most districts they do not know that they can have them. The elected Road Boards in some districts have been due to the members for the district who have looked after their people.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, in Bonavista Bay for the last four years the members have been instrumental in calling the people together to elect Road Boards, and it has worked very well in some respects. But one rather curious thing happened in a certain locality. A man wrote to the member for the district asking if he could be chairman as the previous chairman had resigned and this member wrote back to another man to know if he would take it and that if he did not want it he could give it to the man who had asked for it. I thought that very strange when the chairman is supposed to be elected, but it appears that the proper rule has not been carried out. The way the money has been expended the last four years is a very bad system and created a great lot of bad feeling and I think many people did not vote for the Government party in the last election on that account. There were so many family grants that they were disgusted with the party.

I have much pleasure in supporting the resolutions. I do not wish to say very much because enough has been said. I just wish to refer to what Mr. LeFeuvre said about there not being much dishonesty. If he knew as much about Road Boards as I do perhaps he would think differently. We are interested in this business and we mean to rectify it.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Mr. Speaker, just one word. The whole tenor of the remarks on this subject has been a reflection upon the individuals who compose the Road Boards throughout the country and every settlement in the country will take it as a reflection upon its integrity. With regard to Mr. Winsor's anecdote the rule is that the chairman is elected by the Board. And they do so and they recognize their responsibility in regard to that election and not only is the chairman responsible but the 5 or 7 members who compose the board. That system has been going on for many years. It has been adversely criticised many times but it has never been proved to have been dishonest.

The hon. member for Twillingate told us here this evening that he wrote an individual in his district asking for evidence with regard to another person that had the responsibility of spending public money. Do you not think it would have been fairer to have communicated with the person himself and made enquiry or to have

made enquiry from the proper authority and found out if this $500 has been mis-appropriated. The money may not have been spent. It may still be there. And while there is any there it is impossible and contrary to the ordinary rule to send in any return. There are cases in my own district where money was out for 10 months without any return being sent in but there was always an explanation when the returns did come in. I think the gentlemen on the other side who have spoken tonight are to a certain extent unfair to the electors who sent them here this fall. I know how every dollar is being expended in my district. Before a $500 grant is made I have an estimate of the work made out. I want to know what is required, what the timber is to cost, what quality timber is supplied, what labour is going to cost and a proper detailed estimate of the work in hand. I think the whole tenor of the debate to-night has been a direct charge against the road boards and commissioners that should not have been made, because these members should take sufficient interest in their own affairs in the districts to see to the proper application of the money. And if they do not do that it is unfair and unmanly to blame the men who undertake the work for nothing. It is a reflection upon the honesty of the chairmen of the road boards and also upon their integrity and intelligence. I know men in my district as honest and as intelligent as any in the community. I know a man who has been chairman of a Road Board for 20 years and nothing can be said against him in regard to the distribution of the money that has come into his hands as commissioner. It is more than unfair to attack such men when they are not here to defend themselves. I have no particular objection to the resolutions but I am not prepared to sit down and allow reflections to be cast upon the men that have worked out this system and have done such good for the public under it. If you compare our roads and bridges with the lower Provinces you will find that ours are far better than those in these provinces, all things considered.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything; but the remarks of the hon. member for Placentia impel me to contradict a statement which he made this evening. He said that members of the Opposition had been shirking responsibility in not properly looking after their districts . Every man who represents a district should know all about that district. For five years I have been a member of the Opposition, and during that time I have tried to get information about my district in connection with the various road grants. I was informed that orders had been given to the officials that no member of the Opposition should receive any information from the office.

MR. KENT.—In corroboration of my friend Mr. Clapp I may say that I was also informed that during the session I could get information, but not during the recess of the House.

MR. CLAPP, (Contd.)—Now, Mr. Speaker, we have no voice in the conduct of our district, and information is not afforded when asked for? When I was a member of the Government, I attended to my district and can say now that when any Road Boards wrote to me, I answered back and told them to appoint their own Board and their best men. Those were my instructions. I heard no complaints from my district that such and such a person did not participate in the money distributed among them. The other day I asked two questions; one about special grants and the other about local and marine grants. I have no other means of knowing how the money was spent in my district.

Some time ago I found out that

money had been sent to my district, previous to the elections, and had been spent among the friends of the Government. Not a Liberal man got even a day's work; they were told that they were not wanted and were sent about their business. The other day I proved to this House that thousands of dollars had gone into the district before the elections. These resolutions have been brought into the House to do away with this sort of thing and to prevent money from being spent for political purposes. Every man will thus get his share which he is entitled to. By appointing these elective Road Boards, you will do away with these grievances. You will have the best men appointed to that Board. Is not that a move in the right direction? I don't think that anything was said about a Road Board being dishonest, and I don't think it fair for any Government member to abuse a member of the Opposition. We are here to do our duty and we will do it as far as it lies in our power. I agree with the member for Placentia that every man elected by the people, whether on the Government side or on the Opposition, ought to have the control of his district. Why should the doors be closed against any man, because he is on the Opposition? If it has been done by past Governments, there is no reason for following in the same rut. Why should we not have a change? If the people ask for these Boards, why shouldn't they have them? I am in sympathy with the introducer of these resolutions and support them.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in reply to the last speaker's statement that he could not obtain information from the Department of Public Works. I always endeavoured to give information to any man coming to me with regard to the expenditure of public monies and the management of allocations in his district. No such order as he mentions has been given to any official to my knowledge. With regard to the resolutions now before the chair I don't see that there is anything wrong about them. I cannot understand, however, how the resolutions would improve upon the present system. In my district they make no distinction as regards the expenditure of public monies. I always gave instructions to the officials to make no distinction. I find that there is never any dissatisfaction; everyone is very well pleased and I did not hear that anyone was refused a share of the local or main line grants. As long as that system is continued I don't know that I would altogether support the Resolutions. The Government, I am sure, is desirous of meeting the wants and requirements of the Opposition. As I explained to the member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, I understood and I know that the representative in that district for a number of years, introduced that system of calling a public meeting of the people.

As far as we know, there is nothing wrong with the expenditure, unless you have heard it since you were elected to office. As regards the explanation of Mr. Jennings, the returns for that allocation are not yet to hand. The people take their own time over the work and we do not fuss about and worry them over it, as long as the people and the representative are satisfied. We have not found out any cases of misappropriation and the work has been thoroughly satisfactory.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make any remarks at length on this matter, as I have the honour to represent a district that has not got a Road Board. I don't know whether we will have a Board to deal with expenditure, if the resolutions are put into operation. I should like to express the opinion that

I have formed since the discussion, and I think it would be right that certain members of the House should be informed of certain facts as regards this discussion. Some of the members on the F.P.U. side in this House may have the opinion that all the shortcomings and all the bad features that may accrue from the present system of Road Boards are entirely due to the Government. I take the opportunity to bring the fact out that this Government have had no more to do with the present system than the Opposition. I think they will readily admit that their suggestions have been favourably received by the Government. The hon. member for St. Barbe has spoken of his district and of the way that he was treated during the past 4 or 5 years. I think it was very improper, if there was any such order given in any Department of the Government service. I would not sanction any such order. I want to point out that, when the Liberal Government was in power, members for Bonavista sat in the Opposition for twenty years and never had anything to do with the expenditure of money in their district or got any information. Those members had no more to do with the expenditure of money in their district than perfect strangers. My hon. friend, Mr. Moulton, sat for years representing Burgeo and never got any information whatever about his district, or had any say in the allocation of the grants. The present Opposition certainly cannot complain of the treatment they receive after what they themselves gave when in power. I question whether the last Government would have received these Resolutions. Members sitting opposite have very little to complain of as regards the Government's treatment of them. For nine years I have been here and I have often heard questions asked by the Opposition; but I have not seen one-tenth of the information given that has been given this year. Only the other day we had a Bill brought in by the Opposition and it was received by the Government and passed, with a few amendments it is true. When did we hear of the Opposition bringing in Bills before and putting them through? We are not here to discountenance or disparage the opinions or the suggestions of the Opposition. In his first speech the hon. member for St. Barbe stated that defeated candidates had control over public monies. I think that the elected representative of the district should control the affairs of that district. I do not think that elective Road Boards would prove to be an unmixed good. You will find some difficulties cropping up. The leader of the Opposition said that he foresaw the difficulties in the question of the Road Boards. I agree with him. I think that we will still have political considerations entering into the election and working of these Road Boards. A man who has any power in a district is bound to give the preference to his supporters and friends. I think that we will have much the same state of affairs as in the past.

As has been said before, it would not be practicable to allocate special grants per capita. For one thing they are not large enough to be of any use if so divided. Again, if we allocate all the money at the beginning of the year we have nothing to fall back upon in an unforeseen emergency, which is a very great consideration in the case of some districts. I am prepared to give the resolutions my support. I am prepared to do any share in forwarding any movement that is for the betterment or improvement of the public service, but I do not hold the opinion that this movement is going to be an unqualified success in every particular, and the time may come when the elected Road

Board may receive just as much criticism as the present system is now getting.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker I have no adverse criticism to offer against the working of appointed Boards. I have two appointed Road Boards in my district, and they are giving every satisfaction. These two Boards were not appointed by me. I had reasons five years ago to consider that the section where these two boards exist had not been favorably inclined towards me, and I thought it would be a courteous act to allow these boards to remain in power, and the result has been that I have not one word of adverse criticism to offer. They have given every satisfaction but I would not be acting consistently did I not agree with the resolutions before the House, because St. George's has perhaps a larger measure of experience in the working of elective Road Boads than any other District. There are some 33 road boards and with the exception of the two to which I have referred every one of them is elected. I took advantage of the law upon the Statute Book and thrust upon the people of the District the responsibility of supervising the expenditure of the road moneys. I had the Magistrate go through the district, hold public meetings, and the whole of these 31 boards duly elected and I have nothing but the strongest measure of approval for these Boards. I think that had other members my experience they would be equally pleased with the result. If the people have a direct responsibility for the expenditure of the money they would take a larger measure of interest. Taken all in all, I approve of the principle of elected Road Boards. In the District of St. George we have not a mile of road to the half dozen that we require, but I have no hesitation in saying that the mileage we have got cannot be equalled in any Province in the Dominion. In fact compared to population the Canadian country roads,the U.S. country roads, are not to be compared with those in Newfoundland, and they do not get half the value for double the expenditure.

My experience of the working of elective road boards, has been every thing that could be desired, and the appointed boards in my district have given every satisfaction, but I think the law on the Statute Book has placed in the hands of hon.members, sufficient authority to have elective boards in all districts at the present time. At the same time if it is thought desirable to pass legislation on the subject I cannot act consistently without giving my support.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, we have been somewhat misrepresented. The members on the other side seem to think we are asking for something that it would be difficult to give. All we ask for is that the road boards be elected, and that they be given all the money that belong to the particular place. The Hon. Col. Secretary asked if we would be satisfied if we were on the other side and had the giving out of the money. We cannot just say at present what we are going to do when we get over there, because we are told that we are going to be here for a while yet. The Minister of Public Works spoke of the satisfaction in Bonavista Bay. There is no doubt that the People's Party promised a lot but they did not carry out their promises. If they had it might have been all right. But they failed. I can remember the first time Capt. Winsor called a public meeting. There was quite a crowd there and the Road Board was elected and all the people were satisfied. But the money was still given out in family grants just as they were when no board was elected.

Things went on like this for about a year. Then they held a second meeting. and there were not enough people there to elect a Road Board. The old Board was disgusted and there was not enough to elect anyone in their place. I do not know whether there is a Board there now at all or not. We want to see no more of these family grants. No one knows anything about them. Someone gets a letter marked O. H. M. S., everybody knows that is a family grant. The Road Boards are disgusted over this. It is no good having Road Boards unless they get all the money. The Premier said he did not know of a case where an elected Road Board was refused. I know one. It was in Trinity Bay, Fox Harbour. The people got together and thought it would be a good thing to elect a Road Board. They sent and asked the Government, but they were refused. The men who formed the former Board were supporters of the Government. The man who was chairman resigned. Money came down for him. And there was no one to take it. The Postmaster wrote to one of the members, and got a reply asking him to act as chairman. We know all these things, because we live among the people. It is seen day after day. If you are going to do anything, give the people the Boards, and send all the money to the Boards. Difficulties have been pointed out. The greatest difficulty I see is, that the Boards do not get the money. The trouble has been that these grants have been in the families. The day before polling a grant was sent to a man I know. I have the letter here. I will read it for you if you like. It is a $20 grant. He did not know what to do with it, so he came and showed it to me. I told him it was his grant. I told him he had to work for the member. If all this money were sent to the Road Boards there would be no difficulty at all. The people are asking for Road Boards, and we are asking them for the people. If you give them to the people throughout the country you will not get such a bad name. The people have never known how this money has been spent. We have been here only a few days, but we are getting to know, and we intend to know more in the future, and the people will undoubtedly know too.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to say very much, because there has been too much useless discussion already on this subject. The Leader of the Opposition introduced these resolutions, and the Premier spoke in favour of them, and there the matter should have stood. I have always been in favour of this proposition, because I sat in opposition for four years, and never had the disposition of one dollar. My hon. friend, Mr. Emerson, here had it all. I had nothing to say about it at all. I remember that, and now that I hear my hon. friend, Mr. Clift, complaining about the difficulty of getting any money I would say, take the punishment as you gave when you were in power. In regard to Sir Robert Bond, although we had several fights outside on political matters, I must say he was a gentleman. And I must say he did not deserve the treatment that he has received. He has been treated very badly.

There has been quite a lot of discussion about roads and bridges, quite a lot. And it is useless discussion. There has been a lot of time wasted, keeping men here from their business, taking up so much time and going over the same thing twenty times. The Premier stated that before the session closed, the members would be granted the allocation in the different districts. If any one could complain it would be I. In Burgeo there are not two miles of main line. We never

got our share Name a single district up North, take Trinity, for instance, that district is getting $5,000 more than any other district in the country in surplus grants, and $6,000 more than that is right. It should be divided up per capita. None of the Northern districts should complain. They have quite their share of money, and steamers.

MR. HALFYARD—Except Fogo.

MR. MOULTON—Is there not a steamer calling at Fogo. You have direct steamers calling at all the ports and you have three steamers plying on the Labrador for the convenience of the Northern people. Then you have the Marconi stations. And all this expenditure in boats and Marconi stations is for the Northern people. You not only want all the money but you want to control everything as well. I am sorry to have to talk like this. But I have sat here every day listening to this discussion, and I would not mind if the Northern people were just demanding their rights, but the gentlemen on the other side are satisfied with nothing, and want everything. The Southern Districts must have their share. I beg to support the resolutions.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, some of the members on the other side of the House do not seem to understand the object of the resolutions. This was very clearly defined by Mr. Winsor, that is, that we want the people to have control of the public moneys. We want in Bay de Verde to cut out the family grants. In one case in my district, I find one man had several hundreds of dollars, and no one knew he had it. That is one of the evils of the present system. Whether the Road Boards are elected or appointed, they should have the control of all moneys that belong to the district. There is a lot of money allocated for the building of wells, shovelling snow, etc. The digging of wells in these places is more or less of a nuisance. The well is dug. It belongs to no one. It is dug on the side of a road, and in a few years is filled up. It is only done with the object of bribing somebody. Besides these grants are never accounted for. The return comes in 'contract for digging well,' and that is all we know about it. I notice a case has come up of money sent out last year, and no return is in for it yet. There should be a limited time in which returns are to be sent in, and the public should have some satisfaction in this respect. Mr. Devereaux referred to our roads as being as good as those in Canada. In Canada they are very good indeed. I do not wish to criticise the present system, but I wish to support Mr. Winsor when he says that elective Road Boards should have control of the moneys.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, I do not wish at this late hour to take up the time of the House. The discussion has been very long, and I do not wish to prolong the agony.

The greater part of our time in the House and downstairs is taken up in the discussion of roads and bridges and other matters of intense local interest. When I was not a member ot this Huse but was interested in the Opposition, I spent a great deal of time going through those same accounts, and we have the testimony of members of the Government as to what they did when they were on this side of the House. I am not speaking now for the purpose of criticising. The very things that we complain about now were done by us when we were on the other side of the House, but the members on this side must ask questions because that is the only way they can get information. The chief complaint that I have to make is that the Road Board system is wrong. That is the trouble all along the line, and

here is an echo of it in every settlement. You may discuss the larger questions affecting the country as long as you like, but what the people are most interested in are their local affairs—what about the Road Board? What about the Post Office? What about some other local matter? These are the questions that are asked in every settlement. Now, in my remarks tonight, I am not going to say one word about the expenditure of moneys in Trinity Bay,but I may tell you this that when I was in Trinity Bay last fall, I was very agreeably surprised at the state of the roads and bridges there. I don't know how much money was spent there, but there are certainly some good roads there, and some fine bridges. I suppose, after all, it is not so surprising, because even in winter we found men at work all the time. It was election work, and I was not surprised to learn, when we had a statement from the Minister of Finance a few days ago, that the accounts were heavily overdrawn. I can now understand the generous statement of the Minister of Public Works to the effect that if there were no moneys out of which an allocation could be sent to some man who had made application to him that he would put his hand in his own pocket and give the money, because the bank balance shows that $75,000 has been overdrawn.

The trouble now is, and always has been—it was there under the Bond administration and every other administration as well as the present administration—the present Road Board system. The object of the present resolutions is to provide for Elective Road Boards, and I am very glad to note the spirit in which the Prime Minister has received the resolutions. I should like to point out in supporting these resolutions that it is not proposed, nor do I believe it to be the intention of those interested in the proposed change, to divide up every cent per capita. That was found to be impracticable under the old system. I think it would be absurd to divide up the special grants per capita, according to the population of the various districts. That is not the intion at all. The intention is to give the special grants to the Elective Boards and let them spend the money, and not private individuals, who may wait two years before sending in any account of the money. Now, even though returns are sent in promptly to the Department, the people don't know anything about them. It must be within the knowledge of every member of this House that constituents are constantly asking for information as to certain grants. They know that these grants were sent, but they have no knowledge as to what was done with them. That should not be, and some remedy should be provided. I cannot go back twenty-four years—the period referred to by the hon. Leader of the Government—but I can go back ten years, and during that period I have noticed a remarkable growth in the desire of the people of the North to look after their own affairs, and I think the opportunity to do so should be afforded them. If they make mistakes, as undoubtedly they will, (why, we have a Municipal Council in St. John's and we all know what a number of folks think of them) they will have the remedy in their own hands. But the position is this: That you will be making the people themselves responsible for the handling of their own moneys. The Boards that may be elected shall account to the people direct, at the end of two years, for all the moneys that they shall have received. I mention two years because that is the period suggested by some members during which a Board should

serve, and then the people would have an opportunity of putting other men in their places if they so desired. I think that if this course were carried out throughout the country that this House would be relieved very largely of the bulk of the questions which are now asked regarding local affairs.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Chairman, the last speaker, in the course of his remarks touched one of the sore spots in connection with the expenditure of road moneys. I referred to it the other day when dealing with the matter of Elective Road Boards, and it is this that sometimes returns are not sent in showing how grants are expended. I first discovered the cause of this. some five or six years ago when on a trip to Twillingate. Grants are sent out, and are held over by the Chairman or the Road Board, as the case may be, until the men come back from the fishery in the fall, and then if all the men don't turn up the moneys are still held until the spring. The current idea is that each man is entitled to a certain share of the road moneys, and he expects the grants to be held over until he can work up his share. The result is that grants are sometimes held over for fifteen or eighteen months, and the returns of course cannot be sent in until the money is spent. Road moneys are not looked upon as being intended to put the roads in the best possible condition, but rather as moneys which are to be divided up amongst the people. There is one matter referred to in the resolutions which have been introduced by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, with which I entirely agree, and that is the matter of publicity. I think that the Road Boards should every year account to the people for the moneys received by them I know that during the recent election, in one section of the district of Burin. the charge was made by supporters of the Opposition that road moneys had been misapplied. The Chairman of the Road Board, the following night, called the people together, produced his accounts, and invited the people to go through them and proved that everything was all right. This publicity entirely allayed either discussion or criticism. Everybody must agree with the idea which the hon. member for St. John's East has in mind of a proper control of the expenditure of road moneys, and I have no hesitation in endorsing it.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of supporting the resolutions before the Chair. I may say that the system of Elective Road Boards is being continuously asked for by the people. It was stated here by the hon. member (I think) for Placentia that we were trying to shirk our duties. Well, as a representative for the district of Trinity, I want to say that I did not come here to shirk my duty. I came here to perform it to the best of my ability, in the interest of my constituents. Now, I stated here the other day that I had received something like 89 letters in connection with the matter of Road Boards, and since that time I have received about 29 others, and every one of them ask me to insist upon Elective Road Boards. I have two here that I received tonight. The people would not find it at all difficult to appoint their own boards. As has been suggested by the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, the Magistrate could do what is necessary. He could go around from one settlement to another and arrange for public meetings to be held, at which the Boards could be elected. I hope that the Goverrnment will give this matter its earnest consideration I don't see for the life of me where the difficulty comes in. I think that any difficulties there may be can easily be overcome. I give the resolutions now before the House my earnest

support, because they ask for something which the people all over the country are clamoring for.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, there is just one point that I would like to refer to in connection with these resolutions. As we propose bringing in a bill next session dealing with the whole matter, it might not be worth while having an election say next June or July all over the country, and then having another election under the new Act the following June. What I am going to suggest is this: As to whether it would not be well to confine your election for say the coming months of May or June to such settlements as would be recommended by the representatives. The last resolution would then read something like this: "When such meeting may be held by a Justice of the Peace on the order of the Minister of Public Works, at the request of the members representing it in the Legislature, the locality desiring the election of the Board."

MR. KENT.—That will be all right.

The resolutions were thereupon adopted.

PUBLIC SERVICES LOAN BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the Sale of Debenture Bonds for the Public Service of the Colony" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

RAILWAY LOAN BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the raising of a sum of money by loan for the extension of the Railway System of the Colony" was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act to provide certain retiring allowances" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the question of the construction of a railway across the Isthmus of Avalon; and also for the construction of a railway from Humbermouth, Bay of Islands, to the South-west Arm of Notre Dame Bay.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the report of the Superintendent of the General Hospital.

Mr. Kent gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, February 26th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, Fb. 26th.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of a small settlement, Birchy Bay, near Springdale. This petition is signed by 17 of the inhabitants who want a Post Office. I have a petiton also from the inhabitants of Pilley's Island in relation to a public wharf. There are 69 petitioners. I suppose that there is little chance of the petitions being granted. However, I trust that the Government will consider them. I now ask that they be referred to the Department to which they relate.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Elliston for a Road Board. The petition is signed by all the inhabitants of the settlement, amounting to 165 names. I trust that the Government will see to this matter. I now ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Indian Harbor that that place be made a port of call for the S. S. 'Argyle.' This petition is signed by every man in the place. This settlement is at present completely isolated. This is not the fault of the contractors, because the 'Argyle' is doing more work than can be expected of her to do properly. They complain of her inadequacy to perform the service of that Bay. There ought to be two steamers there. The people in parts of Placentia Bay are today without a mail for more than five weeks. The very same thing has been happening for years, and will happen next year unless the Government take the matter into consideration, and rearrange the entire service.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting all that has been said on this petition by my colleague, Mr. Devereaux. Indian Harbour, the place referred to in this petition, at the time the contract was made to put the Argyle on this route was one of the ports of call for the steamer. It was a port of call for the 'Argyle' up to a short time ago, but for the reason that has been explained by my colleague—the inability of the 'Argyle' to fill the service—it was found necessary for some ports to be taken off, and unfortunately this was one of the ports that was taken off. I would suggest as my colleague has that some arrangement be made such as giving us an additional steamer to ply on this important Bay where so many people are living and where so much business is done, and where so much more business could be done had we the facilities. Indian Harbour is not the only place in the Bay isolated for lack of steamship communication. There are very many other places, similarly situated and though I do not blame the contractors altogether, for the condition of affairs that exist, still I believe they are a little to blame, and while I hold a seat in this House I will use my voice at all times to have these conditions remedied.

At the present time we have one steamer frozen in Placentia with about ten feet of ice around her. I believe, myself, that it will be impossible for that ship to be released until some time in April or whenever there is a general break-up. There were about twenty nine or thirty passengers from different points in the bay, men who had sufficient means if facilities were available to get home. In the meantime they had to wait there for three or four weeks, and their means became exhausted. These men, through no fault of theirs, had to apply to the Government for help to get home.

Now, I think, if the Government could see their way clear they should give us a separate steamer for Placentia Bay, and not have a steamer trying to perform the service of Placentia Bay and Burin District, as the 'Argyle' is at the present time. Under the present schedule the 'Argyle' has to go down around Placentia Bay, return to Placentia and then go a hundred miles west of there to Lamaline. Very often, owing to weather conditions she cannot get into Lamaline, and this causes delay. I think the Government should provide another boat and I do not see why better facilities are provided in every other District than in Placentia. We are the most

isolated District in the whole country. We are differently situated from any of the other Bays, in as much as Placentia Bay is made of Islands, and in other Districts if you cannot get around by steamer or train there is some means of walking or driving, but in Placentia Bay, if you cannot get a steamer it is impossible to get around. I hope the Government will give careful consideration to the matter and try and provide better facilities for the District. I have very much pleasure in giving the petition my hearty support.

MR. MORRIS—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in rising to support the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Devereaux, asking that Indian Harbor be made a port of call for the 'Argyle.' This matter of the 'Argyle' and the service she is performing in Placentia Bay, has become very acute at the present time, and I am very glad to have an opportunity in this House to express my opinion on it. There are five or six very important settlements in Placentia Bay where the steamer should call, but does not, and that is entirely due to the fact that she has to go to Lamaline; calling at Lamaline means the loss of about two or three days, and if she did not have to go there she could very easily go into these three harbours. Now the 'Argyle' is supposed to be the boat for Placentia Bay, and she is not performing that service properly, because of going to Lamaline; and I understand both the 'Portia' and 'Glencoe' call there coming and going each trip. I understand the reason the 'Argyle' calls there is to facilitate the trade of one or two influential firms; and I have no objection to every facility being provided for them; but not at the expense of Placentia Bay. In supporting the prayer of the petition from Indian Harbour, I take this opportunity to record my protest here against the very unsatisfactory service which the 'Argyle' is giving to these very important settlements in Placentia Bay. Something must be done in the matter whether it is by putting on a new steamer or by amending the present schedule. I understand the Government at the present time are considering this matter with the representatives of the districts interested but here in the House of Assembly is the place to express opinions with reference to District matters and we had this matter impressed upon us last fall during our visit to Placentia Bay. I hope that now this matter has been brought before the House the Government will understand the conditions that exist and try and remedy them immediately.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in support of this petition. I have had some representations made to me also, regarding the unsatisfactory conditions of this service in Placentia Bay. There is much need of rearrangement of the services along our coast generally and this is especially true in regard to Placentia Bay as I understand the service there is not meeting the needs of the people in the Bay at all. Many important settlements are entirely shut out from the advantages of being regular ports of call, and this means considerable disadvantage to the people of these places. I think, Sir, if this matter were taken up, between the Government and the contractor, something might be done whereby this steamer plying on Placentia Bay might be able to complete the service on that Bay and give all the ports the advantage of a steamer calling there regularly. As has been pointed out by the junior member for the District, this Bay is not like other Bays, as it consists to a large extent of a number of islands, and depends particularly upon sea communication and the need for regularity and con-

finuance in the service is vital to the people there. It is a matter I am sure that could be arranged to meet the requirements of the people. It is probable that some arrangement could be made with the Contractor that would meet the needs of the people in Burin District as well as in Placentia District.

MR. CURRIE—Mr Speaker, I am very much in sympathy with the petition just presented by my hon. friend Mr. Devereaux, but I should not like the opportunity to pass without explaining the position a little more clearly. I think the impression has been left upon members of this House that Lamaline was added to the ports of call of the 'Argyle' with the consequence that it disarranged the service in Placentia Bay. Now, Sir, the reverse is the truth, because from the very first Lamaline has always been the terminus. It is not a new port, and has not added to the work at all. The trouble is this, there has been a demand from such a number of places in Placentia Bay asking for a steamer to call that the Contractor in trying to give a satisfactory service finds it burdensome to go as far as Lamaline. So far as we in Burin are concerned, we are quite satisfied to drop Lamaline from the 'Argyle's' schedule, provided we get a substitute steamer, but we will not submit to the steamer being taken off otherwise. The hon. member for Placentia, Mr. Morris, said that the 'Portia' calls at Lamaline regularly. As a matter of fact, she calls there probably once or twice a month as the weather permits, and Lamaline cannot be considered a regular port of call for any steamer, except the 'Argyle'. Now, I think Placentia Bay is sufficiently large to be provided with two steamers and there will never be a satisfactory service until such is done. The people of Lamaline have at present been four or five weeks without a mail of any kind, and as it is a very important place and quite a lot of business is done there, the annoyance to the people has been very great. The time has arrived when this route should be covered by two steamers, for I claim that we have reached a period when every part of the country should be brought into closer communication and when the best possible mail and passenger facilities should be given the whole country.

MR. LEFEUVRE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that whilst I sympathize with the request contained in the petition from Indian Harbor, I fully endorse what my colleague, Mr. Currie, has said, with regard to the 'Argyle'. I have no objection to Lamaline being dropped from the 'Argyle's' schedule provided a satisfactory substitute was provided.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Just a word of explanation in connection with this matter. I think Mr. Devereaux stated that the people of Placentia Bay had been five weeks without a mail. That is true. But I think it is only fair to the House, and to the District, and to the Government that I should give an explanation of this. The conditions that have obtained during the last five or six weeks have been extraordinary, and due to the fact that the steamer that was on the Bay in place of the 'Argyle' — which is here being repaired and refitted—was frozen in at the Arm at Placentia. It appears that the 'Clyde' which is the boat now there, was in Placentia, and a heavy gale came on and she had to run for shelter into the Arm, and while she was there the drift ice came in and pinned her in the Arm, and she was unable to get free. The ice rafted and froze, I understand, to a depth of ten feet, and I have no idea when she can be liberated. What I want to say is, that when

this matter was referred to the Government, I immediately got into communication with the Contractors, and Mr. Reid informed me that all his steamers were being overhauled, and he could not possibly get a steamer ready for some time. I asked him to do the best he could, and he took on all the men he could possibly get, and is rushing the work, and we hope to be able to get a steamerr to replace the 'Clyde' in a very short time. What I want to indicate to hon. members is that no blame can attach to anyone. It is purely a question of circumstances over which neither the Government nor any body else had control. The Portia was the only steamer to be found in the harbor of St. John's, and she could not leave for three or four days, and it is utterly impossible to remedy the conditions at present. It is not the fault of the Contractor or the Government that these people have been without mail for four or five weeks. If there were half a dozen steamers on that route it would not make any difference The whole trouble arises from the 'Clyde' being frozen in and the fact that we could not get a steamer to take her place.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from the people of Groais Islands, numerously signed, with reference to making this place a port of call for the steamer. Groais Islands as everyone knows, is becoming a great centre for fishermen. Numbers of men go to fish there, besides the men who live there all the year round. It would be a great convenience for these people if this place were made a port of call for the steamer. It would not be out of the way of the S. S. 'Prospero' and I am sure if the Government would take up this matter with the Contractor there would be no difficulty in having this place made a port of call. It is very unfair to these people that they have no means of communication from the first of January to the thirty first of December.

I have also another petition with regard to the Fishery Rules, from the same place. I would like the permission of the House to read it. (The hon. gentleman then read the petition.)

This petition is numerously signed by the fishermen of the Island, and as they prosecute the fishery they should know what is the best for the interests of all concerned. I trust that these petitions will receive favorable consideration, and I ask that they be referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Hant's Harbor which is largely signed, and which asks for $100 to build an agricultural road. I think this road is very much needed as the people cannot get to their gardens without it, and I have no doubt that the Government will do its best, as agriculture is a thing very much needed in this country.

I have also a petition numerously signed by the people of Catalina, asking for $100 for a ferry from the public wharf to the south side of the harbour. I have no doubt that this ferry is greatly needed. I ask that these petitions be referred to the proper Departments and trust that they will be attended to.

MR STONE—Mr Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the petition just presented by my colleague. A ferry is very badly needed in Catalina, as it is a long distance around and the people have to go two or three miles to get a doctor, whereas if they had a motor ferry even though it were only three horse power, it would be sufficient to meet their requirements. I beg to give those petitions my hearty support.

MR. LLOYD—I beg to support the petition.

QUESTIONS.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a copy of returns of the expenditure of Fog Alarm at Cape Bonavista, and all bills in connection therewith.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to table the information.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing grants, other than local, expended in Burin District for the year 1913, and to whom paid.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to table the information.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of expenditure on the construction of the Telegraph Office at Little Bay Island, N. D. B., stating the contractors, and if tenders were asked to lay such on the table of the House; if the building is rented, what is the annual rental, and to whom paid?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to table the information.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a copy of returns of all special moneys issued by his Department to Blaketown for the Public Wharf in South Dildo from 1909 to 1913, both years inclusive.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the information.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance to lay on the table a detailed statement of all amounts paid under the head of Civil and Criminal Prosecutions, with names, dates and amounts from June 30th, 1913, to date.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I shall have that information tomorrow.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a certified copy of all public messages transmitted over the Government telegraph lines to the outports and elsewhere during the month of October, 1913.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say that information is being prepared. I may have it today, if not I can table it to-morrow.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the name, residence and age of all persons who are now receiving, or have already received, the Old Age Pension in the District of Harbour Main.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I may say I tabled that information yesterday in reply to a question from Mr. Clift.

SUPPLY.

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. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any need for explanation of the amounts asked for under Additional Estimates, but if any hon. gentleman wishes to receive an explanation of any of the votes, I shall be glad to furnish him with it.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay the Committee for any length of time, but I should like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance if any further Supply will be asked for this year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—None that I am aware of.

MR. KENT—The reason why I ask is, that on looking through the Auditor General's Report, and the Sup-

plementary Supply, it would appear that there are items mentioned in the Auditor General's Report as being such as would be asked for under Supplementary Supply, and yet are not mentioned in Supplementary Supply For instance, there are certain increases in salaries referred to by the Auditor General, but not mentioned in Supplementary Supply.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The votes are all in Supplementary Supply. My hon. friend will remember that the matter was brought up by the Opposition when we were in Committee and it was fixed then.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I note that the Estimates for the next year include salaries for the officials at the Department of Marine and Fisheries, at the same figure as those of last year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Any increase will come out of Contingencies.

MR. KENT—I do not think it ought to come out of Contingencies, and I object to it on principle. Salaries should not be paid out of Contingencies, except when new offices are created, and Parliament is not sitting. These salaries, which are fixed, should certainly not come out of that fund. Then, again, according to the Minister's statement the Contingencies account has all been spent and there is no balance left from which to pay salaries up to June 30th next.

I have already referred to the vote for Supplemental Supply and I repeat that we ought to make every effort to reduce the large increase that there has been in this vote during the past few years. Extraordinary amounts are asked for under Supplemental Supply each year, and, when we consider the large amount of the original Estimates, we ought to be more careful. This has been suggested to me by the votes in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but I refer to the whole of the Civil Service. During the past few years the votes for Supplemental Supply have been exceedingly large. Let us look at the figures:

1910..	$214,000.00
1911..	617,000.00
1912	421,000.00
1913	244,000.00

During the previous for years the votes were:

1905	$156,000.00
1906	262,000.00
1907	164,000.00
1908	185,000.00

If we take the appropriations of surplus revenue from the Supplemental Supply for these four years, we find that from 1905-1908 the average vote for Supplemental Supply was about $90,000, where during the past four years the average has been $240,000.00. Not only do I object to the large amount of the Supplemental Supply, but I also object to the lack of particulars as to how this expenditure is made.

During the past year there has been an unusual expenditure for salaries and other items spent on executive responsibility. The Government should make up its mind that all salaries be voted in the ordinary way. I admit that there are many civil servants who are underpaid, and that there is need from time to time to increase certain salaries. There was one case in particular that came under our notice a short time ago, where a man had a million and a half dollars pass through his hands, and yet received a salary of only $600. It was a case of putting temptation in his way, and the result was that he fell, and is now in the Penitentiary. I think that whatever Government be in power they ought to see that public servants are paid in

accordance with the work they do and the responsibilities which they assume However, these salaries should be considered at the right time, and not altered on Executive responsibility. As to the Additional Estimates before the House we shall be in a position to deal with these votes when we are in Committee on the Bills.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I agree with my hon. friend as to the principle of having salaries voted with the main Estimates but the amount now in question is very small. As a matter of fact, Judge Prowse has passed away, and there will be a drop balance of the amount voted to him. The only other case is that of Mr. Goodridge's salary. All the others came under Supplemental Supply.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I think the way in which Supplementary Supply has been tabled is not satisfactory, and that is why we have had this afternoon the discussion between the Hon. Minister of Finance and the Leader of the Opposition, as to what is included in certain votes and what is not. Why should there be any doubt at all? The fact is that the votes are submitted to us in globo when they should be dealt with in detail. Why should not these salaries be in Supplemental Supply? We do not know just where we are in the matter and the votes are printed in the form of a newspaper column that conveys very little to the eye. If they were printed in tabular form, we should know more about it for we should be able to see it at a glance.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The vote for Mr. Goodridge's salary is the only case that is not dealt with in Supply.

MR. KENT—The items to which I have referred, namely, the amounts for boatmen and lighthouse keepers, are not covered in the remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—They are covered for this year in Supplemental Supply.

MR. KENT—They are not covered here. The amount for boatmen and lighthouse keepers is $780.00 according to the Auditor General's report, but there is no provision made for this amount in the Estimates.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks before the votes go through, and they will be very limited. I want merely to point out the remarkable feature of having Additional Estimates against a local loan at this stage. We have heard a great deal about capital account and current account but I submit that this vote should have ben asked for before the expenditure was made. If you intended to make this loan it should have been made last session. Now you are trying to relieve Supplemental Supply of this amount. If this amount were added to Supplemental Supply it would be $355,000, and not $224,000.00. This is shown very clearly by the Auditor General's Report but in order to get over your difficulty you have manipulated the accounts. I do not impute that you have done this dishonestly, but in order to hide your mistakes. What the Government should have done last year they do now, because they find themselves in difficulty. The deficit is $100,000, more than the Minister thought it was yesterday. The whole principle is wrong, but if it were right, it should have been done last year. Now the Government is trying to save its face. That is how it appears to me.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed a

Resolution, and asked leave to sit again.

It was ordered that this Report be received and adopted, and the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Mr. Coaker, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend Chapter V. of 8 Edward VII., entitled: 'An Act with respect to Compensation to Workmen for Injuries suffered in course of their Employment.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it is necessary for me to say anything further on the Amendment to the present 'Workmen's Compensation Act', for I have already dealt with it on the second reading. The intention is to bring loggers and drivers of logs within the scope of the Act. It is now provided that certain men in certain occupations receive compensation from their employers in case of accident, but there is no provision for loggers and drivers. It has been found that these men are liable to accidents and this measure is for the purpose of safeguarding them. There was a case last year of a man who was drowned at Badger, and his dependents could obtain no compensation. They brought the case to the notice of their solicitor, and they found that there was no way in which they could be compensated.

I have found that the employers have no objection to this amendment, and they think it is a step in the right direction. These men deserve compensation if injured while at their work, and I presume that the companies will protect themselves against claims by carrying insurance. In that case they will pay the claims of the men, and the insurance company will repay them.

I have had the Act prepared by a solicitor, and as I have said, the whole object of the amendment is to bring loggers and drivers under the Act.

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 without amendment.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

SAWMILLS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Operation of Saw Mills."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, since we last met on this Bill, I have furnished the members of the Committee with a copy of the Saw Mills Act, for the purpose of convenience. It will be remembered that when this matter was in Committee I dealt with the question of "rinding" of trees and the destruction of the forests by reason of "rinding." I expressed the opinion then that there was considerable difficulty in relation to that matter. I think that the debate which took place must have satisfied everyone that there was a considerable difference of opinion in relation to it. Nevertheless, I think it will be evident to everyone that it is a matter of such importance as to require that the matter should receive

very careful and very early consideration. From what has been stated and from our knowledge, there must be a ry great destruction of spruce trees in the forests for the purpose of obtaining the rinds, for various uses in connection with the fishing industry. They are used in the drying of fish and the covering of places where fish is stored and for other general purposes. What we really want to discover is whether there is a distinct loss by this rinding. In other words, what is the value of the industry and can we substitute something in the way of canvas or other material, that would not be so expensive. There is a good deal of "white-ends" as they are called in the country. Very seldom will you see a "white-end" in the woods around here; but there are a great deal more where these mills operate. I think that we will meet the case to some extent by providing a section somewhat on these lines:— "The Governor in Council may, when it appears in the interest of the Colony,prevent the rinding of trees on the public lands, or on any portion of the public lands of the country, or lands held by license or lease, for the purpose of taking away the rinds for any purpose whatever." That would enable us to have an enquiry and ascertain the extent of the destruction and to see whether anything can be substituted for the rinds for the use of those who need them in connection with the fisheries. I will offer that amendment to the Committee in relation to the matter.

There is another slight amendment —rather an improvement I think— which, after consultation with the Department, I would suggest. It is in Section 3 of the Bill, alterations in the equivalents. I would suggest that the following equivalents be used:

6,000 half drum staves shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.

4,500 drum staves shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.

2,000 herring brl staves shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.

1,600 tierce staves shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.

1,400 fish cask staves shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.

7,000 laths shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.

10,000 shingles shall equal 1,000 ft. board measure.

Heading to be estimated in feet, board measure.

10,000 tub staves shall equal 1,000 feet board measure.

A tub shall not exceed 30 lbs.

I have been informed that this is a more correct value. As I have said to the Committee I hope to arrange to have a complete report made in relation to everyone of these mills, the area over which they cut and the conditions generally of the lands on which they have been cutting. By the next session, I hope to be in a position to make further proposals in relation to that matter.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a suggestion with regard to one clause. It is that before a license be granted, notification be given, if possible, to the representatives of that district, so that they may be aware of the placing of the mill and be given information of what is intended and the chance to apply for a reservation.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I think that a notification should be made in the daily and weekly papers for any new mill.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have no objection to either of these suggestions.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, I don't think that exactly meets the case; the daily papers do not have very wide circulation in the outport districts and the Royal Gazette has certainly no

circulation whatever, practically speaking. It would be much better to have the notification in some paper which has a large circulation in the outports.

MR. COAKER.—Advertize in the Advocate and then everyone will see it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Then the amendment will be to the effect that three months' notice shall be given in the papers.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Chairman, do I understand it was 3 months. Suppose for instance a man wants a license in the spring of the year three months would then be a very long time to wait.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, under the conditions at the present time the Governor-in-Council issues a license to cut timber at a bonus of $2.00 per annum and an annual rent of $2.00. Under the present Bill the only charge is a fee of five dollars on the issue of the license and a royalty of one dollar per thousand feet cut. The difference is in favour of this kind of license and it might soon become general. If it is the intention of the Govment so to deal with the small mills along the coast and they have no intention to grant further licenses to new mills the Act ought to be limited. It would be a hardship to close down the small mills but I think it would be equally a hardship to continue them when it means that they will be eventually crushed out. Assuming that the Act applies only to those mills now operating on the three mile limit, I think that, if this is the intention of the Government, they ought to be satisfied to get the number of mills, their location and other particulars and then limit their output and allow them to operate under the conditions set forth in the license.

The Act is now too broad and it should be amended.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is quite right in his contention and I agree with him that the Act does need the purpose of ascertaining the extent of the cuts which the present mill-owners make. When we know this we shall be in a better position to deal with them. It is not the intention of the Government to create new rights under this Act and I therefore move an amendment to the effect that it shall not be lawful for the Minister to issue licenses to anybody except those who are at present operating on the three-mile limit without timber licenses. The object of the present Act is solely to regulate their business.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a little information as to the small mills which are now operating on the three mile limit. All these mill owners have timber limits, at least those operating in Bonavista District, but they cut on the three mile limit and leave their own areas untouched, or if they do not cut on the three mile limit themselves they have men who do so for them. They sometimes buy timber as well from men who cut on the three mile limit. The consequence of this will be that in a few years time the three mile limit will be cut out and the mill owners will have their old limits to cut from. We should do something to protect the three mile limit from being cut in this way for if this is not done the law will be no good.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I thing the Government will act wisely if they will grant no new licenses for mills but they will also make a mistake if they do not limit the output of those mills that are operating. These mill owners have no regard for the people of the locality in which they may be operating. Their one desire is to cut through all the trees

that are there and then get away to another place. Some of these mills manufacture a tremendous lot of lumber, as much as half a million feet in some cases. I should say that one of them cuts over a million feet of timber a year and all of this from the Crown lands. If the Government will fix a limit to the output they will make the bill more perfect. There are mills in Bonavista Bay that are cutting over three million feet of lumber from public and private areas. If these mills were limited to a hundred thousand feet of lumber a year we would be doing a lot of good. The price of lumber has been increasing all the time at the rate of over a dollar a year. It is almost impossible now to get any pine lumber at all.

The Bill will not be perfect until we limit the cut of these mills to one hundred thousand feet a year. That cut will enable the owners to make a good living for the price that they now receive for lumber is sufficient to enable them to do well out of a cut of that size.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal in what my hon. friend has stated and I am in sympathy with his views on some of the points referred to by him. However, I think he will see that this is a matter in which the Government should proceed with caution and "make haste slowly." When we obtain a complete record of these mills we shall be in a better position to decide on what conditions we shall allow the mill owners to cut. It might be found advisable to vary the limit of the cut in different localities. One mill may be cutting in a place where there is a great deal of timber and doing no harm to the people's rights whereas another may not be cutting as much timber and yet, owing to the scarcity of timber in the vicinity, the mill owners may be causing the people there very great inconvenience.

We shall have a year in which to look round and it would not be advisable at the present time to lay down a hard and fast rule for one hundred and fifty mills when we are not fully familiar with the conditions under which they are operating. Next session we shall have facts and figures before us and we shall be able then to deal with the whole matter in an intelligent way.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, I should like to say just one word before the matter is closed. I think it would be impossible to deal with these mills finally at the present moment but I would suggest that under sub section B of section one the Minister might be enabled to issue licenses under certain conditions as to cut and other points. On enquiry he might find that the mill would do much injury to a locality by cutting as much timber as the owner wished and he might be enabled to limit the cut so that the vicinity might not suffer any injury from it.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the matter now before us. The hon. member for Bonavista spoke of limiting the cut of the mills to one hundred thousand feet each but, if we were to do this, the people of the Colony would have to pay twice as much for their lumber as they do now. I think this would be a great mistake. Again, there is the fact that the mill-owner must make a considerable outlay for his machinery and he has many other expenses which will make it very difficult for him to make two ends meet on that limited cut. I think that, if my hon. friend will look at it in this light, he will see that the small mill owner will suffer very much by being limited in his cut and there will be no advantage gained by the people because of the increase of price.

MR. COAKER.—This next section provides that certain timber shall be

reserved. Would it not be well to have some suggestion there as to who should ask for the reservation?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—At present, of course, it is open to anyone. For instance, the hon. member for Twillingate presented a petition the other day for a reservation down in that district. The Colonial Secretary proposes to have that Gazetted after the next meeting of Council. The matter merely has to be called to the attention of the Government.

MR. COAKER.—How long has the notice to be Gazetted?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—One notice will be sufficient.

MR. COAKER.—You will give notice that you are going to proclaim.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—You absolutely proclaim by notice.

MR. COAKER.—But if you find that a certain proportion of the people want a certain reservation proclaimed and a certain proportion don't want it?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Then you will, of course, have to use your own judgment. You will have to make up your mind from the evidence before you.

MR. COAKER.—I was thinking that if a couple of weeks' notice was given that a certain area was about to be reserved, and then anybody who didn't like it could put in a protest.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—In other words, you suggest that before proclamation is made, notice should be given to the people in the vicinity.

MR. COAKER.—Yes.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—There can be no objection to that. It will read then something like this: Provided however, that no reservation shall be made until public notice has been given to those residents in and near the section of the country in which the land proposed to be reserved is situated.

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.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

LOAN BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for 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.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the first section, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs how much of the proposed loan has already been spent.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Practically the whole of the loan for the extension of telegraphs has already been spent. As regards the loan for lighthouses and fog alarms, none of that has been spent, but materials have been ordered for lighthouses, alarms and lights.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, the total amount of the loan which the Minister is asking for now is $360,000. The loan, as has been already pointed out by the hon. member for Trinity, is in the nature of Supplementary Supply, for money already expended. It is a most unusual course for a Government to incur a debt on public account to this extent and afterwards to provide for it in a loan bill. It is putting things backwards, as it were. Now, these services—the extension of telegraphs, the lighthouse service and the improvement of public buildings—were foreseen at the last session of the Legislature. The need for these further loans on public account were,

or should have been, foreseen by the Government at the last session. But last session, of course, was the session previous to an election and a loan bill on the eve of a general election would not have been very popular,and consequently the liability was incurred, the work was done, and the loan bill now before us is in the nature of an Indemnity Bill for that work. Sometimes, of course it happens that works have to be undertaken to a limited extent, and amounts have been overdrawn to a small amount, but here are expenditures aggregating $360,000 for which a loan is now being asked. We have been going ahead pretty rapidly in the matter of increasing our public debt in recent years. We have a bill before us now that will increase it to the extent of about $2,350,000. The total gross public debt, when these amounts have been realized, will be over $32,000,000, an increase of nearly $10,000,000 in the last five years. Out of that, of course, $8,000,000 have been asked for on account of railway construction—and with that we will deal when we go into Committee on the railway loan which follows this—the balance is for the other purpose to which reference has been made. The conditions in relation to the raising of the local loans are such as, I think, ought to make us hesitate and go slowly in this matter. Altogether there have been four local loan bills passed: One in 1909 for $430,000; another in 1910 for $400,000; another in 1911 for $520,000; and another in 1912 for $250,000; or $1,600,000 altogether. That includes, of course, the amount of $430,000 in 1910 which was refunded in 1911, and though the authority is still outstanding, nothing has been done and nothing will be done under it. The Act, I think, ought be repealed so as not to leave on the Statute book an authority involving $400,000 which it is not intended to use. We have consequently passed bills aggregating $1,200,000 in round figures in local loans. Of these, the first loan of $430,000 was raised some time in 1911. The other two loans of $520,000 and $250,000 are still outstanding, requiring to be raised. Of these loans, $200,000 was taken up by the Government itself as a fund for the Old Age pension (part of the surplus of the year 1909-10 I think was devoted towards a funded amount for the purpose of the Old Age pension). Of the remainder amounting to $570,000, $175,000 was taken up by the public and the balance is still outstanding. Now, that leaves a balance of about $390,000 on the present loans which has not been realized and which the public have not subscribed. We know that the Minister of Finance has had an advertisement going through the public press for some time past calling for this money, but it has not been subscribed. Then there is $150,000 for telephones unsubscribed. That, Mr. Chairman, is a consideration that, I think, ought to make us hesitate. Of course, one of the reasons why these loans have not been subscribed is that our debentures can be bought here in town for less than par; and anyone who may want to invest in debentures is not going down to the Minister of Finance to buy them if he can get them on the market for a less amount than he will have to pay him

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I hear that for the first time now.

MR. KENT.—I have heard it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—The party who sold at less than par must have needed the money very badly.

MR. KENT.—I will sell you debentures at par if you want them.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Oh yes, lots of them can be bought at par.

MR. KENT.—Or at 95. Then, Mr. Chairman, we are now asking for $360,000 more on local loans. This, of course, will be added to the unsubscribed amount of the outstanding loans, and will bring the total unsubscribed loans up to $750,000. Our interest amount, of course, will increase at a corresponding rate. I think the interest on present loans is a little over $1,200,000 a year. When the present Government came into power the interest on the public debt was $870,000. This means an increase of $400,000 in the interest on the public debt—very nearly an increase of fifty per cent. Now, of course I will be told that this increase in interest is met by other sources of revenue. Bell Island and the increase in Crown Lands revenues are the two that are generally pointed to. Then, the Civil Service has not been standing still in the meantime. In Civil Government there has been an increase of $102,000; Pensions, $10,000; Administration of Justice, about $11,000; Education, $116,000; Public Charities, $260,000; Lighthouses, $40,000; Agriculture & Mines, $36,000; Marine & Fisheries, $20,000; Roads and Bridges, $9,000; Postal Telegraph Department, $270,000; Customs, $120,000, or aggregating about $990,000.

In looking at the facts disclosed by the Budget yesterday I think that the Government should have obtained the authority of this House before spending the money on those objects. I appreciate that the erection of lighthouses and fog alarms and such public works are very necessary, but, at the same time we must move slowly when adding to the public debt. The moneys now proposed to be raised are required immediately and if the Surplus Trust account will be in credit after the raising of the loan the amount credited should be deducted from the amount of the loan asked for. No doubt pending the raising of the loan, the Finance Minister will be obliged to arrange with the Bank for an advance to be repaid afterward.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—The moneys which have been expended were really given back to the people in the way of public improvements. Hundreds of miles of telegraph lines were built, lighthouses and alarms and public buildings were constructed as well as several other necessary works during the past twelve months. I am surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition state that our debentures could be bought in this town at ninety-five or less. I heard that statement to-day for the first time. I can inform the hon. member that people come daily to the Department to get our debentures at par and why would they do this if they could buy them on Water Street at a low figure. The hon. member has no proof to show that they can be purchased at ninety-five. It may be that some hard-up person would part with a debenture and would offer it at that figure as an inducement to immediate sale. It is not a nice statement for the leader of the Opposition to make that our debentures had dropped to ninety-five in the local market. I pointed out on another occasion that the loan of $150,000 authorized to be raised to construct a new Lunatic Asylum had not been placed in the market for the reason that when we asked for tenders we found that the building would cost half a million dollars. The Government had been asked by the Board of Trade to do something in the way of installing a new telephone system in St. John's. This legislature gave us authority to raise the sum of $150,000 for this purpose but we did not do so, as our plans in connection with the new system have not been completed. Outside those loans there is only $90,000 still unsold. We are now asking for authority to raise $360,000

for those public works specified in this Bill. Why we imported into the Colony the past few years over one hundred and fifteen motors, which cost a couple of thousand dollars a year to the owners to operate, yet when the Government asks for $360,000 for telegraphs, lighthouses and other purposes, hon. members see nothing but blue ruin staring the country in the face. We know that Opposition members are obliged to say something, but they should confine themselves to the facts. The other afternoon the hon. member, Mr. Clift, stated that moneys from the Special Grant allocated for his district for roads, bridges and marine works had not been expended on those objects, but those moneys had been spent on telegraph extension. The hon. member had asked that the amount of money so spent should be refunded and credited to the marine and road grants of his district. I have since made enquiries about the matter and ascertained that the hon. member was misinformed, for not one cent of those moneys had been spent on Postal Telegraphs in his or in any other district. It would be well if hon. members would be in a position to furnish proofs when making charges of this nature in the House. It will take about $45,000 to complete the lighthouses and alarms now in course of erection, and that amount will be required within the next six months to pay for the machinery and other articles upon arriving.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—The amount asked for is to complete the lighthouses and alarms now in course of erection and to be applied towards the construction of new ones.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, the Finance Minister has stated that he required the money to pay for the goods on arrival. May I ask the hon. member how he paid the interest on the public debt on the 31st of last December. Was there an over draft at the Bank of over half a million dollars? The Finance Minister has found fault with the leader of the Opposition for stating that debentures can be purchased at ninety-five in the local market. If the Minister was wise he would proclaim that fact because our debentures are quoted in some papers at ninety. This statement can be verified by looking up a stock list in the papers published abroad.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, the Finance Minister had stated that as over one hundred motors are imported into the country during the past few years, we should not hesitate to authorize the loans now before us. The Government have made these expenditures on lighthouses and alarms without any legislative authority but how much extra money did they spend in the way of increasing the widow's dole, or on the small pension given to wornout fishermen? This $360,000 was spent last fall but not cent on the fishermen of this Colony. If Governments without any authority are permitted to do these things what is the use of this House of Assembly? If you can spend $360,000 in this way there is nothing to prevent you spending a million dollars. The Government should have asked the Legislature last year for this money as they then knew they would require it for the purposes set forth in this Bill.

It being now 6.30 p.m. the House rose until eight oclock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8 o'clock.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief in my remarks as had the clock not got to 6.30 when it did I would have finished within a few minutes. Now, I was trying to give the Minister of Finance and Customs a little good advice and if I continue in that strain for a few minutes it would not do him anv harm. He has started Lent very well by making a confession because he introduced his Budget on

Ash Wednesday, and revealed the misdeeds of the last twelve months. Now, that would have been all right, if in his confession he had told us all. It is no good for him to make such a confession and only reveal part of his misdeeds. If he had told us everything we might have been able to give him absolution, but I am afraid that half has not yet been told. Now, if I were sure that everything was revealed, and there was no more to follow, I would be able to make up mind as to whether absolution were in order. I would be very glad to hear in this Budget that the Government proposed to add at least another four hundred to the Old Age Pension List. They went on for two or three years and added four hundred a year until they had 1200 on the Pension List. Now, they could have proceeded and voted another $20,000 for this object instead of bringing in this tremendous amount of $650,000 in increased taxation, which will have to be paid by our people within the next twelve months, and it is a great pity that with all the poor, worn-out fishermen we have in this country, there should not be another addition to the pension list. I have received a number of applications since the House opened from men of the age of 74 and 75 years who are unable to work and who are getting perhaps $20 a year, and some of them nothing, and if we could only help these poor old men even the increased taxation would not seem so bad. Now, instead of finding an addition to this Pension List we find that the poor people have to pay an extra tax on their glass of rum and five cents a pound on their tobacco. Neither of these taxes will affect me because I do not drink rum or use tobacco. I suppose if I tell the Minister of Finance this, he will try and get the money out of me in some other form. I know if the Premier were to try he could get at me in some way,because they say there is nothing he is not able to do if he tries. Now I am really sorry that another four hundred has not been added to the list, because there are full 400 more worn out old fishermen, who are just as much entitled to this Pension of $50 a year as the 1200 who are receiving it at present. Why you should it to the 1200 and allow the other 400 to go without it, is a thing that puzzles me.

The public Accounts which have been tabled show that there was a lot of money spent last year. I notice that around Burin District some of the harbours were very fortunate. I notice that St. Lawrence came in for a tremendous slice of the special grants during the year. $3,100 was spent there, and I would like to know how it comes that such an amount as this was spent in one harbour in the District of Burin. Of course it was not because the District of Burin was known to be pretty evenly divided, and that there had been only a majority of one or two votes in the previous election. St. Lawrence at the previous election was known to have been Liberal. I do not say there was anything wrong, but it seems strange to me that this large amount should have been spent in this place just before the election. Now, Mr. Chairman, I intend to go into the Budget a little later and administer a little good advice when we go into the Committee on Ways and Means on tomorrow or Monday, and I shall not at present, further criticise the proposals tabled by the Minister yesterday.

It would not do for me to take up the time of the House in considering these matters, while we are in Committee on the Budget. Nevertheless, I hope we shall not hear again the remark made by my hon. friend as long as we are members of the House, and we shall be here as members as long as he will. No less a sum of money

than $360,000 was spent without the authority of the Legislature, and the only justification that has been advanced has been that it was spent among the people. The spending of money in this reckless way is wrong in principle for, if the executive can spend that amount without authority what is going to prevent them from spending a million dollars? What is the good of the members coming here if the Government can spend money without the authority of the House? I hope we shall not hear of it again.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to put my hon. friend right as to the expenditure in St. Lawrence, to which he has referred. As a matter of fact there has been no special grant expended in St. Lawrence during the past five years. What happened was that during the four years administration of the Government out of the surplus revenues, and before allocating them to the district on the per capita basis, they undertook large district works in various districts. For instance, $20,000 was spent in the construction of a road from Cape Freels to Wesleyville in Bonavista. Something like $45,000 was spent in linking up the roads in the District of Burin, Mr. Bayly, the Road Inspector, Captain Bonia and one or two other officials had charge of the work and they commenced at Burin. and went to Garnish and linked up all the roads in the district. They had to open up a lot of new roads, and the people of all the settlements worked at the roads, and were paid for their labour. That is how the money was spent, and it is not correct to state that there was a special grant to St. Lawrence. Nor was the work carried out to buy votes, as it has been insinuated. The work was commenced three years before the General Election, and one year only after the District had returned two members that were against the Government. Large expenditures were also made in other districts, and it was because the District of Burin needed improvement in its road system that the grant was made. Hon. gentlemen will have some idea of what the District of Burin was like if they can imagine a road from here to Donovan's, and then none between Donovan's and Topsail; then a road from Topsail to Kelligrews, and none from Kelligrews to Holyrood and so on right round to Harbor Grace. The grant was expended in linking up the roads of Burin District, and now a man can drive from one end of it to the other. That is how the money was spent.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I understand that that amount was spent a couple of years ago. I am referring to a recent expenditure at St. Lawrence.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Any amount spent recently was out of this account, and was not an allocation to St. Lawrence.

MR. COAKER—The fact remains that there was a lot of money spent at St. Lawrence recently.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—What amount was spent there was on the roads as I have referred to. I admit that the amount expended was a large one but it was necessary. I went to the District myself and I walked through it for over a hundred miles. In many places there was no road, and I had to walk. I made a report, and an amount was allocated, and the work was done.

MR. COAKER—It was a good thing for Burin that the rt. hon. gentleman went there. When we want roads in our District I shall invite him down there.

MR. LEFEUVRE—Mr. Chairman, it is very plain to be seen why reference has been made to the money

expended at St. Lawrence. A short time ago the hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Stone, was sent there to form branches of the Union, and also to ascertain if the Government members had been guilty of any corruption during the last election campaign whereby they could be unseafed. Unfortunately for his party he failed to obtain any evidence whatever of this. We fought a clean campaign. Not finding anything on that score, hon. members opposite are now complaining of certain expenditures which were made in the district, and they make the inference that money was spent there for the purpose of winning the District. Some of my hon. friends have the habit of reading news items in the opposition papers, and throwing them across the floors of the House as facts. This does not affect us very much,but I think it is only fair to say that no amounts were spent in Burin other than such as were referred to by the rt. hon. Prime Minister.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend has stated that the hon member for Trinity, Mr. Stone, went to Burin not merely to form Unions but really for the purpose of obtaining evidence that the members for Burin had been guilty of corruption. Where is his proof of this statement? I have to tell him that my friend Mr. Stone, went there for no such purpose, but solely to form branches of the Union. Even if we had abundance of evidence that the two members had been guilty of corruption we had no desire to interfere in the matter.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman, I want my hon. friend to understand distinctly that I went to the District of Burin for the sole purpose of forming branches of the Union there. I had no intention of going into any other matters whatever, but was sent by the President of the Union to form Union branches. For the information of my hon. friend and the House, I may say that I was very successful in this, for in the home town of my hon. friend I established a branch, which seventy six members joined in one night. The number of Union members is growing daily throughout the District,and very soon it will be as strong there as it is in the Northern Districts.

I went to do my duty and I hope I did it in a satisfactory way. I did not refer to my hon. friend or his colleague, nor did I give out any information concerning them when I returned home. I hope that what I have said will change the mind of my hon. friend as to why I went to the District

MR. LEFEUVRE.—Mr. Chairman. I know how many men became members of the Union, and what was done by my hon. friend, but I want my hon. friends opposite to understand, that I do not intend to sit here and allow insinuations to be made that money was sent to the District to win our seats. The Government made many improvements in our District during the past four years, just as it did in all the Districts throughout the Island. That money was expended honestly and faithfully and not a dollar was wasted. We are told today, that the money was wasted there. This is not correct, but I suppose it would not be in the interests of my friends opposite to acknowledge this.

MR. STONE—There were a great many people in the District who came and told me that the money was wasted, and that the roads were badly built.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, the reason why we ask for this information concerning these District matters is, that our Councils are interested in these matters, and they are continually asking for information on these points. Take the District of Ferryland, for instance. We have a

branch at Witless Bay, and they take a great interest in the way in which public moneys are spent there. The same applies to Burin, where we have another branch. I would be sorry to learn that any public money was not spent in a proper way, but it is our duty to investigate these matters, and not to take it for granted.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, the Bill before the House is a Bill for the raising of a loan by the sale of debenture bonds but one would not think so from the debate. I was unfortunately unable to be present this afternoon, when the Minister of Finance and Customs gave the House an explanation of certain matters referred to by me, in my remarks on the Bill when it was in Committee for the first time. On that occasion, I asked that, as the Bill made provision for the raising of a sum of money for telegraph purposes, the Minister might include in the Bill a sum that was taken from Twillingate District and transferred from its grant for bridges and roads to the Postal Telegraphs. I understand that my hon. friend stated that this amount was not transferred to the Postal Telegraphs. Is that correct?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes That amount was spent in the district.

MR. CLIFT—In that case, what my hon. friend stated was not correct, for I still maintain that the money voted for roads and bridges was transferred to the Postal Telegraphs account, and when I made the statement, I was not aware that it had been transferred back. I found afterwards that the money had been transferred back again to the roads and bridges account. I am pleased to know this, and to learn that the District received the benefit of the expenditure.

With regard to the Bill for raising $360,000, I have very little to say, for the money has been expended, and it has to be found. Whether we raise it by a Loan Bill, or take it out of current account really makes very little difference. However, I would like to say that this Bill looks to me very much like a Bill that was brought here in the session of 1909, when we were told that it was a Bill brought down to cover a deficit that was left by the outgoing Government. In fact, every session of this Legislature since then, the Minister in his Budget Speech has made reference to the deficit left by the Bond Government in 1909. People would have imagined from the way in which he spoke, that the deficit that then existed was brought about, not by expenditures in the public interests, but for possible personal interests. One would have thought that the money went into the pockets of the late Government. Supposing that during the recent election there had been a change of Government, what would have happened? Matters would have been just as they were five years ago, and the incoming Government would have had to obtain a loan to cover over-expenditures. I do not remember what the amount was in 1909 but it was not as large as this amount. However, the same principle applies in each case, and it is very unfair and very unnecessary for the Hon. Minister of Finance to come here every year and talk of the late Government as having left a deficit. There was nothing unusual in the fact that the Government had to raise a loan in 1909 for the expenditures of the former Government, but it was only what the Government is doing now, and has done every year since it came in power.

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 without amendment.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

RAILWAY LOAN.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for Raising a Sum of Money by Loan for the Extension of the Railway System of the Colony."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, we are quite familiar with Loan Bills by this time and we pass from one to another without the slightest hesitation. The railway contracts of the present Government are responsible for the greater part of these loans and it is difficult to say when they will end. In 1910 we were told that $4,000,000 would complete the railway. Two years ago there was a loan and the Prime Minister stated that it would be sufficient to complete the line, and that the railways would be in operation by the close of 1914. It has been stated recently that "prophecy may be a gratuitous form of error, but looking forward is a duty in politics," and I think that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister when he introduced the Resolutions might have looked forward before he decided to act. If he had done so, we would not be in the position that we are in to-day. I do not think we have seen the last of these loans. It will be found necessary to raise a a further loan to complete these branches. Already we are asked for eight million dollars and we are not yet through with the matter. When the resolutions were going through the House, I stated that it would take not less than $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 to complete the lines proposed. Now I believe that even that estimate is under the mark, and is less than what will ultimately be required to complete these works. That estimate was from a first examination of the contract, from the figures of the Prime Minister given in his introduction of that motion. To-day we have none of the lines completed.

The other evening while referring to this bill. I thought that we should have supplied us any further information required as to the conditions now existing. The Prime Minister sent me a copy of a letter to-day which was written by Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, at the request of the Prime Minister. This letter refers to the Bonavista Branch.

Mr. Chairman, on that line according to the Government Engineer's estimate, there is still due $63,450. That shows that this line is not yet complete; there is still a large amount of money outstanding. The Trepassey Branch is in a forward condition and is open as far as Renews. . Now, Mr. Chairman, though he says the line is in a forward condition, he does not give any estimate as to what the probable cost will be, until the line is completed and the contractor ready to receive his final certificate. The Heart's Content Branch is also in a forward condition so the letter states However, there is no estimate given of what that branch will finally cost. The Bonavista branch which is practically completed has still to obtain an amount of at least $63.000; but evidently a much larger sum is required for the Heart's Content branch. The Bay de Verde branch, it appears, is roughly completed. The other lines are not estimated at all. Now the mileage was originally estimated by the Prime Minister as 250 miles. Last year, he corrected that and made it between 350 and 400 miles all told. If you take it that there are 250 miles and that there are only 100 miles to

be completed, some $1,500,000 would then be required under the Main contract. On addition to that, you have got the $63,000 which are due on the Bonavista line. Then, if you go to the other part of the contract which deals with the rolling stock and other matters of the contract, you will find many thousands of dollars more required. On the 1893 contract with the Reids, it was laid down that they should equip the lines; that they should place a certain number of engines, cars and other rolling stock on the line of railway. He says that no very accurate estimate can be given as to the cost of the rolling stock. He does not give any calculation as to what the Fortune Bay, Bay de Verde and Bonne Bay branches will cost under this heading.

Fortune Bay branch amounted to $5,000 for material, the Bonne Bay $3,000, the Bay de Verde branch $39,000,- the Trepassey branch $182,000, and the Bonavista branch $189,000. It is thus evident that before the lines are completed the extras will have cost the colony a considerable amount. Altogether it will amount to some $1,806,770. If you raise the loan for which you are now going at the same figures as before, you will still be in debt to the extent of $60,000 or $70,000.

The Prime Minister the other evening, in reply to Mr. Coaker, stated that the branch railways would cost only $4,000,000.

When we on this side of the House during that debate were pointing out that it would be more and showing how it would be more it would have been very easily for the Prime Minister to put us right and show us the basis for his calculations if he had not intended to mislead the committee as to the cost of the contracts. But be that as it may it is now only a matter of history. The fact remains we are now going into the market asking for $2,000,000 more. He made the same mistake the last time the loan was before the House. I have not his remarks before me, but I have here his letter to Glynn Mills Currie and Co. of July 4th 1912 in which he says that the loan then contemplated would see the end of loan for these branches.

That prophecy was "a gratuitous form of error" and had he taken the trouble to look forward we would not be here to-day asking for more monev There is no doubt that the mistake was made at the beginning. We undertook a big obligation and we have to carry it out. But when we were undertaking this obligation the information that we had was not accurate. Mr. Hall's figures were merely an estimate and the Prime Minister's were an estimate based on Mr. Hall's. And as far as we can judge we are in the same position to-day.

As to the loan itself everyone knows that Colonial Loans,not Newfoundland loans alone, but all Colonial Loans,do not stand as favorably with the investing public at 3½ as they did four years ago. There has been a very heavy falling off in the demand for these securities during the last year and even during the last month. There has been a slight revival just recently but they are going up to where they stood at the last loan and all loans issued of late to the Colonies are issued at from 3½ to 4%. Look at the Provinces of Canada. They are all issuing 4 per cent. bonds so that if we get the present loan at as favorable a figure as the last one, which was more unfavorable than the one previous, we will be doing very well. Looking at the condition of the market, I do not believe that you can issue your loan at the same figure as you did in 1912. The conditions have changed. In the first place our Budget this year will

have a bad effect. Last year the Minister of Finance took off duties aggregating about $380,000. This year he has to put these duties on again, but not on the same articles. He has to replace the amount that he took off last year. Not alone that, but the duties that he is putting on this year greatly exceed the amount that he took off. This financial condition will have a bad effect. Then there has been a change in the market, and our own position is changed. We are doing nothing of a constructive nature, beyond the building of these railways. And so we find the market not as favorable for the railway loans as it would be were we spending money in constructive country building by investing large sums in industrial concerns. That is one of the reasons why the Dominion of Canada and the Provinces had to call a halt in the building of transportation systems, and make some expenditures on industrial works. The same thing applies here. We are a small people, scattered round the coast, and not very wealthy. The number of men actually wealthy is very small and we are almost entirely dependent for our existence upon the fishery, and even the catch of fish is now at a standstill. It has stood at one figure for a number of years. Fortunately the price has been up of late for upon that everything depends. The other industries, those of our mines and forest are only in their infancy. I do not intend to delay the Committee any longer. We must recognize the fact that we are committed to these contracts. We are obliged to pay for the work. But one thing we ought to do is to be more economical in the paying out. Take for instance, the manner in which arbitrations have been carried out. The amount spent for this purpose is anything but economical. Most of the payment to arbi trotors were unnecessary. There was no reason why one man with a salary could not do the work of the Government arbitrators, instead of paying out thousands and thousands of dollars for that work. A man should have experience and knowledge for that work, instead of an inexperienced man detailed for every arbitration. The Committee is familiar with the figures of these arbitrations, and I point to that as one of the items in which the Government has not been as economical as it might have been. As to other items we have had no means of judging so far, we cannot say whether there has been proper economy or not. Mr. Hall is a man in whom I have thorough confidence as an enquirer. He knows his business thoroughly, but he is a man very much overworked. Everything is thrust upon him. His time and attention ought to be limited solely to railway work and I do not think it fair to him or fair to the country that his attention should be taken up with every matter of public business that may require engineering work. He ought to be enabled to see that this railway is properly constructed and properly operated, and he cannot do this with all the work that is thrust upon him.

As to the operation of the line, I do not intend to discuss that tonight. Everyone knows that complaints about its working and especially in regard to the line from St. John's to Harbor Grace, are continuous. Everyone recognizes that there are times during snow blockades when difficulties keep them from operating, but if sufficient rolling stock were kept it would not happen as often as it does.

However, the immediate question before the House is the loan. As I said before this is not the last loan on this account that this House will be asked to authorize before this line is completed. This prophesy may be "a gratuitous form of error." I hope

it will be an error, but I am afraid that it will not.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the hon. member upon the very fair criticism that he has made in relation to this matter. From the standpoint of the Opposition and of one who has the responsibilities of Leader of the Opposition, I could not expect that he would be less severe in his criticism of this subject, and in particular in regard to the personal aspects of it in connection with that part of it which I have to a certain extent to shoulder for the estimate made as to the cost. But I want to put the position to the Committee and to the country fairly, it is this. If my hon. friend is correct, and if he has satisfied the Committee as to the soundness of his criticism he can only have succeeded in showing that I was out in my Estimate. If he is right, if he has convinced the Committee that he is right than he has established nothing against the railway contract, nothing against me. He has established only the fact that I was a few miles out. Is not that dealing with a subject dead and gone, 'whipping a dead horse.' What object, what point, what good can possibly come from discussing year after year, night after night the fact that I was out in my estimate of the mileage and the cost. Suppose I was to admit, (but I do not admit it) that all that has been said is true and that the railway instead of costing $4,000,000 as it as been stated that I said, would cost $8,000,000, the only deduction from that would be that I was out in my estimate. Even if my figures were incorrect the railway would have to go on. As Sir Robert Bond said, when Leader of the Opposition, we had a mandate from the people to build these railways. The country had distinctly told us to build these branches. We went to the country on that policy. We took the public into our confidence. We entered into a solemn contract with them in 1908 and 1909. We told them that if returned we would build those railways. There was nothing hidden at all. We did not come here under false pretences. We named each branch. We came back and we started to build the branches. And Sir Robert Bond standing where my friend stands tonight said in 1910: "You have a mandate from the people to build these branches." If we have this mandate if we were sent back to build these branches, if we are building them and at reasonable rates, where does the personal aspect come in, so far as I am concerned? And if the hon. member has succeeded in proving any thing it is that I was out in my estimate, that I was wrong personally It may be a subject for comment if I was wrong, which I do not admit, but why it should cause discussion session after session, why it should be heralded forth in every manifesto, and on every platform, passes my comprehension.

What are the facts? When we went to the country in 1908, we promised to build these branches. I had an estimate before there had been a line of survey, and before anything was known of the distances, and in the manifesto that I sent to the country, I estimated the distance at 250 miles. I was merely stating the distances after looking at the map. Sir Robert Bond, after consulting with the Government Engineer stated the whole of these branches would mean 192 miles. He stated that in his Manifesto and he estimated the cost at $15,000 a mile. Did he intend to deceive the country, when he made that statement? Of course not. He was trying to make out a case against the party. He was simply following the same lines as I did in estimating the cost

per mile without reference to other items. He did not speak of additional rolling stock, or cost of operation, or snow fences or stations or the other items. It is well known what the cost of a railroad is in this country. The line to Port aux Basques cost about $18,000 a mile. Suppose the branches amount to 375 miles, the total cost would then be about $7,200,000. I was out in my estimate of the mileage, but so was Sir Robert Bond, who had at his command all the resources of the Government Engineer's office. His estimate was 190 miles, mine 250. So that he was 60 miles below mine. If I made an error he made it, and I made it in good company. But that is not the only estimate that was made because the financial critic of the party at that time, Hon. Mr. Anderson made an estimate. I know that my hon. friends do not look up to him now as a financial critic as they did then, but they considered him sufficiently important a critic at the time to publish his statement as a Manifesto in the 'Evening Telegram.' Look at his speech in the British Hall at the time, and you will find what he estimates. Here is the document itself, "The Morris Manifesto means Confederation," and so on, and then he goes on to estimate the mileage of the proposed branches, and fixes it at 275 miles.

There you have three estimates, mine, Mr. Anderson's and Sir Robert Bond's, and not one of them makes any estimate of the cost of the railway except according to the cost per mile at $15,600. Nothing about rolling stock, right of way. Nothing about any other expenses which bring the cost up to $18,000 a mile. I was right in my estimate originally, but when we began to build the road we had to make important alterations, that added considerably to the mileage. When we started from Bonavista we found we had to make certain detours to join up important settlements along the line. The same is true of Trepassey. After we had made allowance for the character of the country, the road, when we got to Trepassey, had increased something like twenty miles. We recognized that the road would be of no value if we were to run it through the country as the crow flies. We had to touch the various settlements, and in that way the line was lengthened. Then as regards the Carbonear branch we had the option of going from Carbonear down to Grate's Cove and vicinity or of crossing over the barrens to Hearts' Content and going down on that side of Trinity Bay. We determined to go around Dildo and connect up that part of the country. We connected nearly five thousand people by bringing that line the way we did, while there was not a living soul on the barrens between Carbonear and Heart's Content. By making the alteration and by going around from Dildo down through Green's Harbor and that vicinity we linked up five thousand people, and brought the railway within a few miles of Hant's Harbour and Scilly Cove, and other important settlements in that vicinity That is why I happened to be out in my estimate. But, Mr. Chairman, the main point is this: Are the roads being built at a reasonable price? Did we make a good bargain? That is what the country wants to know tonight—not whether I was out in my estimate. Is the work that they asked us to undertake being carried out at a fair and reasonable price? We were told by them to go ahead and build these roads, and we claim now that we have built them at a rate that no other Government and no other party could have improved on; and I am prepared to prove that statement before any reasonable tribunal. There never was a better contract; there

never will be a better contract. I defy any Party or any Government to make a better contract in the country or outside of it. What are the facts? In 1889, before Sir Robert Thorburn went to the country and was defeated, he called for tenders to build a railway from Placentia Junction down to Hall's Bay. When we came in—the Party led by Sir William Whiteway, of which my friend Sir Robert Bond, was Colonial Secretary—we found eight tenders for this line from eight different people, including Mr. Simpson, the man who built our dock; Murphy of Halifax, and a number of others, and after studying the eight tenders carefully, we were advised by the Government Engineer of the day, and by others, that the best tender was that of Mr. R. G. Reid. Now, what was his tender? This was in 1890—24 years ago. His tender was $16,400 per mile—you will find it in the Journal of that day—and two thousand acres of land per mile, which at 30 cents per acre would be about $600 per mile more. In other words, Mr. Reid asked for $17,000 a mile to build that railway. And mind, that was to build a trunk line through miles and miles of prairie land, and not branch railways, which are much more expensive and much more difficult to build, with their rock cutting, getting in and out of settlements, and up and down steep grades. And that was the best tender of the bunch Well, we beat him down to $15,600 per mile—got him to take off nearly $2,000 per mile; and he built the railway not alone down to Exploits, because when we got to Exploits in 1893, we made a contract with him to build the line to Port aux Basques. From 1889 to 1897, when the last spike was driven at Port aux Basques. Sir William Whiteway, Sir Robert Bond and myself were in the Executive. There is not a foot of that line that I don't know something about, because every mile of it had to be passed by the Executive Council, and I don't think there was a mile that I did not scrutinize and examine.

In 1909 twenty years afterwards we had to look for a contractor to build our branch railways. I did not want to be told that a man here, with his own trains and his own steamers with his thorough knowledge of the country and his facilities for bringing men and materials by train and by boat to the scene of his operations, could do the work very much cheaper than anyone else, inside the country or outside it; but when we commenced negotiations we found ourselves up against this proposition: We said to Mr. Reid, we want you to build these branch railways, what will you do it for? Well, he said, I cannot build them for what I built them before, because the cost of everything has gone up. There was no getting away from that. Everyone in the country is talking about the increased cost of living. And remember that we were insisting that under this contract he was to pay the labor of the country fifty per cent. more than he did in 1890. We thought that we were doing a good thing in 1890 when we made Reid put it in his contract that the men would be paid $1.00 a day, because in those days seventy and eighty cents a day was what the laborer in this country was being paid, and they were only paid that for portions of the year. We fixed the minimum wage in that contract at $1.00 a day, and no man was to be employed on that road at less than that sum. Then when we went to the Company twenty years afterwards we said: You must pay the men $1.50 a day. You can give them as much more as you like but no man must be employed at less than $1.50 per day—fifty cents to feed himself on the line and $1.00 to take off it. Well then, he

said, if you want me to pay a fifty per cent. increase on labor, which represents half the cost per mile (because, he said, when you pay me $15,600 per mile to build your railway, half of that goes for labor) you double the cost of construction to me. But he did not stop there. He said, the rails that I used in 1890 on the road to Port aux Basques, cost me $20 a ton. You will find the invoices down in your own Custom House. Rails to-day are $28 and $30 a ton, an increase of fifty per cent. Engines have increased fifty per cent.; first-class carriages have increased 75 per cent.; box cars have increased 50 per cent.; engineering, 50 per cent.; and the cost of labor 100 per cent. Now, he said, in view of this, how can you expect me to-day to build a railway for you as cheaply as it was done in 1890. Well, we said, you have got to do it. If you want the contract you have got not alone to build it for what you built it in 1890, but you have got to build it for $600 a mile less, if you want us to pay you in gold. And we made the contract with him. And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that any fair minded man who looks at these figures will admit that we made a splendid contract for the country. Let any man in the country to-morrow see what he can get a house built for. He will find that he cannot get a house or anything else built in this town at the present time for less than 45 or 50 per cent. more than he could have got it done for twenty years ago. And what is true of this country is true of every other country. Labor has gone up and everything else has gone up. If Reid had said to us: We built your railway 20 years ago for $15,600 a mile and now we will take this contract at a 40 per cent. increase, how could we get away from the arguments that he could put up? What answer could we give? Why should he act the philanthropist? But we pointed out to him that he had great facilities for building this road that no other contractor would have; that he would be able to utilize his railway for bringing men and materials where he wanted them, as his railway was not fully occupied all the year round, without its costing him anything directly; that he had his engineering staff here, his offices and his general staff here; and that he could therefore build all these branch lines and at the same time do all his other work without increased cost; and taking all these thing into consideration he made the contract. And there are people to-day who say that there is not much money in it for him. I can give a very fair opinion of what his father made out of the seven or eight million dollars that he got from us for building the line to Port aux Basques He came down here at that time highly recommended, a man of means and of influence; one of the directors of the Bank of Montreal, one of the greatest money institutions in the world; one of the directors of the C P. R., one of the greatest railway concerns in the world; a man of fine, sterling character; and he satisfied the country as regards that contract, and that is the testimony not of myself alone but of Sir Robert Bond and everybody else who had any dealing with him. I know what he made out of that railway work. I know what he was reputed to have made before he came here and I know what he was worth when he died. It is public property and can be ascertained by anyone from the probate office in the country in which he lived. Considering the moneys that he received from this country under arbitrations and from other sources, I know that he could have made but very little money out of this line. I hope that the present contractors will not lose any money

under the present contract, but I would prefer to have the work done by them rather than that I should have to do it upon the same terms. The first question that we have to answer is this: Did we have a mandate from the people to build these roads, no matter what their length is? If we were sworn and empannelled to-night, Mr. Chairman, as a jury, and if we were about to retire to find our verdict, and if you were the Judge putting the case to us before we retired, would you not ask us to find that question first? Whether we had been authorized by the country to build these lines. And the verdict of the jury would be: Yes. And then the next question which you would put to us would be this: Did they make a good contract, a cheap contract, a better contract than could have been expected under the circumstances. And the answer must be: Yes. That must be the verdict. That will be the verdict of history and the future Prowse or Pedley, in devoting a chapter to the building of the Newfoundland railway, will have to say that the present is the best contract and the cheapest contract that has ever made in this or any other country. And if that be the verdict, then where do I come in? Where does my estimate come in? Of what interest is it to the country if I was out fifty miles or a hundred miles or two hundred miles? But if I was out in my estimate it must be remembered that the estimate was made when I had no data before me. The roads had not been surveyed. Even when we were debating the last loan here two years ago we did not have the data then. And even when my learned friend very properly asked two days ago for information, I was unable to give him the length of some of the branches. Take the branch railway to Fortune where the terminus has not yet been fixed owing to the difficulties the engineers have encountered in approaching a port in Fortune Bay. It was only a month ago that the railway company's engineer, Mr. Hall, the representative of the district (Mr. Emerson) and myself spent hours and hours over the data put before us, and even to-night as I speak nothing has been decided. It is for that reason it is difficult to make a very close estimate as to the lengths of the various branches; but as I have already said, that is not the point. The point is this: Are they to be built? and are we building them at a reasonable rate? My learned friend, the Leader of the Opposition, paid a tribute to the Government Engineer as to his qualifications for this work. It is not necessary for me to endorse that here, because I have done it in other places. A more satisfactory man in his own line it would be impossible to find. He is watching every mile of that road, every curve, every grade and every station, and everything connected with it with the same conscientious care as if it were his own private property. He is absolutely satisfactory, and I would like to put him on the stand to-night (but I am precluded from doing it) to tell you what he thinks of the contract. Suppose the work does cost $8,000,000. At 3½ per cent., that is only $280,000. If I were here to-night asking for a vote to increase the Pauper Relief fund by $280,000 there would not be a word about it.

MR. COAKER.—Oh, wouldn't there?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well, there might. I will modify that and say that if I were to have done it four years ago, when the hon. member was still a humble constituent rather than the leader of the Back Row, it would not receive as much opposition as it would to-night. Now, we have been in office five years, and the revenue of the country has increased about $1,000,000 in that time.

I am speaking now in round figures. Now, can we afford $280,000 a year to pay the interest on these branch railways? That is the question for the country—the question they have already decided. Can we afford $280,000 a year to open up the country and make it possible for the people to live in it—to give them the conveniences and advantages and blessings of civilization? Some people will ask: Will it pay? Well there are many things in this world that don't pay, very many things. You never hear a person ask whether a lighthouse will pay. You have got to have the lighthouse. It pays indirectly. You don't get the money in income or revenue, but it is a necessity and you must have it Did you ever hear anybody ask whether a dose of medicine would pay? You have got to have it sometimes. There are many things that you have got to have that you get no income from. We are not living on this earth for a thousand years. We are only here for a very short while and while here the people of this country, like every other country, are entitled to some of the blessings and advantages of civilization, such as the railway. We have added $100,000 to education since we have been here. When we came in the vote was $260,000. To-day it is ever $360,000. Nobody has said a word about that $100,000 a year. Does that pay? It pays indirectly. We get no direct return, but I want to see the man that will object to that vote. We have put up seventy lighthouses and fog alarms since we came in, to make it safe for the mariners around our coasts to get home in the fog and frost and snow. Does that pay? It pays indirectly. And it is the same with the railway. The people have it for their mails and their freights and their passengers; it connects up the whole country. For that reason, $280,000 a year, as was stated here this afternoon, is a mere flea-bite. It does not amount to anything. The Finance Minister stated there this afternoon that within the last three or four years 120 motor cars have been imported into this country, They are owned right here in this little town of St. John's. These cars cost about $300,000 a year —$20,000 a year more than the whole cost of the railway. And these people don't mind that. It is a luxury to them and they spend it, but if I were to go to them to-night and say that I wanted $280,000 from them to open up and develop the country, they would drop down dead. There are some people who do not mind spending money on motors, champagne and other luxuries, but who will hesitate to contribute in the way of increased taxes, in the direction of improvements for the country. The first question we have to ask ourselves, is, had we a mandate from the people to build those branch railways; secondly, have we made a good contract and built it as cheaply as possible and thirdly, are our people able to afford to pay for it. I have no hesitation in saying that after a few years such development will have taken place in the way of providing employment for our people, in the opening up of new industries, which will more than justify the outlay on those works. I can show to this committee that we obtained a revenue from sources not dreamed of by our predecessors which is almost sufficient to pay the $280,000 required to meet the interest on the loans for the branch railways. We will get nearly one-half this amount from the Bell Island ore the present year. When it was proposed that the Bell Island companies should pay a royalty Sir Robert Bond who was leader of the Opposition, pointed out that that industry would be hampered as its profits were small and the imposition of that tax would mean the lessening of the output. What are

the facts in this respect? Why, the output has increased to such an extent that this year Bell Island will pay into the revenue, something like $120,000 from that tax. When we came into power the revenue from the Crown Lands Department was only fifty-nine thousand dollars, which was the largest amount received in any one year from this office by our predecessors. Under the policy we adopted we received a quarter of a million dollars one year and during the past five years there was an average amount of $120,000 in the way of rentals paid annually to that Department, it will therefore be seen that Bell Island and the Crown Lands Department will provide nearly all the interest on the outlay in connection with the branch railway system. I am fully prepared to lay this matter before an independent tribunal tonight with the certainty of a favourable decision to the policy of the Government in reference to the building of those branch lines but it must be remembered that hon. members opposite can only view this matter from an opposition standpoint. All Parliaments throughout the world are divided and it is owing to the differences which exist on party-lines that this is so. The Mother of Parliaments is divided in the same way just as the Borden Party in Canada is opposed to the Laurier Party, and it is the same way with every Parliament all over the world. Those differences have always existed and will continue to exist as long as there is a diversity of opinion amongst men. I can assure hon. members opposite that I have no intention whatever of misleading the people of this country in connection with the estimates for the construction of those branch railways. The hon. member Mr. Coaker, stated last night that when I said in this House the cost of the branch lines would be four millions dollars I knew that they would cost eight million dollars. I consider that statement to be a very unfair one. The Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond had estimated on the basis of one hundred and ninety-two miles, and surely the hon. member, Mr. Coaker, was prepared to accept that statement as the hon. member at that time regarded Sir Robert Bond as the centre around which the solar system revolved. If I was astray in my estimate I was not singular in that respect. I explained at that time the basis on which I made my estimate and further the present leader of the Opposition, Mr. Kent, drew attention to the fact at that time that I did not make my estimate including the items referred to to-night. When the resolutions were before the House in 1910, Mr. Kent in his criticisms referred to the fact that no allowances were made for estimates for rolling stock, stations, snow-fences and other necessaries along the line, which would mean a difference between contract prices and those required fully to equip the line. The hon. member, Mr. Kent, at that time made it impossible for the people to be deceived in my estimate because he pointed out that items such as I have mentioned were not included. The Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond who criticised the resolutions from a financial standpoint did not make reference in his speech to the fact that I had not included those items for the simple reason that he had taken it for granted that I did not intend to include them. My estimate was only an approximate one for I was not in the possession of any plans or surveys to guide me in making up a correct one. I think therefore that on the whole we have reason to congratulate ourselves that we have done so well in securing such a good contract for the building of those branches which must open up the country to the great advantage and

benefit to our people.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that the leader of the Government has admitted that he was out in his calculations. If the rt. hon. member was out in his calculations [illegible] years ago he is absolutely out in his calculations to-night. Apparently, we are not living in the year 1914, but the clock has been put back four years and we are discussing the branch railway resolutions and not the third loan bill. We are not considering to-night whether the Premier had a mandate from the people to build these railways, for he had it four years ago. in 1910, and we are not called upon now to decide whether the contract was a good or bad one. We have it now and must abide by it. We are now considering the third loan bill and this country is called upon to pay for the branches twice as much as the people were led to believe it would cost. We were told by the Premier in his manifesto that these branch lines of railway would be built without any further taxation on the people of the country. What a commentary on that position to-day. when the Finance Minister has tabled his Budget and increased the duties by a quarter of a million dollars more than the taxes in force when the railway contract was made. The Finance Minister has not only put on the $350,000 which were taken off last year but has added another $250,000 or an amount almost equivalent to that required to pay the interest on the money necessary to build branch railways. These branches cost $15,000 a mile and actual cash expenditure today was over $5,000,000. The Prime Minister stated that the extras were not included in his estimate, but he knew those extras were required and certainly was well aware of that fact when two years afterwards he said at Burin that four million dollars would cover the entire cost of the branch railways. The Prime Minister said that members on this side of the House were a hostile court. What happened in the other chamber at that time? The leader of the Government in the Legislative Council had charge of the resolutions and stated that very careful consideration had been given to the matter and that four million dollars would be sufficient to build and equip the branch lines. The Hon. Mr. Robinson ridiculed the contention that the branch lines would cost nearer seven or eight million dollars than four millions. When the Prime Minister asked for another loan of two million dollars he stated that the amount would not only be sufficient fully to build and equip the line but that there would be a balance left over. Yes, it is true, there was a balance but it was on the wrong side of the account. We admit we have to pay all outstanding accounts in connection with this work, but it is our duty as an Opposition to criticise the action of the Government with the object of preventing them from repeating their mistakes. From the past utterances of the Prime Minister are we now justified in accepting his assurance that no more money will require to be raised for this purpose. The Government were obliged to requisition the services of the Government Engineer for the purpose of ascertaining whether the two millions now asked for will suffice to complete the work. We have a letter from Mr. Hall but that letter does not buttress up the case of the Government to the extent that this two million dollars now asked for will fully construct and equip these branch lines.

So far as I have been able to discover and I have followed the matter pretty closely, no Colony no matter how substantial has attempted during the past 12 or 14 months to put a 3½% loan upon the market. Surely

that is a matter that has occupied the attention of the Government. It is perfectly true that the financial stringency that existed almost the whole of last year has somewhat abated, but it is by no means over, and not long since the Dominion of Canada got a black eye in asking for a 4% loan. Now under these circumstances, with these matters that are naturally maters of knowledge to the Government as men who are bound to watch the markets when anything unusual occurs, why has nothing been told us as to the reasons that prompted the Government to take this extraordinary course? Surely that is more relevant to the question before us than a debate on whether we have a mandate or not, or whether the contracts are good, bad or indifferent. Now, sir, I make these criticisms and in doing so I can assure the Leader of the Government that when I refer to his remarks or his estimates I do not imply that he deliberately or wilfully deceived either this House or this country. I do not charge him with that, but I do charge him with laxity in creating an impression throughout this country—and an impression that not only went through the country but which was created in the minds of the leading members of his own administration—that this country was going to get through this contract on a loan that would entail an annual interest charge of $140,000.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks about this matter. I must first congratulate the Premier on the excellent speech which he has delivered. Now I listened to his explanation as to the first loan and as to whether the contract was a good one, and I must come to the conclusion that he has not established his case in showing that that was a good contract in every way What I do most strongly condemn is what my friend, Dr. Lloyd, has pointed out, that the country was led to believe that we were going to have five branch railways by an expenditure of four million dollars and I was one of the men who changed their politics and left Sir Robert Bond, and backed up Sir Edward Morris, because I believed we were going to get these five branch railways for that amount. The country at that time wanted some progressive policy laid before it, and Sir Edward Morris came out with this railway policy and promised these five branches for four million dollars. Then, to the astonishment of the country, it was found that this four million dollars was not enough Now they are bringing the amount up to eight millions, and no one seems to know how much more it is going to cost. That is the serious point and the point that I cannot agree with, and how a man of Sir Edward Morris's ability and with the knowledge he possesses—and he does possess a large amount both of ability and knowledge—could make such a mistake and be four million dollars out, on a four million dollar transaction is what we cannot understand. This is a point which the country and the people cannot understand. I am now speaking from the standpoint of the common men—not men like Dr. Lloyd or Mr. Kent that can argue upon the legal aspect—but the common man, the man on the street, the fisherman. The Premier said that if he was out in his estimate he was in good company as Sir Robert Bond had estimated the difference at 190 miles and Mr. Anderson at 275 miles. I never understood that Mr. Anderson was an authority on this mater, and I never knew that he was to be quoted with the authority of an expert upon railway matters or the surveys of land. He will be delighted when

he finds that he is such an important man.

Now, there is another aspect to this question, and it is this, if the people had been told that this railroad policy was going to cost eight million dollars, they would never have had anything to do with it. They were satisfied to pay four million dollars or an annual interest charge of $140,000 for these railways, but they are not satisfied to pay eight million dollars and $280,000 as an interest tax for these branches. We wanted some improvements in connection with the railway system, but there are dozens of things that we wanted worse than these branches. If this money had been used in buying these motor boats for the fishermen and in developing the fisheries, it would not be necessarry to put on this $650,000 extra taxation, because hundreds of thousands of dollars will be coming in to the revenue owing to increased imports, because of the great amount of wealth produced by our fishermen. We were satisfied to pay $4,000,000 for these railways, but we are not satisfied to pay $8,000,000, because we cannot afford it. It would have been much better to have spent this money in the development of our fishery and our agricultural and our lumbering resources which would have meant increased earnings for our people. Now, the Premier speaks of the money that he got from Bell Island as helping to pay the interest on the cost of the railways. Now, that money would have been there to add to the revenue if he had not built a mile of these railways. Now, we do not give him much credit for that money. We say that he should have got more than he did. If he had not got what he did we would say that he had no more brains than Sir Robert Bond. Now, he only got 7½ cents a ton. He might have said to the companies here is the Fishermen's Union demanding 10 cents a ton on this ore. By the next election they will have eight or ten men in the House and they will then be looking for 20 cents a ton. Now give us 15 cents a ton and we will fix the matter for you.

Now I am sorry to see that we are not getting all the money we should out of our timber lands. It appears that there is a lot outstanding still From the information tabled we find that there is $91,000 due the Crown Lands on these timber limits. I hope they will make an effort and get this in at once.

Now the Premier has stated that the wages in 1890 were 80 cents and a dollar a day, and today they are $1.50. He forgot that a man who gets $1.50 today is no better off than a man who got $1.00 in 1890. He speaks of having fixed the wages of the men working on the railway at $1.50 a day. Now as a matter of fact the contractor could not get men to work for less. Now let me tell him that the wages will not stand long at $1.50 because next year the men will get $1.60 and $1.70. as we will not let them work for less. Now, it would have been better if instead of spending this extra $4,000,000 on these railways the Premier had taken $2,000,000 of it and spent it on motor engines for the fishermen, he could have bought 15,000 motor engines, and let the fishermen pay it back on the instalment plan. Now I referred to this matter in a speech in this House earlier in the Session. Supposing each one of these men that would be provided with a motor engine were to get 20 quintals of fish extra. Look at the vast amount of fish that would be brought into the Colony. It would mean that 300,000 quintals extra would be brought in each year.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—

It would lower the price of fish about $2.00 a quintal.

MR. COAKER—It would do nothing of the kind because new markets would be found for our fish, and even today there is a greater demand for our fish than we can supply. At present the Market is clean and not a fish to be had, and in the reports which the Premier read the other night, it was pointed out that if our fish were properly marketed we would sell 500,000 quintals more in Brazil and Spain. That is quite true as I know these countries would take that fish if it were cured to suit them. If that 300 000 quintals were brought into the country it would mean $2,000,000 added to the earnings of our people. Now if the Premier knew what I know and heard what I hear about this railway business, and other matters he would be converted into our views and make the best Premier we ever had. It is too bad the way things have turned out, because I believe he is trying to do his best, and I agree with Dr. Lloyd that he did not deliberately attempt to deceive either the House or the Colony. I know he has his good points as well as his bad ones, and I believe if he were weighed in the balance we would find that the good would out weigh the bad. However, this work has been done and these contracts have been made, and the money must be raised to pay for them, and we have got to find the loan. I hope when the Prime Minister goes to London next June he may get the loan, and that he may get it for 3½ and at 95 or 96 and if does when he comes back we will pat him on the shoulder and say that after all he is a good fellow.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to make any comment upon this measure as I think it has been fully thrashed out already, and I do not know anything that I could say that would throw any more light on the subject. At the same time, Sir, before this loan Bill finally passes this Committee I would like to ascertain from the Minister in charge, if it is raised at the same figure as the last loan, will it be sufficient to cover all liabilties of every description that my arise under this contract?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes, as far as I know.

MR. CLIFT—Has the Minister taken any means to ascertain if this sum will be a sufficient sum to cover all possible contingencies or liabilities that may arise out of this coutract?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes.

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 without amendment.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting certain retiring allowances."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what the intention of the Government is in the matter of pensioning Judge Conroy.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is the intention of the Government to take that matter up at an early date.

MR. COAKER—I think the matter should be taken up by the Government at once, for there is a Retiring Allowances Bill before the House now. If the Government has not yet decided what to do in the matter it can easily be taken up and dealt with within a

day or two. The amounts that are set forth in the Bill before us seem to be very moderate. I should like to know if any of the parties named will receive the Old Age Pension.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—No.

MR. COAKER—The F. P.U. has a plank opposed to pensions of the kind now before us. There should be a system whereby those entering the Civil Service shall make certain payments and when they are old in the service, they will receive insurance based on what they have paid in. The fishermen of the Colony have a strong objection to men being put into the Civil Service for two or three years, and then retired on two thirds of their salary. I understand that the Civil Servants named on the list before us, have all been in the service for a number of years, and I have no objection to men who have worked hard in the service receiving a few dollars in their old age. I notice a sum of $534 for Thomas Morris, and I understand that he has no desire to be pensioned.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—He applied for a pension two years ago.

MR. COAKER—I have heard that he has no wish now to be pensioned, and if that is so, and he can do his work well, I do not see why he should be pensioned. I should particularly like the Government to make up their minds about Judge Conroy's position. I would very much like to see my hon. friend, Mr. Morris, in that position.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, before the statement of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, I thought this Bill would go through without remark. However, I wish to offer a strong protest against the attitude of the Government as disclosed by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, in the matter of Judge Conroy's retirement. We are told that it is the intention of the Government to take up the question of his pension at the earliest opportunity. That is a direct insult to this House. It may not be meant, but it is none the less an insult. This House is the proper place to deal with salaries and pensions, and it is not for the Government to tell this House while it is in session that they will go into the question of pensions when the House closes.

There are matters of urgency which demand the attention of the Government when the House is not sitting, but it is not so in this case. For over two years the condition of Judge Conroy's health has been well known. It is an unfortunate fact that he has been in poor health. In the face of this, it is an insult to this House to be told that the matter of his pension will be taken up when the House closes.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with my hon. friend, that, if it had been decided to give Judge Conroy a pension, now is the proper time to take it up There has been no decision arrived at and as a matter of fact there will be correspondence on the matter, and the whole question will have to be discussed. When a decision is arrived at, we shall come in here and have it ratified. That is the universal practice, and my hon. friend will see that we cannot put it in the Bill when there has been no decision in the matter.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the point I am referring to The matter has been before the Government for the past two years, and there has been ample time for all correspondence to be over long ago. It is common knowledge that Judge Conroy came here last time to see about his pension, and yet we are now in session, and there seems to have been nothing decided in the matter.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—When Judge Conroy was last here he did not make any reference whatever to the matter.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to be perfectly clear that a man who has not been able to do his work for the past two years ought to be pensioned. The office is a most important one, and somebody ought to be appointed to it. Every day there is new work to be done, and, although I have no doubt that Judge Knight does his work in a satisfactory way, he cannot be expected to do the work of two men. That is not fair to him nor is it fair to the country. Let the Government have the pluck to deal with the matter as it should be dealt with. Why do they not give it to the hon. member for Placentia, who has been looking for the position for the past five or ten years. He is growing old and he has been in the political world for the past twenty five years. He is a very nice man, too. I only wish his brother was as nice to us as he has been. The Government need not fear opposition from us in Placentia Bay, and we should all like to see my hon. friend made 'His Honor.'

MR. MORRIS—I must thank my hon. friend for his kind remarks.

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 without amendment.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

INSPECTION OF FOODS BILL.

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 relating to the Inspection of Foods in the City of St. John's" with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion, the Council's amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the information asked for by my hon. friend, Mr. Kent, concerning outport telegraphs. These are original documents, and I would ask that they be left in the custody of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. Abbott gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Jennings gave Notice of Question.

DR. LLOYD—I should like to know from the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, what is the present position of the Labrador Boundary dispute.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to answering the question put by my learned friend. The position is that for the past four years we have been negotiating with the Canadian Government as to the terms of the reference to be submitted to the Privy Council. The solicitors in England for the Government, and the solicitors for Canada have been unable to agree so far as to the exact question to be put to the Privy Council. We have put forward what we are told is the correct question but the Canadian Government does not agree with our question. On that point negotiations are still going on.

As a matter of fact, we are advised that the proper question to ask the Privy Council is, 'What is the boundary between the two countries?' They wish us to agree to ask the Tribunal to find a boundary; in other words, to make or draw a boundary. We believe we have a good case. That is the position as it stands at present.

DR. LLOYD—I am much obliged to

my rt. hon. friend for the information.

Mr. Halfyard gave Notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded, that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrrow, Friday, February 27th at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, Feb. 27th.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Codroy who are badly in need of a road. I trust that the Government will give this every consideration.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of North Arm, Holyrood. The petitioners desire that a sum of money be granted to construct a public wharf. The petition is largely signed. This wharf has been much damaged by the late storms. I trust that this matter will receive a certain amount from the funds voted by the Legislature. The people of that place are very industrious. This is very necessary to enable them to carry on their business. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. G. KENNEDY—Mr. Speaker, I heartily support that petition.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from W. B. Temple and others of Twillingate, asking for a sum of money to repair the wharf at Jones's Cove. This is the wharf from which the ferry sails and it is in a bad state of repair. If something is not done, the wharf will be washed away. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and I hope the request of the petitioners will be granted at an early date.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my hon. colleague. I also ask leave to present a petition from the people of Moreton's Harbour and vicinity asking for the sum of $600 to build a public wharf at that place. The petition is largely signed and the wharf is very badly needed as there is no public wharf there. I also ask leave to present a petition from the people of a small settlement, called Western Head. They ask for the sum of sixty dollars to build a branch road from the main line. I have much pleasure in supporting both these petitions, and ask that they be referred to their proper departments.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I have been entrusted with a number of petitions from the residents of the city of St. John's, within the Municipal limits. The petitioners number 1559 in all, and I understand that there will be also presented here other petitions, containing in all with this, at least 3,000 signatures. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read the petition. (Petition was read.)

It is nedless for me to point out that when a petition of that class, so largely signed and dealing with such an important matter, is presented to this House, it is certain that the petitioners will find here a friendly and sympathetic audience. Nobody can live in the city and know of its condition without being able to endorse what the petitioners say, nor is the condition, to which they refer, confined to the back streets and lanes. It is with regret that we have to admit that very often in the most

important localities we can see very filthy conditions existing. All sorts of garbage are thrown out and at the present time there are piles of snow black with dirt, that make these places look very filthy. There is no need for me to describe the conditions for they are well known to all of us, and it is needless also to point out that this filth must have a very bad effect on the health of the people who are compelled to come in contact with it. It will serve no purpose now to enter into a discussion as to who is to be blamed for this condition of affairs, and I submit that it would be unfair to attribute it to either the present or past Councils. They have done their very best according to the means at their disposal, to remedy the conditions, but they have been hampered by the fact that the funds that have been at their disposal have not been sufficient to enable them to do all that they wished to do. What are the real grievances in the city today? What do we suffer from as shareholders or partners? That is the way we must look at the matter for we are a corporation, and every citizen is a shareholder. We have been taxed for the past fifty years and those before us, and the city has to show for this various civic properties and utilities and services. The question that we have to ask ourselves is this. Are the present conditions what we desire them to be? Are our services up to date? Can the citizens approve of the manner in which these services are carried out? The answers to these questions must be unfavorable for, if not, we should not have had the late movement on the part of the citizens, and these petitions would not have been presented. It is unnecessary for me to go into the arguments of those who are not satisfied with the present state of affairs in the city, because hon. members have had them on many occasions. The movement which was inaugurated a very short time ago has received much support by the citizens meeting held in the city a short time ago, a very capable and representative committee was appointed. That committee has been largely responsible for the present petition, and such a representative body would not have approached the House unless they felt sure that there was a good and sufficient reason for their doing so What are the grievances that the people have? In the first place the water supply is defective and we ought to know why it is. Only last autumn, for instance, there was serious complaint about the quality of the water supplied, and today there is no water in many parts of the city, and there has been none for the past fortnight. Then, take our sewerage system. We have twenty or thirty carts going through the city every night, collecting soil and this soil is afterwards dumped out in the country under conditions that ought not to exist The tub system ought to be discontinued. Tubs are now put out, and you can go along the most important streets and see all kinds of receptacles used by citizens from barrels to old silk hats. Such a state of affairs should not exist. Then there is the present system of repairing roads, which can easily be improved upon. What is put on the roads today is washed off tomorrow, and this has been going on for a long time. In fact, there is not a department in our city service that does not require immediate attention and reform. It is a matter for congratulation that the citizens themselves are beginning to take a deeper interest in civic affairs. I only hope that this interest will continue to increase. I remember when in 1888 the Municipal Council

was started, the very people who are now behind this movement were against the inauguration of the Council, because they thought they would be taxed out of existence. Previous to 1888 civic affairs were under the control of the Board of Works, and matters were even worse then. The different councils from 1888 up to the present time have done good work, and there have been many improvements made in the different departments.

In 1898 there was a change in the form of government of the city, and the Council was suspended, and three gentlemen were appointed to take charge of the city's affairs. There was considerable objection to this, and I think it was well founded, for I do not agree with the taking away of the franchise of the people unless they themselves ask for it. They have the right to elect their own Council, and it is only in a case like the present, when no less than three thousand citizens voluntarily ask for it, that it can be entertained.

We may assume that, if three thousand rate payers have signed their names, there are many others who would have done so had an opportunity been given them. We may take it for granted, therefore, that the great body of the citizens of St. Johns are in favor of these petitions. I do not wish to delay the House by going into any details but I have looked up several facts and figures dealing with the matter, and these may be of assistance to hon. members in coming to a decision on the matter. The election of the present Council took place on June 27th 1910, and in the ordinary course of events they will go out of office on June 27th next. At that election there were 3192 voters and twelve candidates, six being elected and six defeated. Mr. Ellis, who had been a member of the former Council, was elected Mayor by acclamation. In the previous election, the Hon. Mr. Gibbs had been elected Mayor, polling 2,000 against 1,000 polled by Mr. George Shea, the first mayor of the city, and 400, polled by Hon. John Anderson. On that occasion 3,600 voters went to the polls. I have not with me the total number of voters in the city, but I should suppose that there are between four and five thousand, perhaps more. In view, therefore, of the large percentage of the citizens who have signed these petitions, I feel sure that every consideration will be given by this House to the prayer of the petition. There has been a misunderstanding in many places in relation to the effect of the granting of the prayer of the petition. Many people, for instance, think that the persons appointed will have the power to increase taxation. They have not asked for this power, nor would it be right to grant it to them. The present Council will go out in June, and, unless something is done in the meantime by this Legislature, a similar body will then be elected. The petitioners ask that instead of an election being held it be suspended for a year or so in order that ten or twelve citizens who are prepared to give their services free, may have an opportunity of taking up the civic problems and seeing if conditions can be improved. The citizens who are prepared to do this are men who are keenly interested in civic affairs, and it stands to reason that they will be able to make a report on the affairs of the city in a very independent and no doubt, satisfactory manner. We are told that there is a very large amount of money owed the city for rates and taxes, that have not been collected. I do not know what the amount is, but it has been estimated by competent authorities between

$50,000 and $90,000. These men will consider what is the best means to adopt to collect these arrears. We all know that when men are elected at the polls it is not always easy to deal with these matters, for they are elected for a short term only and perhaps to perform a specific work. If the prayer of the petitioners is granted a great deal will depend on the men who are appointed to take up the matter. They ask that twelve men be appointed by the Governor in Council. Personally, I think that, in the event of the prayer of the petition being acceded to, these twelve men should be selected at a proper meeting held in the city. At that meeting the rate payers could nominate the best possible men, and then their names could be submitted for appointment. Perhaps it would be considered more advisable if the twelve men were selected by the fifty gentlemen who were appointed a committee at the recent public meeting. The great object is. of course, to obtain the services of the very best men possible, and I hope this end will be attained, for I regard this movement as a hopeful sign of new interest being taken by the citizens of the city in municipal affairs. I can only hope that this petition to the Legislature will result in some good, and that a year from now we shall see a very great improvement in the various departments of the civic affairs of St. John's.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I have also to ask leave to present a number of petitions, which are similar to those which have just been presented by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, it might be well to consider them with those which my rt. hon. friend has presented, rather than to adopt the usual procedure, which is to present them one after the other. I shall ask the House, therefore, kindly to consider them all, at the same time. I may say that the petitions which I hold have been forwarded to me through the central or executive committee of citizens to which my rt. hon. friend has referred, and that they are signed by 1422 citizens. These petitioners added to those who have signed the petitions presented by the rt. hon. the Prime Minister, will bring the total number up to about three thousand citizens. It is unnecessary for me to refer at any length to the facts and conditions set forth in the petition upon which the prayer of the petitioners is based. The petition has been read and hon. members know of their own knowledge that the conditions set forth are only too true. These problems before us are problems that for some time have been demanding the attention of the citizens of St. John's, and the present movement which was inaugurated a few weeks ago under Mr. W. G. Gosling, the then President of the Board of Trade, is a genuine movement. The citizens associated with the movement are thoroughly sincere and have a single purpose in view, namely, the betterment of the city. There is no doubt in the minds of any of our citizens that the conditions of St. Johns, with all its facilities, have not been what we desire. Everybody complains of the conditions, and every citizen is dissatisfied with matters as they are now. Why is this? It is not for the lack of men capable of undertaking the work of improving conditions, but the fault is in the system that now prevails. All the questions in the petitions can be dealt with and should be dealt with.

Our sanitary system is defective. Many streets have no good water service, and even in those streets where there is a water supply many houses

are not connected with it or with the sewerage These are problems which I don't think our present system of Council Government can satisfactorily solve. The object of the petitioners is to go into matters thoroughly and find out what system will best suit our needs. At present the City Council is not a Municipal Government in the proper sense of the word; it is simply a Board of administrators who administer the affairs of the city.

The legislation for the city is done here. Now the question is what is the remedy for all these defects? Is it that proposed by the petitioners? They propose that a number of citizens should administer the affairs of the city, and devise a better system of government for the city. It is a question as to whether the best method of arriving at a system of government is to have these two objects at the same time in the hands of the same body. The administration of the affairs of the city would as now, demand quite a deal of attention at the hands of the citizens who undertake the work. The devising of some means of Municipal Government is a large undertaking in itself. I hardly think that the attempt to combine the two functions in one body will prove successful. I think, Mr. Speaker that the petitions which are before us ought to receive the most serious consideration of the House. We ought to consider whether we will hand over the administration of the affairs of the city to a Committee which will at the same time have to investigate and consider what changes should be made. The administration of the affairs of the city is probably one of the most serious matters for the citizens of St. John's. The prominent citizens who are members of the Citizens' Committee evidently think that the joining of the administration of the affairs and the devising of a system of government in the same body is the best way. The petitioners expressly ask that the elections which would take place in June be postponed for one year. They simply ask that the Committee take over the powers of the present Council and run the administration for a year. This Committee will then go out of existence and the new Board will take its place. As to the manner in which these members would be nominated, whether by the choice of the Governor in Council, or by a public meeting of citizens, is a matter of detail which would be worked out in the Legislature.

As I said, I have some doubt as to whether it would be wise to give this Committee two duties, that of governing the city, and that of investigation. I am inclined to the opinion that it would be better to continue the present Council for another year for the former purpose, and give the Committee every facility for the investigation of municipal affairs. However, I have an open mind in the question. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that these petitions be taken into consideration at the same time as those presented by the Prime Minister.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in endorsing the sentiments expressed in relation to the petitions before the House, and I give them my conscientious and earnest support. All citizens know that for the past eight or ten years the City Council has been criticised and blamed for a great many things that they are not really responsible for. I was a member of the City Council for four years from 1900 to 1904 and I know a great deal about the difficulties with which the City Council has to contend. I take it that this petition is in no way a condemnation or criticism of

the present Council or of their predecessors.

I am glad, Sir, that the gentlemen who have been instrumental in bringing forward this movement are at last aware of their responsibility. Of late years very few of our more prominent and wealthy citizens have taken an interest in the Municipal Elections Often they do not even go to the Polls, and give their vote. I heartily welcome this movement, for I believe that a great deal can be done and I believe that a great deal will now be done. I take it that the present Council will go out in June, and I think that some of the retiring Councillors should be on this Commission. I think it desirable to have some persons whose knowledge and experience would be of great service. It is at once evident that a great interest is now being taken in this movement. Some 3,000 persons have signed the petitions and have done so willingly. This is a very large percentage of those who voted at the last elections and forms over half of the eligible voters.

I think that it would be desirable that the Commissioners be nominated by the citizens and not by the Governor-in-Council.

I don't think that it would be unwise to place the Committee in charge of affairs for one year, and thus let others get an insight into the Civic Government at first hand. Much harm cannot result from such a course and it is very probable that much good will be the outcome. It cannot be disputed that we are less taxed than other towns of our size. I believe that the majority of citizens would readily suffer a small increase in taxation, in order that the conditions now existing might be improved.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I give the petitions my sincere support and trust that they will be favorably considered by the House..

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few observations in connection with the petitions. These petitions are signed by some 3,000 peope and it is the object of the promoters of these petitions to take measures for the improvement of the Civic Government of this city. It is proposed that these Commissioners should take charge of affairs for one year and should during that time enquire into the best methods for the improvement of the present conditions. One of the first questions to be considered would be that of the water supply. If we appoint a new commission, we cannot be certain that its members will be acquainted with the requirements for a satisfactory water supply. We cannot expect the present Council or any other council to bring about reforms, if we do not supply them with the necessary funds. The Councils in the past have been handicapped through lack of funds and the same applies to the present Council. I have every faith in the present Mayor and Council, and I am confident that if they had the money at their disposal they would do much to improve the present state of affairs It is no use to formulate a scheme and take a plebiscite of citizens upon it, for most of them will regret it. The place to move in these matters is here in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is merely a question of funds and that the present Council is quite capable of doing good work, if they had the money. As a matter of fact we pay no taxation. We pay a water tax, but that is all. And while I have no objection to the petition, going to the Governor-in-Council for consideration, I am strongly of opinion that no matter what the outcome is we will be up against the position that money will

have to be expended for the improvement of the water service and other purposes, and that money can only be obtained by imposing some further or new taxation on the people. The last speaker referred to the efforts of the previous Municipal Council and the manner in which they were criticised. I have every sympathy for him and them because I know that they had a great deal to contend with. However Municipal Councils have one consolation and that is that they are not the only Council in the world that has been subjected to unfair criticism for we find Councils in every city in every country, suffering the same hardships and I have known people unfair enough to criticise the conduct of Government and of members of the House of Assembly.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr Speaker, I wish to give my unqualified support, a support without any reservation, to the petitions presented by the Premier and my colleague the leader of the Opposition. I do so because I feel that they are the expressed wish of the people of St. John's and because the object which they have is one that deserves support. A reference has been made to the fact that the petitions are signed by some three thousand people and it has been suggested that the number is not sufficiently large to be called a majority, Considering the number of voters in the districts, I do not think that in recent years there has come before the House a petition that could with more truth be called a strictly representative one, than the one to-day before us, and no stronger confirmation of this can be had than the figures quoted by the Premier. The petition here to-day is signed by a number of people totalling the actual number who vote in the Municipal Elections, When you consider the fact that these signatures were not directly asked for, when you consider that unlike other petitions these were not hawked round the streets—in the hope of getting signatures of all and sundry, when you realise that each signature is a voluntary testimony of support of the prayer of the petition, we must recognise that we are dealing with an uprising in the public spirit of the people of St. John's. Three thousand voters do not petition this Legislature without cause and that a cause exists has been shown by the two hon. members who presented these petitions. There is no doubt of the necessity for some radical change, there is no doubt that that change cannot leave us in a worse position than we are at present. There is no doubt that those who have voluntarily offered their services to push forward this movement and to take charge of the city's affairs for months without reward, merely for the purpose of consideration of this House deserve every support. I do not think, sir, that we should consider the objection referred to by my colleague, Mr. Kent, as being spoken of in the street, namely that by granting the prayer of the petition we will disfranchise the people of St. John's. We have received a mandate from the people of St. John's to disfranchise them at their own wish and even then this disfranchisement is only temporary.

We have been told over and over again that the one failing in this community has been apathy and lack of public spirit and that despite complaints of conditions around us, there has been no public sentiment to carry out reform and as far as my knowledge goes this is the first time that the legislature has been asked to do anything in this direction. And in my opinion we would make a great error, an error that we would later heartily regret if we allowed these petitions to be presented without tak-

ing some action upon them. That objections will be raised is beyond doubt Even the petitioners and prime movers themselves recognise this and they ask for no powers beyond those now exercised by the Council, and ask for these powers merely for the purpose of looking into the condition of affairs and suggesting reforms. And at the end of their year of office we can at worst go back to the old conditions.

There is just one other position that I would like to put forward and it is this:—We have numerous duties. they rest upon us as a legislature and as individual members of it, and one of the most important to my mind is the upholding and when necessary uplifting of public opinion. As I said before as a public we have been accused of being apathetic. We are to inclined to say "Well it is none of my business' and I say that as members of this legislature we must throw off this apathy and hold out a hand of encouragement to every endeavour to uplift and uphold a good wholesome public opinion I say therefore let us give these petitions our unanimous support, give this movement every opportunity, and even if no concrete form of change takes place in our municipal government as a result of it, we will at least be better by having stirred public sentiment in St. John's in the right direction.

MR. KENNEDY—Mr. Speaker, I do do not wish to detain the House very long on this subject, but I have a very few words to say. I think as a representative of the city, and one who has spent two terms in the City Council. I have a right to speak on this subject. We all know the trials and troubles that the present and past Councils have had to contend with. And Councils despite these troubles and trials have done some good reforms. I remember twelve years ago, when I went into the Council, my hon. friend Mr. Bennett was there, and the first work we undertook was the bringing in of the second water supply so that the people in St. John's to-day are using twice as much water as in other cities. We have a very good water supply. In regard to that great nuisance, the dust nuisance, I contend that the Council has done very good work. We must always have some mud. We are built on the side of a hill and the dust from the higher levels is bound to be blown over the hill, and rest on the lower parts of the town. But the Council has done everything within its means to cope with the nuisance. They have to contend with the same thing in the cities of Canada and the States. In regard to the petition I think that it is a good sign of the times to see men of the class that are now petitioning the House, taking an active interest in civic affairs. Ordinarily in the past they took no interest whatever in them, but when the time for appraising came round we found them going up to underrate their property. But they now ask for a chance to examine into the condition of affairs and see how they are being carried out. They are supported by a petition of 3,000 people taken from a list of 5060 and such a petition deserves the gravest consideration from this House. I give it my support and I hope that twelve months from now they will be able to bring in a measure and that I will be able to support that measure as coming from the citizens committee.

MR. DWYER—Mr. Speaker, I am in entire accord with this petition. I have had a fair amount of experience having lived in St. John's and seen all the Councils at work for the past 20 years. The really unfortunate part has been that the Council has never had any power or authority to carry out good and effective work. There

is always some work requiring to be done or some men doing work and they do it as they like because there is no proper supervision over the work and the mistakeable character of the work shows in the end. The other day we had a fire of series proportions. There was no water and it was only a few years ago thousands of dollars were spent bringing a new water supply from Windsor Lake through the Freshwater Valley and there was not enough pressure to go over the place when the fire occurred. The reason of this is that the Council does not see the work carried out right. Unfortunately that was an expensive work and when it was finished it cost as much again to put it right. That is my experience I am not blaming the Government or the Council. It is just the unfortunate way that the business is done. Besides these men do not devote their whole time to Council work. Then again they are very poorly paid, in money, though in abuse they have probably got more than they can bear. They are working practically for nothing and are abused every time they do anything that does not meet with public approval.

Now this Citizens Committee has been formed and is undoubtedly doing good work and I say there is plenty of room for improvement. It is a good thing to have practical men to look into affairs and carry out reforms. They will probably go further than the poor unfortunate councils could have done in the past. Because I do not think the Council had enough power to remedy the evils that were there. I hope the new Council will have my support and if they need advice they can have it from an old man at any time.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to lose this opportunity of giving this petition my hearty support. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. premier and Mr. Bennett on the subject of the petition, and I think they have covered the subject pretty thoroughly. I have no doubt that the ultimate outcome of this movement will be that we shall have to pay more taxes and as far as I am concerned I am perfectly satisfied to do it. I think we have a duty to perform towards the city and more particularly towards the children. At one time I lived in a part of the city, and in order to get to Water Street, I had to pass through some very filthy streets In the summer time they reeked with stench and disease. The children were dirty, their faces were covered with dirt from the gutter, dust and grime. so that they could not possibly be healthy. These children have a very hard fight for their lives. Now in regard to taxes, as one of the members has said there is no taxation paid in this city as compared with other cities. We pay a water tax for which we get water, but we pay no tax on property and one of the most important matters that should be attended to is our water supply. We have not a good enough supply for the city and that matter should be taken up at once.

When we look at the list of names of those who form the committee we find men of intelligence and credit and if the commission of twelve is drawn from these men, their work will be for the benefit of the city. This petition has my hearty support.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, with regard to the matter before the chair, I don't want to interfere with anything that you wish to do in St. John's, but there is one aspect of the matter that I would like to refer to, and that is if you appoint a Board of Commissioners to take charge of the

city for a year, it is useless to think that that Board is going to be in office for a year and then come back and tell you that they can carry on the affairs of the town without increased taxation. You will have to make up your minds that if you want a better town and a cleaner town that you will have to pay for it. The present Council has not sufficient power. If you are going to do anything at all do the right thing, and that is, give the town a full measure of incorporation. Let the people have complete charge of their own affairs, except as regards the raising of loans. Let them come here for any loans that they may want to get. We have been asking for the last four years for a full measure of Elective Road Boards for the outports, and it might seem rather a peculiar position for us to support a measure that would tend to take away from the city the right to an elected Municipal Council while at the same time we are protesting against the appointment by the Government of Boards to take charge of matters in the outports. Now, I very much doubt whether the Citizens' Committee, if they are given the power asked for in those petitions, are going to do what they wish to do. They will be taking too much upon themselves. If the citizens were to come before us asking for a Committee to be appointed to thoroughly investigate present conditions during the coming months, and then at the next session present resolutions dealing with the future government of the city it would be alright; but to have to do that and at the same time govern the city, is, I think, too much to expect. They are all busy men and they won't be able to give the time necessary to this work. Personally, I know what it means to my work to have to come here every afternoon for the last five or six weeks, and every one of the men whose names are on that Committee is just as busy as I am. They will find that it will be too much to govern the city and at the same time enquire into conditions and draft resolutions to lay before us next session.

Another thing that should be taken into consideration is the matter of the taxing of absentee landlords. Thousands of dollars go across the water every year to people who have property here, and we should get after these people and get from them some of the money which we need for the improvement of the city. They have for years been drawing large incomes from their properties here, and it would not be unreasonable to ask them for a fair proportion of those incomes for the needs of the city.

Now, I don't intend to delay the House any longer. I did not intend to speak at all,but so many members have spoken, some of them not representatives of St John's, that I thought it might not be out of place to give an expression of opinion from the Back Row.

QUESTIONS.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the amount of local, main line and special grants sent to Whitbourne Road Board from 1909 to 1913, both years inclusive.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS—That statement is being prepared.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House copies of returns of the amounts of $50 and $200 issued by his department to Allan Brown, Amherst Cove, and George Mifflin, Middle Amherst Cove, in the fall of 1913.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS—That statement is also being prepared.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the

table of the House a copy of returns of expenditure of an allocation of $50 made on January 12th, 1913, to Robert Boone, of Lewisporte, for repairs to winter mail route between Campbellton and Comfort Cove.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS—I hope to have that information for the next sitting of the House.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing (a) what amount of duties were paid upon liquors during the last six weeks; (b) what amount of customs and excise duty was paid upon tobacco during the last six weeks.

HON. MIN. FINANCE & CUSTOMS —That statement is being prepared I hope to have it for the next sitting.

SUNDRY THIRD READINGS.

Pursuant to order the Bills entitled:—"An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act"; "An Act in amendment of the Crown Lands Act respecting Saw Mills"; "An Act respecting the sale of Debenture Bonds for the Public Service of the Colony"; "An Act respecting the raising of a sum of money by loan for the extension of the Railway System of the Colony"; and "An Act to provide certain Retiring Allowances"; 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 mesage requesting the concurrence of that body in their provisions

SUPPLY RESOLUTION.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported a Resolution which was read a first time as follows:

Additional Estimates $94,400

The said Resolution being read a second time, it was moved that the House concur with the Committee therein; and the said Resolution was agreed to.

Second reading of Council's amendment to INSPECTION OF FOODS BILL.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I desire to explain to the House the effect of these amendments. They are not of a serious character. The first is in the first section. It gives the officer power to enter a premises and inspect, in addition to the articles named by us in the Bill, any other articles. The words "or any other articles" are added to that section. The next amendment is in sub-section 2 of section 1, in which they have also inserted the words "or other articles." In section 2 there is a slight verbal alteration. In section 6 the word "Fish" has been eliminated. I take it that the object the Council had in removing that was so that the conveyance of codfish through the streets on carts would not be embraced. In section 7, sub-section 1, the word "reasonable" is inserted. There can be no objection to that

The latter part of sub-section 2 of section 7 has been amended to read as follows:—"All butchers or persons engaged in the handling or sale of meat shall wear clean aprons or overalls. Spitting, except in a suitable receptacle provided for the purpose, is strictly prohibited about such premises."

In sub-section 6 of section 8—"No person shall smoke in any workroom or room in which food is stored, nor shall any person spit on the floors"—the Council have added the words: "No person shall spit about the premises, except in a suitable receptacle provided for the purpose."

The next amendment is in section 13, in which the words "not exceeding" have been inserted after the word "Penalty"; and in the fourth line the words "taking or" have been added so that it will read "Any person taking or purchasing any article.'

Section 14 is amended to read 'or in default of payment imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month."

Section 15 is amended by striking out the words in the fourth line: 'Stated in section 1 of this Act.'

In section 16 the words 'seven days' are inserted in the fourth line.

It seems to me that all these amendments are reasonable and I do not see any objection to any of them.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up from this House, entitled: 'An Act relating to the Inspection of Foods in the City of St. John's' 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.

PARTRIDGE BERRIES AND PROTECTION OF ANIMALS BILLS.

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: 'An Act for the Protection of the Growth of Partridge Berries' and 'An Act to amend and consolidate the Law for the Protection of Animals' with certain amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the Council's amendment was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

EXPLOSIVES BILL.

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 amend Chapters 40 and 41 of the Consolidated Statutes (second series) respecting the Storage and Carrying of Gunpowder and other Explosives' with certain amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the Council's amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

TRAIN FERRY RESOLUTION.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the construction of a railway across the Isthmus of Avalon; also for the construction of a railroad from Hummer Mouth, Bay of Islands, to Southwest Arm, Notre Dame Bay.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, I beg to move these Resolutions. In doing so I may say that the promoter of this is Mr. Thompson, who was identified with the introduction in 1905 or 1906 of a measure in relation to the establishment of a fast line across the Atlantic. He has been most industrious since then in the exploiting of that undertaking, but unfortunately he has not been able to succeed in enlisting capital in its support, and the rights and privileges granted him on that occasion have lapsed and no longer exist. This is an application for the right to build a railroad in much the same country—across to Bay of Islands from Green Bay, and the establishment of a ferry service to Cape Breton; also to build a short piece of railway across the Isthmus of Avalon from Rantem or such other point in Trinity Bay as may be found desirable, to Little Southern Harbor in Placentia Bay. There is some correspondence in relation to this matter, upon which this application is based. I had hoped to have had it printed

so that it could be laid before the Committee, and the reason the moving of this Resolution was deferred until this late hour was in the hope that it would have been ready, but it has not yet come up. The correspondence includes the letters from Mr. Thompson to the Government in relation to the granting of the right of way. It will be seen by reference to the Memorandum of Association of the Newfoundland Railway and Train-ferry Syndicate, Limited, (which I propose to table) incorporated on the 19th December, 1913, what the objects of this Company are.

These letters are being printed and will be laid before the Committee so that every hon. member will have an opportunity of discussing the resolution in every detail. The concessions asked for are very few, namely a right of way, sufficent lands for factories. stores and terminal facilities They also ask for the admission of machinery and other articles free of duty, as set forth in the resolutions. This concession has been given to other Companies who unfortunately did not carry out their contracts. If ever this Train Ferry Syndicate comes out here and develops the fishing industry as contemplated, I think this Colony will be well repaid for the concessions asked for and the term of twenty years mentioned in the foregoing section is not an excessive one.

This concession will of course,not be given unless the Company proceeds with the construction of the works which will entail the expenditure of a large amount of money. I have no doubt that many hon. members were present the other evening when Mr. Thompson delivered a very interesting and instructive lecture in the Seamen's Institute on the subject of this train-ferry project. That lecture has since been published in the daily papers. In view of the many changes which are taking place in transportation all over the world it is very difficult to say in what manner, and to what extent this project may develop. Mr. Thompson has associated with him in this scheme a number of notable men, one of whom is a Mr. Malcolm Smyth, who is very largely interested in the fishery business in Scotland. I understand that he is the owner of sixty or seventy large steam trawlers. I trust that the undertaking will be successful and the efforts of Mr. Thompson rewarded. I shall have the correspondence tabled, so that the Committee may have full information on the subject. I beg to move the Resolutions.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted, and the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill respecting Municipal Affairs.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, March 2nd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 2nd, 1914.

The House met at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

PETITIONS.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present some petitions, similar to those presented on Friday last, from the citizens of St. John's, concerning Municipal Affairs, and I would ask that they be referred to the Department to which they relate.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Thos.

Glavine and other residents of Bishop's Falls. The petitioners ask that a sum of $400 be granted for the construction of a road, to pass in front of blocks of land now built upon. This road would directly benefit eighteen families, who, at present, are unable to get from one place to another except over bog and water. The petition is signed by a large number of the residents of that settlement, which is a new settlement, where there is a very large industry. The people feel the great necessity of roads, for very little has been expended. This connecting road would be a great convenience to the people of the place. I trust that the Minister of Public Works will give this matter special attention. I now ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to support the petition presented by Mr. Clift.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the residents of Old Bonaventure on the subject of a road, and from the inhabitants of Sibley's Cove, members of the F.P.U., concerning the spending of local moneys by Elective Road Boards. Also that sums of money be granted for the construction of a breakwater there. I ask that these be referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a batch of petitions dealing with different subjects, some for telephonic connection and others for other things. It would take too long to go into details, but I think that similar petitions were presented last year. I don't know whether or not they were approved by the Government. I pass them over to the Department to which they relate, and trust they will be favorably considered.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support these petitions. I think it must be gratifying to everybody that these districts are beginning to show an interest in their public affairs.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Point La Haye asking that a fog alarm be placed at the point there I may say, Sir, that there is a small lighthouse at that point, but during the last fifteen years, ever since it was erected, there has been complaint not only from the fishermen in that vicinity, but also from the fishermen in Placentia and Fortune Bays. There have been repeated complaints because of the inefficiency of the lighthouse. Numberless requests have come to me not only from my own district, but from various districts on the West Coast. They asked that I would endeavour to place before the Government the great necesity of putting a fog-alarm at Point La Haye. Four years ago I presented a petition with the same number of names from St. Mary's Bay, asking for a fog-alarm. I regret that the Government thought it was not of sufficient importance to place an alarm there, although they have erected seventy-two light-houses and fog-alarms during the last few years. I trust now, Sir, that the Government will take into serious consideration the subject matter of this petition and will act promptly in relation to it. I have much pleasure in giving my hearty support to the petition and I trust that in twelve months at least there will be no necessity for the fishermen of Placentia, Burin or Fortune Bay to send in a complaint regarding such an important matter. I would ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and be favorably considered.

MR. F. J. MORRIS.—Mr. Chairman. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my colleague. I second all the observations of my learned friend and agree with him. This alarm would be valuable. But I am inclined to think that if we can-

not have both, it is more necessary to place a light on Colinet Island than to establish this fog alarm.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say one or two words in reference to this petition. I know that the light-house on Colinet Island is a very necessary thing. There are not half enough light-houses around our coast. There is also a great necessity for the placing of a fog-alarm at Point La Haye. I don't think the Government would hesitate over the expenditure of seven or eight thousand dollars for the erection of such a fog alarm. There are many times when a light house is of very little use to this particular section where there is very shallow water and very dangerous shoals. All our fishermen come from St. Mary's Bay and Placentia Bay and resort to these grounds, more so in the Fall of the year. I don't see why we could not have both a lighthouse on Colinet Island and a fog-alarm at Point La Haye. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. LeFEUVRE.—Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in supporting this. I think it would be a great boon to the fishermen if they had the fog-alarm at Point La Haye.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to present a number of petitions from Bonavista Bay, regarding a number of matters in the district generally. The petitions ask that telephonic connection be made and that roads be made connecting various places with the railway station . In Bonavista, there are several places which are miles away from the railway, and a good connecting road would prove of great benefit to the people of these places and would be also the means of adding trade to the railway. At Keels, which is a large fishing centre, they want a money order office, telegraphic connection and other things. Other petitions deal with the erection of wharves. The people of St. Brendan's ask that it be made a port of call for the S.S. Prospero. More of the petitions deal with the erection of lights and beacons and I trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will look into them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have delayed the House in this matter; but I think that a little money spent in the district of Bonavista would do an immense amount of good, and I hope that the petitions will be favorably considered.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petitions presented by Mr. Coaker. Most of these petitions do not ask for a big outlay of money. I think the Government should pay attention to them, and I hope that they will be granted.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Bay de Verde district. It is largely signed and asks for different sums of money for the public service, and also in relation to the prevention of inshore trawling on the Labrador. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this matter should have the attention of the Government. Another matter they ask for is that the Labrador steamer call at Western Bay, to carry the fishermen from there to the Labrador. They have no communication by steamer unless they go to Carbonear or Hr. Grace. I would ask the Government to take the matter into consideration.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I support the first clause in that petition, that is in connection with trawlers. I have heard a great deal of dissatisfaction in regard to that industry. It is only of late years that bankers have gone down there setting their trawls, and they do considerable damage to the fishery down there. I have heard many complaints about it and I think it requires very careful investigation.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, some years ago the

whole of Conception Bay petitioned the late Government asking them to amend the Act then in force about trawling on Labrador It was the law then that vessels could trawl from Aug. 15th if they wished. The late Government refused to accede to the request. When the Government came into power these petitions were renewed and the question came before the Fisheries Board. Some of the petitions asked us to prohibit trawling altogether by bankers from that part of the coast. The matter was thoroughly discussed by the Board and we thought it would be a little too much to preserve the fishery for one part of the coast alone and to keep the Western fishermen from there altogether. We therefore amended the law and said that there were to be no trawls set from Double Island and Cape Harrison until Sept. 15th. It is a well-known fact that all the people are leaving Labrador on Sept. 15th. They were complaining about the West Coast bankers going down there to fish. Then about two years ago there were petitions to the Government asking that trawls be not allowed at all. And some of these petitioners were those that had petitioned shortly before for permission to set trawls. I consider that there are too many laws on the Statute Books in regard to fishery matters. The fish is in the water and I think the fishermen should be helped to take it out, not to reserve a fishery to one set of people and disfranchise another. It is a well-known fact that the season is over on Sept. 15th, and all the West Coast fishermen go into the Straits and remain until the snow comes. Trawlers from the West Coast often fish outside the three mile limit, and they do not do a lot of injury, because all the fishermen do not remain down there, and it is after they come home that they go up there to trawl. And while I am always prepared to support anything that is for the general benefit, I see no reason for disfranchising one part of the coast to reserve any place for a particular class of people on another part. Petitions have come from the French Shore, asking the Government not to allow the people of Twillingate to set their traps on the French Shore until June 25th, because they do not get time to get their traps out before they come down. That is ridiculous. What about the man from Twillingate? Are we to disfranchise him until the man from the French Shore, the man who is living there, has time to put out his trap? Now in regard to these petitions from Bay de Verde, you will find fishermen, and good fishermen who have their opinion about this matter that is entirely different from that expressed in the petitions. However, the matter will come up before the Fisheries Board.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I have fished at Labrador, at Indian Tickle, and I know the circumstances in connection with trawl fishing and the people who use trawls. And I know that complaints have been made of bankers going and setting their trawls where men are fishing. That, of course, seems very hard, and if it continued the petitioners would be justified in asking the Government to prohibit it altogether. But if trawls are not allowed to fish there until Sept. 15th then it cannot be such a great hardship.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter, but in view of the explanation of the Minister I will not prolong the discussion. I did not know that that law had been passed, and I am very sorry that it is not more generally known, and that steps have not been taken to make it known. Let the public know that they cannot trawl until Sept. 15th, and there will be no objection. But at present they do not know.

MR. F. J. MORRIS.—Mr. Speaker, I just wish to say one word about this matter. I happened to be on the coast of Labrador in the summer of 1910, and spent four months there, and it was my duty to enquire into the trap setting and other matters, and amongst other things this matter referred to. I made a report to His Excellency. At the time I was down there the coast was frequented by American, Canadian and West Coast Bankers, and they crowd down on the most favored spots on the Labrador. In one place I was into, Batteau, there were 25 or 30 of them out early in the morning on the grounds and back in the evening splitting fish. This matter was brought before me in my capacity as Judge of the Labrador Court, and I made a report to the Government from Battle Harbour, which was published in the Journal of the House. I will read an extract from that Report to show that at that time it was a live issue:—"Another matter of very serious import to the local fishermen from Battle Harbour to Indian Harbour, was brought before the Court by the fishermen of Batteau. It appears that during recent years, early in the month of September, a large number of American, Canadian and Newfoundland bankers come in from the Grand Banks. They anchor in the different harbors at night, and sail out in the mornings to the near fishing grounds and set out huge fleets of trawls, covering every available fishery berth, to the exclusion of the local fishermen. The people fishing on this part of the coast feel this intrusion very keenly, as this practice considerably affects their livelihood, and petitions were presented during the late session of the Legislature on this subject. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries promised the people to introduce a measure prohibiting the use of trawls on this part of the coast by bankers until after the first of October in each year. This will meet the difficulty." I cannot say what conditions exist down there now, but at that time I thought it of sufficient importance to make a report on it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the accounts of the Civil and Criminal prosecutions asked for by Mr. Kent on Tuesday last.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from New Chelsea, asking for the sum of $25.00 to dig a well to get some water. There are four or five families there, and it is quite a long distance to get water from. I hope the Government will consider the matter.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill—"An Act respecting Municipal Affairs"—was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

PARTRIDGE BERRIES BILL.

Second reading of Council's amendment to "Protection of Partridge Berries Bill."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker. The only amendment to the bill as it went up to the Council is in the section which provides that it shall be lawful for the Board of Trade to make rules and regulations and provide penalties for the breach of the Act, which rules and regulations, when approved of by the Governor in Council, shall be published in the Royal Gazette, when they will have the effect of law.

MR. COAKER.—With regard to this amendment, I would like to know who appoints the Inspector. Is it the Board of Trade?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I don't know whether it is the Board of Trade that actually appoints the Inspector. I think it is the people who are interested in exportation. This

merely deals with the rules and regulations made in relation to the inspection.

MR. COAKER.—But the amendment now proposes that these berries should be inspected, and that the rules should be drawn up by the Board of Trade. Now, we object to that. We don't want any inspection, and that the rules should be drawn up by the Board of Trade. Now, we object to that. We don't want any inspection by a person appointed by the Board of Trade unless the men who are selling are represented as well. If you are going to amend the law and make the inspection of berries necessary, protect the man who is selling as well as the man who is buying. The Council sees fit to alter the Bill as it was sent up to them and are trying to undo the good that might be done, and I think the only way to deal with it is by refusing the amendment.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Under the amendment full protection can be provided for the people who are selling. There is no regulation dealing with the aspect of the matter to which the hon. member refers. The section at present provides for rules and regulations not alone in relation to inspection, but to inspection for exportation. This is what the section says: "It shall be lawful for the Board of Trade to make rules and regulations, etc., in respect to the inspection and exportation of partridge berries." Well, now, if you wish, you might be able to bring under that, rules and regulations dealing with the purchase of the berries and their inspection when they are being bought from the people who gather them; but you need not do that; you can confine your inspection to the exportation. In other words, after they reach here, let them be culled and examined before they are exported; but I don't think it would be wise to have a very severe inspection, if any inspection at all, of berries brought here by the people who pick them, but when you come to exporting the berries, then, in the interests of the industry, an inspection is necessary. I took it that that was the sentiment of the House when we were discussing the Bill. I know what the feelings of the House are on the matter and regard will be had to them.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, that may be the intention, but it is not the wording of the amendment. There is no provision at all with regard to the kind of inspection. It is a general power given to the Board of Trade to make rules and regulations in respect of the inspection and exportation of partridge berries. If it is intended to limit the inspection to berries about to be exported, I think the Act ought state that clearly. It could be very easily done by a very slight change in the wording of the section, but as the section reads now there is nothing to prevent the Board of Trade from making regulations in relation to the matter to which the hon. member for Bonavista referred.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I entirely concur with the hon. leader of the Opposition, but of course, any rules or regulations that might be made by the Board of Trade would not be valid until approved by the Governor in Council.

MR. HICKMAN.—I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the object of the framer of this amendment was to have the berries inspected when they arrived in St. John's to be purchased by the buyers, and to have the same inspection do for the exportation. The inspector was appointed by the Board of Trade. He was recommended by the people interested in the industry. He proved himself to be very obnoxious to the outport people, and at a meeting of the Berry Company a year ago I proposed that a second inspector be appointed. We agreed to do that, but

at the next meeting, at which I was not present, some of the members with whom the inspector had a big pull and who did as they liked with him, opposed that idea and kept to the one inspector; and that is what will happen now unless an inspector is officially appointed by the Government.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Do you think the difficulty could be got over if the inspection were limited to the exportation?

MR. COAKER.—Yes, that would get over it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—For the present. Later on, when the industry develops, it may be desirable to have a more effective and more comprehensive inspection, but at present it is difficult to understand how you could have all the berries that are sold all over the country properly culled and inspected. It seems to me that if for the present the inspection were confined to exportation, the difficulty would be got over.

DR. LLOYD.—I quite agree with the remarks that have been made, but the fact of the matter is that the amendment is not confined as the Leader of the Government suggests, and there is no power in the Government to so confine it. There is no power in the Government to make a rule of such a nature as the Prime Minister suggests.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The rules have to be approved of by the Governor in Council.

DR. LLOYD.—Perfectly true, but we are asked now to give the Board of Trade powers which the Prime Minister states the Governor in Council will not give them.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—No, because I presume it is quite possible that they may only ask for inspection for exportation.

DR. LLOYD.—It is not a question of what may be asked for. It is a question of the powers which we are asked to give the Board of Trade now.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It depends on how you interpret that section.

DR. LLOYD.—The interpretation is clear enough, and under the section we are asked to give certain powers to the Board of Trade which the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister indicates he will not agree to. Now I think what we ought to do is to amend the section.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to any amendment. My only desire is to express the wish of the Legislature. If it is desirable to limit it absolutely, I have no objection.

MR. COAKER.—Could we not have this added: "In respect of inspection for exportation" instead of "and exportation?" Would that get over the difficulty? I have no objection whatever to an inspection of berries coming into St. John's as long as both buyers and sellers are represented. We don't want an inspector who can do what he choses—who can call 20 gallons 18, and 18 gallons 15. If you are going to have an inspection, let the seller be represented as well as the buyer.

DR. LLOYD.—Might I suggest to the Leader of the Government that the matter be deferred and taken up later.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes, it can be deferred and a conference arranged with members of the Upper House.

On motion, the Bill was deferred accordingly.

EXPLOSIVES BILL.

Second reading of Council's Amendment to Explosives Bill.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The amendment in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is in the third section. The words are added: "Or having on board." I move the second reading of the amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend Chapters 40 and 41 of the Consolidated Statutes (second series), respecting the Storage and carrying of Gunpowder and other Explosives" 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.

PROTECTION OF ANIMALS BILL.

Second reading of Council's Amendment to The Protection of Animal's

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The first amendment to this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is in section 1, sub-section B. The word "animal" is stricken out and the word "it" substituted. It merely improved the wording. The next amendment is in sub-section D. Some words are added, and then in sub-section 1, after the word "the" in the first line, add: "Shall subject or cause or permit any animal to be subjected to any operation without due care and humanity." Then in sub-section G, in the second line, add the words, "The offence of." In the fourth line "a" is left out; it is unnecessary. Instead of "a summary conviction" read "summary conviction." Then the word "alternatively" is changed to read "alternately." In section 2, a Justice of the Peace is inserted instead of a Stipendiary Magistrate—I suppose to enlarge the facilities for having the Act carried out. Then in section 3, "If any person shall be guilty of cruelty" insert the words "to any animal." That makes the section read better and puts the nominative case in the proper place. In that section also the word, "Justice," is inserted instead of "Magistrate." Then in subsection A of section 3 strike out the words "Provided that," so that the section will start: "This section shall," etc. In the seventh line of section 6, strike out the words "at once"; then in sub-section 2 of section 6 insert the word "his" for "the" and leave out the words "of that person." The next amendment is the addition of the word "dog" in sub-section 4 of section 6. Section 7 has been altered somewhat. There are a few other verbal amendments. and a Section has been added as to animals run over by automobiles, somewhat similar to that in relation to animals injured by trains. I beg to move these amendments.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the Council upon the result of this work in connection with this bill We have seven or eight lawyers in the Assembly, some of whom have occupied the highest positions in the country, yet in face of this, fifteen business men in the Upper Chamber return this bill with the information that it is not in legal form. We are simply told that the bill was full of grammatical errors.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Those amendments were not made by the Council with the desire to reflect on the composition of or grammatical errors in the bill. The desire is to give every bill careful consideration with a view to making it as perfect as possible. The Council have added a few words here and there in a section which I think will have the effect of improving the bill. No matter how perfect the draft of a bill may be, whether it emanates from the Upper or Lower Chamber, it is very easy to improve it by amendments. Sometimes amendments do not improve, but have the contrary effect. We must not be too sensitive, and I am sure the lawyers in this House are not. Hon. members must remember that the Privy Council of England to-day is engaged setting aside the highest decisions of the highest courts of the Empire on the Interpretation of Statutes and the meaning of certain Acts

of Parliament. If the House desires we can have a joint conference on this Bill.

MR. F. J. MORRIS.—Mr. Speaker, I heard the other day from parties outside this House that these amendments would be made by the Council owing to the ungrammatical construction of many of its sections. I may mention that the Solicitor of the House had nothing to do with this Bill as it was prepared by a body wholly unconnected with either branch of the Legislature.

MR. DWYER.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about this Bill with reference to cruelty to animals. The other day I was coming out with a young lady, and she spoke about this question of cruelty to animals and said the whole country was talking about the matter; and it appears to me that a lot of people are more concerned with the care of the animals than they are with the care of their fellow beings. Often we see men around the streets who are unable to work, but there is no society to look out for cruelty to human beings. We have been told that it hurts an animals feelings to see another being killed. I don't know who got the information from the animals. A lot of the statements and information given on this subject are given without much consideration or authority, and I think that before we go any further with this matter there are a lot more important things that should be attended to.

The amendments were now 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.

LOGGERS BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Mr. Coaker the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill—"An Act to regulate the Employment of Men engaged in Logging."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, since this matter came up at its second reading I have had several interviews with men concerned in the employment of men working in the logging woods, and as there has been quite a difference of opinion in connection with Sections 1 and 2 of this Act I have decided to withdraw them from the Bill at the present time, and in all probability at next session of the Legislature will bring them forward as amendments to this Bill. Many propositions have been made, but we have not been able to see our way clear to accept them up to the present time, and the best way for all concerned, I think, is to withdraw the two sections and leave the matter of the minimum wage over for consideration.

The remaining sections of the Bill will have some alterations also. Section 12 will read as follows:—

12. Logging camps shall be covered with board, sheathed with felt or otherwise made water-tight. The sides of the sleeping compartments shall be lined with sheathing paper, or board or other satisfactory material: Provided that in any section this board cannot be conveyed, covering shall be that approved by the Government Engineer."

Now the employers state that in many cases in their limits it would be impossible to convey lumber for these camps, and wherever it is possible board will be used, but at some places this would only be possible at tremendous cost, and I am satisfied to amend this section and have the covering approved of by the Government Engineer. I think that this will meet with the wishes of the men and will satisfy the employers.

Section 13 has also been amended. Now I think that one or two of the larger companies maintain hospitals, and they claim that they do not get one-half their cost from the fees paid by the men. Now I think thirty cents is a very fair fee to be paid by a man who is in the employ of a company maintaining a hospital. When no hospital is at hand, no fee shall be paid. Now this section enacts that the physician shall make his visit once a month. In the original bill it was once a week. It has been pointed out to us that in the larger areas it would be impossible for the doctor to make a weekly visit, but as the camps are connected by telephone, the doctor can always be procured in an emergency. That is satisfactory to us. We are also satisfied with the fee charged in connection with the hospital, as the men do not expect to get to the hospitals without charge. Employers shall cause a physician to visit each logging camp at least once in each month when loggers are occupying the same and respond promptly to any emergency, except when prevented by any unavoidable circumstance. No charge shall be made to loggers for medicine, but a charge of thirty cents a month shall be made by any employers operating a hospital at headquarters, and in consideration of the monthly fee of thirty cents by the loggers while logging with the owner of such hospital, the loggers shall be entitled to medical treatment including nursing and proper food at such hospitals. By paying this fee, if a man is ill for three or four weeks he will get hospital free and proper food and nourishment. The Biil with these amendments meets the wishes of most of the employers of labor, except the Bishop's Falls Company. From the conversations I had with these people it would be impossible to have a bill at all if we had to meet with their wishes. The other men representing the other Companies have gone into the matter very fully and are quite satisfied.

Now a suggestion has been made by some of the employers that a minimum wage could be fixed, even at the rate of $1.10 a day, instead of $1.00, but that each man receiving that wage should cut a cord and a half a day, and that seventy cents a cord would be paid for any more cut. I am not in a position to state if the men would accept that, but I do believe if a minimum wage is fixed there ought to be a provision that the men should do a certain amount of work. I have no sympathy for the man who will not work. If he goes to work for a certain wage he should give a certain return. I will bring this matter before our Councils before the House meets again, and find out if the men are satisfied if the minimum wage is adopted, that a certain definite amount of work should be given in return. I understand that in other countries where this minimum wage is in force, the men must do a certain definite amount of work. It is an important matter so far as the loggers are concerned, and also it is a serious departure from the old policy in this country, and I think that when we are introducing legislation providing for this minimum wage there should be a provision setting down the amount of work a man should do in return for a certain sum of money per day. This minimum wage is bound to come. The men are wanting it. The electorate are realizing that they have great powers, and it is our duty to see that they use these powers reasonably. It is our belief that we can return thirty members to this House out of the membership of thirty-six, but this is no reason why we should be unreasonable in our demands, and when we fix a minimum wage we are willing to provide that a certain amount of work should be

given in return. At present I am withdrawing the whole clause dealing with this matter in order that we may be better able to deal with it at the next session.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I am very glad to note that the hon. the introducer of this Bill has considered it wise to drop these matters. I think he has been well advised, and I think that in the interests of the men and in the interests of the employers, consideration should be given to the question of cutting by the cord that he has suggested now, because I think that he will probably find that unless that is very carefully considered it will be even a worse system than atempting to fix a minimum wage; because if there is any business where it would be difficult to call upon a man to give a return for his work it is in the logging business. In almost any other work you can engage in a man can give a certain return for his work except in the logging business. You can put ten men in the woods to-day who will work like slaves over a certain amount of work, while another ten men may double their ordinary earnings working in another place. That is a principle so well-known that it does not admit of debate. A great deal depends upon the character of the forest, upon the size of the trees and upon the contract under which the men are working. If he simply had to fell the trees it would be a much more simple contract than if he had to fell it, trim it and bring it to the bank of the river. A great deal depends upon the contract the man makes, but one can very clearly understand that you can put two very good men in the forest and under the proposed system of cutting by the cord one will not earn his salt and the other will make very good wages, as there are so many matters that will affect them in connection with their operations. Now as to the other amendments proposed here as to the materials to be used in the camps, I am in entire sympathy with making the surroundings of the men as comfortable as possible, and at the same time not entailing unnecessary expense on the Companies. The men are reasonable, and do not want to bring in with them city comforts and advantages, and if they rest comfortably and are warm and their surroundings are clean and they have good food, that is about all they require. Of course, you will never be able to do all that you desire. It is perfectly impossible to fix men's wages and fix a return to be given them for these wages. Take the case of a farmer whose men may be out of his sight all day long. He cannot tell whether they are working hard or loafing, and he has got to trust very largely to the men themselves, and my experience has been if you pay men for their work and treat them decently you will get full value from them. I pointed this out when the Bill was introduced that it was a very serious matter to fix these wages, and if he had not taken this section out of the Bill I should have asked him to defer it at least until we had gone into the matter with a view to ascertaining if the industry could bear it. That is the main thing. We have got the Companies to come here and establish their business and employ a large number of men. They cannot close up their work as their capital is represented in construction and in machinery and they cannot leave. We should not begin penalizing them with exacting conditions not asked for by the men. I am in entire sympathy with the desire to benefit the condition of the loggers, but before starting in on work like this we ought to be very fully informed in relation to all matters bearing on it.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the principle embodied in

this Bill, because I think the time has arrived in this country when every effort should be put forth by the Legislature to assure the best working conditions in all industries where our men are employed. We all should recognize the principle that the best possible condition should be provided for our men in the various industries in which they are engaged. Of course some employers do not recognize this principle and they are content as long as they can get men to work for them for small wages. All they think about is the dividends they receive. I am sorry that I cannot agree with the Leader of the Government as to the inadvisability of fixing a minimum wage. I think the time has arrived in the country when this principle of minimum wage should be adopted in our industries. This principle has been recognized in other countries and a Wage Board established, which is composed of representatives of the Employers and Employees, and when a dispute arises as to wages paid in any industry the matter is submitted to this Board, and when their finding is handed down as to what rate of wages should be paid, that is enforced by the Government. I think that is a principle that should be recognized in this country. No matter what his occupation is, a man is entitled to a certain amount of reasonable comforts and to be provided with the necessaries of life, and I think no man should be compelled to work for a wage insufficint to provide him with these comforts. If a man is lazy he should be compelled to work, and if he is unable to work the State should should provide for him. There are many men employed in the various industries of this country to-day who are unable to get enough remuneration for their work to provide them with the comforts of life. There are thousands of men in this country—men with families—who are unable to obtain these comforts, owing to the small wages they receive. Some may object to this principle, because they think it will make it hard for the employer to conduct his business and face competition; but in countries where these Wages Boards are established they are welcomed by the employers as well as by the men. There are two classes of employers in every country. One considers the comfort and well-being of his men, because he knows if he pleases his men they will do better work. The other does not consider the men at all as long as he can get big returns and big dividends from their work. I am glad that the introducer of this Bill has recognized the principle of a minimum wage, and I trust that he will be able to introduce a bill at the next session of the House embodying this principle.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Bill before the Committee, I am glad that the hon. member for Bonavista has seen well not to press the first two sections at the present time. As I said on the second reading, from my information or want of information on the matter, I am not prepared to accept the portion of the Bill in relation to an industry that I am not satisfied can bear it. From the information that I can gather concerning logging or paper and pulp industries, which are principally concerned in this measure, we should make some further investigation before we make up our minds as to the effect it will have as to the wages to be paid by the companies doing that business.

I believe that the conditions of labour in this country today are such that men who are able to work can command a living wage. These industries are new and their owners have invested a very large amount of capital in them. There are two very large companies, and I understand that one has not yet paid any dividend

while the other has been working at a loss. Under these conditions I think it would be a mistake if we were to make any conditions as to the wages to be paid until we are better informed in the matter. The hon. member has done a good act in bringing the matter before us. He has put us on the search, so to speak, and we can make further inquiries into the matter and later on be able to deal with it more intelligently. As I have said, I think he is acting wisely in not pressing these sections at the present time.

As to the other conditions and changes which my hon. friend has just stated that he intends to make I think they are improvements in the Bill. As to the sections concerning the conditions of the camps, the providing of provisions and food, the cleanliness of the camp and other conditions, these are matters upon which hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the industry can enlighten the Committee as we go along. As far as I can see, the object of all these sections is to enable the men to work under better conditions than they have worked heretofore. I take it that some of the conditions that prevail in some of the camps require to be altered. No doubt in some of the camps conditions are satisfactory and the Bill will not affect them materially.

There can be no possible objection to the making of the camps as healthy and as clean as possible under the circumstances, and to the taking of steps necessary to protect the workmen from sickness. These are objects which all will agree in trying to attain. As to the question of payment, my hon. friend, need not abandon his first two sections but merely postpone them for a year. In the meantime inquiries can be made and we shall be in a position then to deal more fully with that matter.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Chairman, I think we all agree with the principle of this Bill, and particularly now when the first two sections have been stricken out. The main principle of the Bill is one that will receive the approbation of the entire community, namely, the investigation into and supervision of the conditions that exist in the logging camps. Anything that tends to improve the condition of the working classes has always received the approval of this House, and this measure, I feel sure, will meet with its full approval also.

The sections that have been stricken out were certainly far reaching in their possibilities for it stands to reason that the adoption of a minimum wage for logging camps would affect every line of industry in the Colony. If this Legislature is called upon to legislate on the wages to be paid in the logging camps they could be called upon in every department of the commercial and industrial life of the Colony. Such a matter as that certainly requires our very gravest consideration.

I think the fact that the supply of labour is limited insures the payment to the laborer of at least a certain standard wage. Well built, good, capable men are always in demand, no matter what part of the Colony they may be in. Some of these men are in the logging camps, and I have no doubt they receive good wages. Of course, there are drones in every hive, and there are no doubt, men who are not as inclined to work as their neighbours. These are the men who drag the good men down, for it is just as incumbent on a man to earn the wage that he is paid, as it is on the employer to give his men a fair wage. It is desirable that men should earn good wages, and give good returns, and all would like to see that condi-

tion of affairs existing. However, it is a difficult matter to fix a rate of wages and I submit that the principle is a very dangerous one because it would involve every branch of the life of the Colony.

There is another feature of this Bill that deserves our attention. Ours is an old country in years, but it is very young in development. We are crying out for capital to be invested here, for while we have a country that we believe is worthy of development, we have very little of the capital that is necessary. We should take care, therefore, not to frighten them by laws which they would look upon as a hardship on the employer. The mere fact that the Legislature is dealing with the wages to be paid men may make capitalists decide not to invest their money here. That would mean a loss to the Colony and would tend to keep down wages rather than increase them for the more industries we have the more men are required, and the greater the demand is for workmen the more wages they will receive. Wages will rise in that way, for after all the question of supply and demand rules the wages which men receive much more than any other question.

The other features of the Bill will commend themselves to all, for we want to see the lumber man properly housed and properly fed, and it is our duty to protect them in every possible way as long as it is consistent with fair play to those who have invested their capital in the Colony. The Bill has many fine clauses, and I am particularly glad to see that the question of medical superintendence has been dealt with in such a practical way. The other clauses as to clothing, sanitation, sleeping and heating, are very commendable, and I am sure that my hon. friend, the introducer of the measure, can feel satisfied that a long stride has been taken in the improvement of the conditions under which the men in the lumber camps have to work.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, so much has been said in the way of general approval of the measure that it is unnecessary for me to say anything more in that direction. Naturally there is no difference of opinion as to the necessity for doing everything possible to better the condition of the men, but, as there has been general comment on the Bill, might I suggest for consideration the provisions contained in clause 14, as to whether it is a wise provision from the standpoint of the men, and as to whether the employers themselves are prepared not to look upon it as an unnecessary hardship.

The men in the camps would have a delegate who would look after their interests. Would it not be better in the interests of the men that this delegate should be independent of the employer and that he should merely receive board and lodging at reasonable cost. The owners can be compelled to give him board and lodging on reasonable terms and this would save the delegate from the rather humiliating position of having to protect the men's interests in their dealings with the men on whom he is living free of cost.

The delegate of the Longshoremen in this city, for instance, would be in a peculiar position if the House compelled the merchants on Water St. to contribute towards his support. The same applies in the case of the delegate in the lumber camps and I think it would be advisable to alter the clause along the lines that I have suggested. I do not move an amendment to the clause but merely suggest that the hon. introducer might adopt the alteration.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the representative of the men paying a reasonable figure for his board and lodging. The clause was put in because you cannot get hotels in the logging woods, and the delegate cannot have a home of his own, like the delegates in St. John's. As I have said, I have no objection to the suggested alteration.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, Section 1 does not make any provision for loggers who are required to come home for urgent reasons that may arise. If the logger responds to the call he may have to give up part of his wages. Possibly some arrangement can be made as to this whereby men who are compelled through unforeseen circumstances, such as family bereavement, to leave their work will be paid for their services.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, there is a lot in what the hon. member says. It is a matter that can be overcome, however, by arrangement. I do not think any employer would refuse a man's wages in a deserving case, and they could make an agreement perhaps for the logger to return to work later on.

MR DOWNEY.—Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience in matters of this kind, and I have never refused to allow a man to leave work when circumstances demanded that he should go home. It may not be desirable in such cases to state a definite period for notice to be given. Personally, I do not think any employer would deduct anything from a man's wages when it was imperative for him to go home.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, the reason why I mention the matter is that I know of several cases where men were not treated as they would have been by the hon. member who has just spoken. He has a very humane heart, but there are employers who will squeeze every dollar that they can out of a workman, and I think that a clause should be inserted that would put the matter beyond any doubt.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a man refused his full pay under the circumstances referred to, but I recognize the necessity for some provision to be inserted whereby the workman can appeal to the nearest magistrate to obtain his rights if he is refused a part of the wages that he has earned.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, the workman might not have any chance to appeal to a magistrate without very great trouble and annoyance.. I do not think that any man with a heart would refuse to pay a workmen under such circumstances, but I think we should make some provision whereby the workman can be sure of getting what he is entitled to.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, perhaps it will get over the difficulty if we provide that the workmen shall give reasonable notice under such circumstances. In cases where the parties cannot agree, the matter can be settled by the Court, who will decide what is a reasonable time in each case.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, the object of the Bill is to protect the logger without taking from the employer any rights to which he is in fair play entitled. There has been much discussion as to the question of payment of a minimum wage for the loggers,and it has been suggested that if we deal with the question of wages we may frighten away capital. I fail to see how we can hope to build up industries in the Colony if the men with capital are frightened because we say that men must receive a dollar a day for their labour. No weakling is of much service in this industry, which calls for strenuous work, and it seems unreasonable that we

cannot pass a law that those who are engaged in this hard work must receive at least a dollar a day

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.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend 61 Vic., Cap. 8, entitled 'An Act respecting salaries.'

Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Act 61 Vic., Cap. 3, entitled 'An Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.'

Mr. Stone gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Grimes gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Jennings gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Targett gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Abbott gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Halfyard gave Notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 3rd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 3rd, 1914.

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

PETITIONS.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Speaker, I have been entrusted with a petition signed by a number of influential people in this city, in relation to the question of the forwarding by trains and steamships, of intoxicating liquors to Local Option Districts, and also concerning prohibition from the W.C.T.U. I desire to associate myself with this worthy work of the W.C.T.U. This petition is signed by some 500 residents of St. John's West. I have not been able to examine all of them. During the session I understand a number of petitions will be presented of a similar character, from different portions of the country. It is represented that the facility with which liquor can be obtained from St. John's destroys in great part the effect of local option; and it is requested that it be made unlawful for steamers or trains subsidized by the Government to convey liquor to any local option district. The petition in relation to Prohibition reads in part as follows:—

"Your petitioners are of opinion that the time has come when the importation, sale and manufacture of intoxicants in Newfoundland should be prohibited, and in order that the inhabitants may be afforded an opportunity of directly deciding upon the matter they urgently request that an act be passed during the present session creating the necessary procedure for the taking of a plebiscite at an early date."

This is signed by a number of petitioners, influential people who, no doubt, have given the matter every consideration. You will notice that the two matters referred to are the sending by trains or steamships to districts that are already under the Local Option law, intoxicants of any kind, where the vessels or trains are subsidized by the Government, and in the second place that an act should be passed by which the people of this country can decide whether total prohibition would or would not be beneficial in the interests of the country. To this general principle I think all will agree, and that is that petitions which are so largely signed, and come from those who have no other object than the improvement and advancement and welfare of the community at heart deserve the most care-

ful attention and consideration from this House. After all, this is the place, and this is the only place where these matters can be disposed of and law formulated. And I think everyone in this House, no matter what his political convictions may be, will agree with me, that every consideration and every enquiry should be given and made into this matter with a view to seeing if the legislation and the remedy asked for can be given. The larger question of prohibition is one that will require a great deal of time and a great deal of consideration, before one can finally make a pronouncement upon it. We should want to know what prohibition really means, how it has worked in other cities, and how it would be likely to work here, admitting for the sake of argument that there is need for it here. In the first place, it is not generally known that even where prohibition exists that it only goes to the extent of prohibiting the importation for sale and a prohibition of manufacturing. There is not a city, nor a state, nor a country, that I am aware of, that has gone so far as to prohibit the importation of liquor by persons for their own use, so that in considering the question of prohibition we have immediately to ask ourselves the question whether it would be better after all for Newfoundland to have prohibition to-day that we are now partially under local option and partially under license. That is one of the matters that requires a great deal of thought and consideration. We know that so far a great deal has been accomplished by local option. Thirty years ago when the first local option enactment was introduced the right existed all over the Island to sell liquor. Under the local option law, districts and settlements were given the right to say whether they wished to have liquor sold in their towns, and after thirty years' experience the whole Island practically is under local option with the exception of St. John's. But we have to admit that notwithstanding all that,the consumption of liquor has not depreciated to the extent that might have been expected by the large adoption of the scheme all over the country. The reason is this. Parties think that when you pass a local option law you stop the consumption of liquor. That is not so. The only person that you affect is the man who goes into the public house. You affect no one else. When you close the public house you only affect the man who goes in there, not the thousands who keep it in their own house, who use it properly, and without injury to themselves, and for that reason you have no decrease in the consumption. But notwithstanding all that there has been a great improvement brought about not alone by the local option, but by moral suasion all over the country. People in all places realize that abnormal consumption of alcohol is of no benefit to any one. So that when we come down to consider the question of prohibition, we have to satisfy ourselves first as to the need for it, secondly as to how it has worked in other countries, and then as to how it is going to work here. In other words, if we had prohibition to-morrow, would it improve us from the temperance standpoint? I think it was in 1864 that prohibition was started first in the state of Maine; some years afterwards it became part of the constitution, as a result of an agitation, and to-day it is a part of the constitution of the State that no liquor can be imported into that State for the purpose of sale, nor can liquor be manufactured there. But as I said when I began, they have not gone so far as to prohibit the importation of liquor for private use. Looking at the experience of places that have passed this legislation, I cannot see much induce-

ment for us to go in for it. As far as I can learn it has not been a success in the State of Maine,and it has been abandoned in the other New England States where it has been in force. I merely point this out to show that grave and careful enquiry and consideration should be given this matter to see how it has worked in other places before we decide on its adoption here or go to the expense or the trouble of calling upon the people to vote on it. In Canada the question of prohibition was submitted to the people by plebiscite as has been asked for here, in 1908 I think. At that time they had on the voters list some 1,200,000 voters. Out of that 700,000 did not go to the polls at all. The total number that went was 550,000, and those in favor of prohibition had a majority of 10,000. The Government came to the conclusion that that vote did not justify them in putting it on the Statute Book. It is impossible to say how such a matter would be received in this country, but it is important to recognise that even if we had prohibition, it would only be a partial prohibition, and would not be prohibition against the man who could import it for his own use. It is one of those matters that requires great consideration.

The other request of the petitioners is in regard to the trains and steamships that are subsidized by the Government. That would practically mean prohibition if it were carried out for a number of settlements of the country that have no other connection than subsidized steam and rail; and as I say I know of no precedent where a legislature has gone as far as that. In other words if we were to pass a Bill here making it unlawful for Bowring Bros., the Reid-Newfoundland Co., and the Newfoundland Produce Co., to carry spirits it would practically mean prohibition and a class of prohibition that has never been adopted in any other country. It would not effect those settlements that have other means of communication. It would not affect Bonavista, Trinity and Holyrood, and other places, that have other means of communication than subsidized trains and steamships, but there are places that have no other means of communication, and if we were to make it unlawful to carry spirits on these vessels and trains we would only inconvenience these latter settlements. That would be going further than has ever been gone before. If a person in Bangor or Portland, Maine, were to have liquor in his house for his own use there is nothing to prevent him. They only prevent the importation for sale and the manufacture. We are asked here to go further than any other legislation has ever gone before, in relation to this matter. Further, an argument might be made out for the adoption of the legislation, but it would be a law that it would be impossible to carry out. Supposing a man was to send a package containing liquor tomorrow to Bonne Bay by the S. S. 'Portia.' How are you going to fine Bowring Bros. for carrying that package unless you provide machinery for the opening of every package that goes by the 'Portia.' A most harmless looking package might contain anything. But even if you do you are going against the principle that a man may import whatever he may consider necessary for his own use, which no legislature has ever done before. I merely put these various suggestions before the House, so that we may go cautiously in relation to this matter. I myself am a great believer in the temperance cause. For thirty years I have given to every measure of a temperance nature that I considered wise, my best support. The Commission that was appointed only a few years ago

in which we had some of the best temperance workers in the country at the head, were appointed at my instance, when I was at the Department of Justice, and I should be sorry now to see any move on the part of the temperance people that would bring about a worse condition of affairs than we have now. It was only a few years ago that this House adopted the six o'clock closing hour. There were men on that occasion who doubted the wisdom of the measure, and there are those today who are not so sure that it has been fruitful of results. I am always prepared to give the matter a trial, so that if there is any good in it, it might be availed of by the whole country. But the experience of centuries has been that while you can do a good deal by legislation you can never make a country sober by act of Parliament. You may restrict the sale, you may restrict the manufacture, but it ultimately comes down to this, that if you want to make a people sober you must do it by moral suasion, and you must begin with them when they are children. Get the child when he is young. Bring him up with a horror of liquor. Take him when he is ten years old, when he is impressionable, and have him take the pledge, not in a perfunctory way, but let him take it under solemn circumstances, let him realize that he is making a solemn vow. What is the effect? The child grows up impressed with the solemnity and importance of the promise that he has made, he never longs for that which he has never experienced. Is not that true? A man never longs for that which he has never experienced. A man who has never tasted liquor does not know the pleasures of the cup. For that reason, if you catch the child young, when his mind is impressionable, he will grow up sober, so that ultimately the whole community and the whole country will be sober. Of course, the two things can go hand in hand, moral suasion and a certain class of legislation. It must be remembered that without the people that take a living and continued interest in these movement we would have very few of the reforms that we have today. It has been by their efforts that there has been accomplished by legislation what has been so accomplished. I have very great pleasure in presenting these petitions to the house, and, speaking for myself, I say, that I am delighted to give every consideration to these petitions, and to see if possible whether the prayer can be carried out or at least, if not the actual prayer, then something that will effect equally good results. In Canada they have some regulations in this matter. No intoxicating liquors can be sent through the mails, and perhaps something in this line can be done in Newfoundland. I have had the advantage of discussing this matter with the committee that had charge of it, and I have this to say, that throughout the whole consultation, they appeared most reasonable and fair. They wish only to accomplish what will give good results and that, I take to be the wish of all.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I also have been handed a couple of petitions similar to those which the Prime Minister has presented to this House. I would ask, for convenience sake, that these petitions and the others that will probably be presented, be considered at the same time as the petitions which the Prime Minister has just presented. The petitions as the Prime Minister has pointed out, have a two-fold object. First, they ask that legislation be enacted at this session making it illegal to convey intoxicating liquors of any kind by railway or other facilities of conveyance subsidized by the Government into dis-

tricts in which the local option law is now in force. Secondly, they ask that legislation be enacted at this session providing machinery whereby the people at large throughout the country may be enabled to vote by way of plebiscite upon the question as to the prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors. These objects, Mr. Speaker, are directed towards the purpose of improving as far as possible conditions in the colony with regard to the use and sale of intoxicating liquors. The two objects are separate. One has a far more comprehensive purpose than the other. The importation into local option districts is a question which stands by itself, and is altogether apart from the question of prohibition. In connection with prohibition we are only asked to give the people of the country an opportunity of deciding whether they themselves are prepared to enforce it as outlined in these petitions. Now, that, of course, is a question largely resolving itself into one as to whether here in this Legislature is the right place to deal with this question of prohibition or whether we should refer the matter to the decision of the people at large. We are not really asked in these petitions this evening to decide on the question of prohibition; we are not even asked to refer the matter to the people; we are only asked to provide machinery so that if at any time in the future it should be thought desirable to have the people pass upon this question, they will be enabled to do so. I have already, Mr. Speaker, expressed the opinion in this House, that the reference of a question like this to the people under a plebiscite is to a certain extent shirking the question by the members of this House. We are a deliberative assembly for the purpose of making laws, and amongst others we should decide the question as to whether in our opinion, prohibition should be enforced or not. Now, I still maintain that opinion. Reading these petitions and noting the names that are signed to them, I find that they are largely and influentially signed by men who have had an opportunity of observing many of the conditions to which they refer in the outports, and in St. John's; and whether, in deference to these opinions, this House should provide legislation along the lines suggested, establishing a machinery in the whole Island similar, I presume, to that of local option, is one of the objects of these petitions. If it should be decided to introduce legislation upon the lines proposed here, then the question as to the nature of the proposal that will be submitted to the people for their decision would have to be considered. For instance. the question referred to by the Prime Minister—whether we would have prohibition without depriving a man of the right of importing for his own private use, would be a matter of the detail of the legislation when it would come before the House. The other question, Mr. Speaker, as to the carriage of intoxicating liquors into local option districts, that, of course, is also a matter of the detail of legislation. What I mean by that is this: if you bring in a law here prohibiting the importation of liquors into local option districts, the first question that would naturally suggest itself to a person who would sit down for the purpose of formulating such a law would be: Are you going to put the question of the use of intoxicating liquors to the voters in these districts in the same manner as you previously put the question as to the sale? The present Local Option law is one which prohibits the sale of intoxicating liquors in the districts in which it is in force. Now we are asked to

widen that, and the question that the person forming the legislation has to ask himself is: Are we going to submit the broader question to the people of these districts, or are we to take the broader question as a logical consequence of the previous question and pass direct legislation in the matter? Then again, Sir, the question of the enforcing of such legislation would be another matter which those who would form the law would have to consider. For instance, take the steamers that are subsidized by the Government and the railway trains. I don't know what portion of the traffic of these lines such legislation would affect, but if you restrict the traffic which goes over these lines, will it be necessary to compensate the owners for the loss which they may sustain? I don't know whether this traffic represents a large factor in their freight arrangements or not, but they have got contracts with the Government which put the colony under certain obligations. If it is found in the interests of the people, that such legislation as this should be enacted, then I think it ought to be done, even at the cost of such an expenditure, but that is a factor that would have to be taken into account in framing the legislation that would be necessary to enforce these provisions. Then, of course, in enforcing such legislation you could only affect freight carrying traffic. Passengers' luggage and such like would hardly come within the scope of this law, and also steamers, crafts, and other modes of conveyance that are used to ply around the coasts of this Colony would not come within the provisions of any such enactment.

The Legislation, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, has a two-fold object. The principle at the root of the whole thing is this: We have a social evil growing out of the abuse of intoxicating liquors. What is the best way to remedy or to diminish as much as possible this evil and its consequences? None of us can deny that the evil to a certain extent exists amongst us; that families suffer and that individuals suffer in their homes and in every other circumstance of life from the consequences of the abuse of liquor; but there is the danger, as has been pointed out by the Prime Minister, that in applying a remedy you may be only diverting the evil into other channels and producing consequences which are worse even than those that prevail under a regulated, properly inspected and well kept license system. I think, Mr. Speaker, that any person who has seen any of the cities on this side of the Atlantic or on the other side will admit that on the whole the licensed houses in this city are carried on in a most law-abiding and careful way, and with very few, if any, convictions for violations of the law. There are some consequences which flow from the liquor traffic which are unavoidable and I think that the man to provide the remedy for these will be the man who can bring the force of moral suasion to bear upon the individual and bring home to him the consequences of his own act upon himself and upon his family. That is the direction in which, I think, you are going to accomplish the greatest good along these lines. If you look back at the history of this temperance question you will find that the greatest good has been accomplished along these lines. Prohibition, from the little I have read about it, has been more or less a failure. The cities of the United States which tried it had to abandon it.

It was found that the law was openly and flagrantly violated. This kind of thing not only fails to remedy the evil which it is intended to wipe out but creates a certain amount of

disrespect for the law. That is the other side of the question. I think Mr. Speaker, that this petition should be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary and that the matter should be thoroughly and carefully enquired into between now and the time the House meets again, and if it is decided that either of these requests are going to accomplish the objects which they have in view, the matter should be dealt with next session.

I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in presenting to the House these petitions. They are largely signed, as I said before, by men who have had opportunities of seeing the evil consequences of the abuse of liquor and every effort ought be made to remedy this abuse. If we do not think that this particular remedy will accomplish the good that is desired, we ought at least to try if some means cannot be devised of lessening the evil, if not removing it altogether.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I also received a few of these petitions. Mine are from Bonavista and Musgrave Hr. in the district of Fogo. They are signed by about 600 people. These are all that have reached me up to the present time. I may say that all my life I have been a temperance man I have never taken any liquor in any shape, and anything that I can do to assist the cause of temperance will be done. It is not easy to accomplish the prayers of these petitions. The first request is for the prohibition of the transportation of liquor to what is known as Local Option districts. That is a very difficult matter to carry out, and even if we did pass such a law I don't think we can prevent the outports from getting liquor as long as it is sold in St. John's. The other and the larger question of prohibition is one that will receive my support whenever it comes before the House in any shape, as long as it is to be an effective measure. I don't agree with the remarks of the Rt. Hon. Premier with regard to prohibition. If I ever vote for a measure of prohibition it must be one which prohibits not only the sale of liquor but its importation. I shall never support any measure that will permit a man with means to import liquor for his own use and will not allow the poor man to use it because he has not the means to import it direct. I believe that the sale of liquor is a curse. Of course, it is only natural that the man who has never used it is going to look at it in that light. Men have used liquor in moderation, and if every man would use it in moderation there would not be very much evil in it, but the whole trouble is that so many men indulge in it to excess and cannot use it in moderation. The Premier in his observations stated that he had never known of any country prohibiting the importation of liquor in the manner that I have just described. Now, why do we prohibit the use of poison? We won't allow men to import poison—we allow certain people to do it but not the general public. In thousands of cases the use of liquor is just as great an evil as the use of poison, because when a man indulges in the use of liquor to excess it brings him down to the level of the beast. Of course, I appreciate the fact that it is a pretty difficult question to deal with, but the only cure to my mind is to prohibit the use of it altogether. Some men like it and can use it in moderation, but the men who do not use it at all are the better men. Most of those who use it go to destruction through it. How many thousands of children have been reared without education and with scarcely any food or clothes simply because their fathers indulge in liquor? How many thousands of bright, able, brilliant

men have gone to destruction through it? Nothing has been said about them. Now, I have no intention of giving a temperance address. I merely want to say that I am a temperance man and intend to do all I can to promote the temperance cause, but I am above all a total prohibitionist, and as long as I have the right to cast a vote in this house that vote shall go for total prohibition; but I will never vote for any measure that will allow one man to use liquor because he has the means to import it direct while it will not permit another man to use it because he has no means and is not able to import it. What I want is a measure that will keep it out altogether.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the petitions now before the House and ask leave to present others from the district of Burin. One is from the Rev. James Wilson, President of the Methodist Conference, and some ninety residents of Flat Islands; the next is from Rev. H. G. Coppin and a considerable number of the residents of Burin; the next is from Rev. Charles Lench and residents of Grand Bank; the next, is from the Rev. Charles R. Blount and residents of Fortune; and the last is from the residents of Great Burin. These petitions contain in the neighbourhood of 600 signatures altogether. In discussing this petition I desire to say that I am in entire accord with it, and give it my hearty support. The questions arising out of it have been very amply discussed this afternoon by the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, and it is hardly worth while that I should delay the time of the House by adding to the discussion at any length.

The introductory paragraph to this petition contains a strong indictment, and if it is correct,and we have no reason to dispute the fact, it is reason sufficient for any body of people, no matter how large or how small, to approach this Legislature and demand that something should be done to remedy the evil. It is a fact, Sir, that the present Local Option law as we have it in the outports is of no avail. The people of every district outside of St. John's have decided for Local Option. In other words, they have practically said that they were not going to have intoxicating liquors within their borders; but the very thing they have desired is being nullified by the fact that under the law as it is now, liquor can be imported into the district in unlimited quantities for consumption the only prohibition being that it must not be sold there. Now, I claim sir that the unrestricted importation of liquor into Local Option districts, if not contrary to the letter of the law, is at least contrary to the spirit of it; and it is to be expected that the Temperance people of the outports who hold such strong opinions on this matter and who are seeing their wishes nullified in this way, should again take this matter up and demand that some more stringent law be put on the statute book whereby, if necessary, the total prohibition of liquor will be brought about. These petitions have a particular interest for me, Sir, because one of the first requests made to me by one of my constituents in the district of Burin was to bring before the House a Temperance Bill that would do away with the difficulties that they were up against in that section of the country in connection with this question. It will be remembered that only a few months ago some of the newspapers seriously discussed this very question, and one of the deplorable features ventilated was that youths in the outports were habitually sending on to St. John's and procuring liquor, and the position at present is simply this; that licensed dealers in

St. John's are allowed to send liquor to the outports under conditions that would cancel their license here. A boy in the outports of 15 or 16 years of age can go to the telegraph office, put down his money, send on a prepaid telegram to the dealer here and have his liquor sent out him, and there is no law to either stop or punish him. This is the condition of affairs that exists at the present time, and it is a condition that must be stopped. Again take the matter of delivery. A package containing liquor goes out to some station by train. It is delivered there at 11 or 12 o'clock at night, and the owner can get it as soon as it reaches there, whereas in St. John's a person cannot get liquor at any store except between the hours of 9 and 6. The law that applies to St. John's in this connection does not apply to the outports. This certainly should be remedied and officials should not be permitted to deliver packages containing liquor except during certain hours. Now, Sir, with respect to the first section of the petition, wherein the petitioners request that railways, steamers, etc., subsidized by the Government should not be permitted to bring liquor into local option districts, I am not particularly taken with it, for besides discriminating against the trains and coastal steamers it will not stop the traffic, for I venture to suggest that more liquor is carried to the outports in the ordinary fore-and-after than by the regular services. Again, any discrimination against the trains and steamers is likely to be met by a demand for compensation on the part of the Companies, though that might not be a subject for serious consideration, if the great object aimed at were secured. Reference has been made this afternoon to liquor being sent by mail. I do not think it is necessary to do anything in relation to passing a law in this connection, because according to the report of the Postmaster general it is illegal, under the law at present, for any person to use the mails to send liquor to the outports. As to the plebiscite—the creation of machinery to permit the people to vote on the liquor question—that is a request which I don't think we should hesitate to grant. With the principle of referendum generally I have no very great sympathy. I agree with my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition that it is taking away from the Government and the Legislature responsibiities which they should assume. It is also a very expensive process. As, however, it seems to be the desire of petitioners that a plebiscite should be taken I am quite ready to put on one side my antipathy, and give my support to it, because the Temperance question has never been made a party question in this country, and consequently the responsibility does not attach so greatly to the Government, and because I anticipate the cost would not be very large. I believe the temperance people are so sincere in this matter that they would be willing to undertake all the clerical work of the election free of cost to the Colony. And it is a good way of finding out the exact feeling of the whole country regarding prohibition.

As I have already stated my entire sympathy is with these petitions, and I am prepared to pledge my support to any legislation which may be introduced for the purpose of stopping the liquor traffic. At the same time I am disappointed in the petition now before the House. It is not at all so largely signed as I have been led to believe, and apparently comes from one section of our people only. It is another of those spasmodic efforts which have characterized the Temperance movement in recent years. I do

not desire to dishearten the Temperance people, but I cannot help saying that unless greater efforts are made to secure the enthusiastic support of the people there can be very little hope for success. Only a few years ago we had a local option election in St. John's. For a few weeks some faithful and enthusiastic work was done. The election was lost, and for a while the Temperance question took a back place. Then followed a petition reducing the hours of sale which was more succesful, and now comes this petition. In the meantime no effort has been made to create a strong temperance sentiment among our people, and I hold that such is a necessary antecedent to legislation. While there is indifference, while there is a lack of activity, and failing a spontaneous and sturdy demand, one can hardly lay blame to the legislature if does not take the matter seriously. Personally, I should like to see an immediate rousing of the Temperance forces, and a campaign initiated that would stir the whole country to its depths. Only by such effort can success come. It is now rather late in the session, but I do hope something will be done to stop this unlimited supply of intoxicating liquor to the outports, for as I have already said, it nullifies entirely the Local Option movement.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I have today several petitions similar to those I have just heard read by the hon. Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, about which I desire to make a few remarks. They relate to the bringing in of legislation for the purpose of preventing the transportation by steamer or railway of intoxicating liquors as well as the business of providing machinery therefore. The matters have both been so fully discussed by their introducers, that little is left for me to say. The petitions which I have the honour to present come from various parts of my district. When the matter comes up for the consideration of the Government or Committee of the House, I shall be very glad to give it my fullest and most ardent support.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I beg on behalf of the hon. Speaker, to present a petition from the inhabitants of Carbonear on the question already before the House. I think the attitude we ought to take towards this bill is one of duty. We, or at least most of us, have had experience which will aid us in deciding the attitude that ought to be taken in this matter. I have the honour to represent a local option district, and I would point out that very little good results can be obtained from this as long as St. John's has not local option. Boys of eighteen and thereabouts have little difficulty in obtaining drink through the Post Office and Telegraph Office. The demoralizing effect of this needs no pointing out, and I beg to give this petition my heartiest support.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present several petitions from Burgeo, Petites and Channel which ask that the carrying of liquor around in the coastal boats be abolished, as it tends to invalidate the good which might accrue from the temperance societies formed there. Local Option has resulted in a great deal of good in the United States. I think the matter ought to be considered at once by the Government. Speaking for myself and, I am sure, a large fraction of the population, I would double as much as I now pay to the revenue of this Colony to see this sale of intoxicating liquors stamped out. I beg to give it my heartiest support when it comes up here before this House.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I am entrusted with the presentation of three petitions from the District of Twillingate on this subject, and had it been at any other time of the year many more signatures would have been obtained. I also can speak from personal knowledge that the sale of spirits in St. John's, largely nullifies the benefits of Local Option in Twillingate District. Increased facilities of travel at present in vogue such as extra steamers and railway trains make it easier for people to import liquor into Local Option districts, and it is very easy to obtain liquor from St. John's at any time of the year. As far as the question of prohibition is concerned I do not think there is any doubt as to the result of the plebiscite vote. The difficulties of carrying it out would soon be overcome. There were always difficulties surrounding every great benefit, and if people were stopped from undertaking good works very little good would ever be accomplished. I beg to give to this matter my most ardent support.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, I have here a few petitions from my District to which I beg to give my most ardent support. I see here the names of men who have succumbed to this terrible temptation and who cry out now for help and protection. I realize the fact that the way to reform is beset with many difficulties, but these must be overcome, and ought not to be considered. Although I have never tasted liquor, I have suffered much to adhere to my principles. This struggle ought not to be put before every youth in the Colony. The weaker minded must give in. I have every sympathy with this Bill and beg to give it my most ardent support.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I have here three petitions on the subject now under discussion. As so much has been said, I need not go deeply into the details of this question. I think we ought to remove this temptation from our people, especially from the young men. I agree with the hon. member for Bonavista, that if this is to be successful Local Option must be in force all over the island. I beg to give this petition my most ardent support, and hand it over to the Department to which it relates.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleosure in presenting several petitions on the same subject from the District of Trinity, which I have the honor to represent. The names attached to the petitions aggregate about eight hundred and this fact alone insures my most earnest consideration. I may say that I am not altogether in sympathy with the idea of prohibiting intoxicating liquors being carried on subsidized trains and steamers. This is my own personal opinion, but when I have before me, petitions signed by eight hundred of my constituents, it makes me pause and consider whether or not these petitioners are entitled to have their views carried out. If the people desire that subsidized trains and steamers should not carry intoxicating liquors I would be bound by the sentiment of the district. Whenever it appears to me that the majority of the people of Trinity Bay desire protection in the way of prohibition or Local Option, I am prepared to give the matter my support, but the sentiments of the majority of the people of that district is not represented by those petitions. I am speaking now as to the evidence before the House. It may be that people from other parts of the district may have an opportunity of expressing themselves in other petitions. I find that these particular petitions come from a few localities in the neighbourhood of Clarenville and Shoal Harbour. If it will be

shown that the people of the other portions of the district also are in support of the movement, I am prepared to give it my support. In reference to the other matter I am not adverse to the question of referendum or plebiscite, nor do I think it would be degrading in any way to this House to consult the people by such a method. It is merely referring the question to the people who sent us here. When the people of Newfoundland express themselves in favor of prohibition, I will consider myself bound by their decision, and I see no objection to this House providing machinery to carry out the wishes of the people.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Speaker, I have here eighteen petitions from various parts of Trinity Bay. In all the number of petitioners are about eight hundred, and would represent the sentiment of a large portion of that district. When this matter comes up before the Committee I shall have a few words to say. Just now I would point out that this feeling prevailing around our shores ought to receive our fullest consideration. Liquor is good neither for the young nor the old; it has always been a curse, and will always be a curse, as long as we have it in this country. Personally I do not take very much. As a matter of fact, I have not tasted liquor for the past thirty years. There was a time when I had a great liking for liquor, and I had a hard fight to keep against it. I had a strong turn for it, and I certainly pity any poor creature that has a thirst for liquor, and I think it is our duty as legislators to do our best to help our fellow creatures. In many other ways we are trying to legislate on different matters. We have been trying to make laws in this House to protect the dumb animals—which I have no doubt is a good law, and I think myself, that while making laws for the dumb animals we should make laws to help out our fellow creatures, our young people as well as our middle aged people, and I am sure that this petition has my hearty support. There is not much need of my saying much as the matter has been pretty fully debated, but I am sure that I shall do all in my power to help out the petition.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the inhabitants of Joe Batt's Arm and Barrd Island on this question, signed by 75 people. One regrettable feature in connection with these petitions is that it is so late in the session of the Assembly, and I suppose our friends, the movers in this question of temperance, were a little late in sending their petitions to Fogo District,otherwise I would have petitions from other sections of that District. I have received a message from Revd. Mr. Mercer of Fogo, and I understood from him that petitions had been signed by quite a number but it was too late to get them along this session. I think the advocates of temperance who have listened to the speeches here this afternoon on this question should be encouraged. I think this Legislature should be looked upon as a temperance Legislature, and all we need now for the prayers of these petitions to come into effect is for the Government—the Opposition is all right—to grapple with the question. Let them exert some more labour on the matter. Nobody will deny that the evil of intemperance is a great evil, and a great curse, and if we can introduce legislation to retard this evil the outports of this country will certainly back us up. There is no doubt that Local Option in the outport districts is considerably lessened by the convenience of transportation, and in Local Option districts where

liquor is not now sold, the people can send to St. John's and get a case of whiskey or brandy or whatever it is they wish. We know that some people indulge in liquor to such an extent that it brings want and misery, not only to themselves, but to their wives and those dependent upon them. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to detain the work of this House in this particular, because it is a well known fact that if the demands of these petitions were set before the people liquor would be prohibited from this country in its entirety. I have great pleasure in presenting this petition, and I give it my hearty support, and I trust that the powers that be will show the country that they have the courage of their convictions in this matter. If the finances of the country will prevent from acting in this particular, let them put the duty on tea and sugar and molasses and food stuffs and I believe they will get the majority of the country to support them in so doing. We are willing to legislate for animals but when you come to dealing with a question like this that seriously affects so many of our people, we talk about the difficulty of putting these laws into execution. While we talk like that we will never have any reform, we will stick in a hole and the evils of old legislation will be with us forever.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Speaker, I have the honour Sir, today of presenting two petitions of the same tenor as those already presented by hon. members of this House. Temperance is a great question and one which has engaged the noblest minds in all countries for ages. Legislatures in all countries have dealt with the question of temperance, and if you think of the last 300 years of temperance reform in England you will surely come to the conclusion that moral suasion is a greater force than any law that can be put upon the Statute Book by any Assembly. Take the biographies of the greatest men in Great Britain and Ireland and you will find, that they scintillate with the moral sentiment of temperance. That scintillation is great in the life of the great Theobald Mathew, so great that down to this very moment in this very city, even in this very hall its influence is felt on this one particular question now before the Chair, so that it is well to look back upon those monuments of genius that struggle for the whole human weal and it is well that we criticise fairly and squarely the measures that have been introduced into the various Legislatures on this side of the water at least during the last fifty years. This is a subject that has agitated the whole continent of America during the last hundred years.

In the Dominion of Canada we find a law known as the Scott Act. A law which before it was attempted to be put into effect was looked upon to be an extraordinarily good law. Today those who had the opportunity of introducing that law would, if they were alive be making excuses for its ineffectiveness. As has been said here today by the hon. member for Burgeo, the law is broken in the open day in cities such as Sydney and other cities in the Lower Provinces of Canada, and in fact all over Canada where that law is in operation. The same may be said of the Temperance Laws in force in some parts of the United States, and particularly of the Law as enforced in Maine.

Neil Dow, that great Temperance Reformer, believed that by moral suasion alone was it possible to further the cause of temperance. And again, take the great living churches, Methodist, Anglican, Presbyterian and Ro-

man Catholic, and you will find the names of great men coming down the corridors of time who have devoted their lives to this great moral question of Temperance.

Now, Sir, let us come down to another phase of this question. We know that England grappled with this question in the 17th and in the early part of the 18th century through her legislatures and her police, helped by the Churches. But because it was taken up by the Legislatures and the police and the laymen it was refused and denied until the great minds of Cobden and Bright brought into operation Free Trade. Since that time they have had no smuggling around the coast of England, and since liquor was recognized as a commodity just as tea is a commodity, they have no trouble in that regard, and the forces of the Churches in England, Scotland and Ireland have brought about a condition that you have England to-day one of the greatest examples of a country permeated by the truest of temperance principles. We know the great difficulty that England experienced in legislating upon these matters. It is only a few years ago that the same difficulty arose in connection with the opium trade. Now then, if we feel that it is necessary in order to create a higher standard of morality in this country to bring in a Bill prohibiting the import of liquors we will stand in a peculiar position. Only a few miles away is the Island of St. Pierre where liquor can be procured very cheap, and if you interfere with the ordinary laws of this country at present in force, and prohibit the importation of liquor I fear you may create a greater evil owing to the nearness of this Island of St. Pierre. It is so easy to create an army of smugglers; and it is so easy for the human heart to forget the moral sentiments which are contained in the Decalogue and to forget the laws of this country for the sake of a few dollars. With regard to barring liquor from steamers and trains subsidized by the Government, it is not fair to penalize a man that has come to an agreement with the Government by the provisions and operations of the suggested law. All these things have to be considered; and I trust, Sir, that when this House meets again we may be able to consider a Bill which may be evolved from the wishes of the signatories of these petitions, and I hope they will bring such a Bill before this House that will create such a temperance sentiment as will permeate every section of the country. I have no doubt that all of us will give proper and personal support to whatever Bill may come before this House to propagate that great moral question, the temperance question. I would ask that these petitions be referred to the departments to which they relate.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I have also a petition here from Clarke's Beach in the district of Port de Grave dealing with the matter now before the chair. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition because the district I represent is a strong local option district. The effect of local option in that district however, has been almost neutralized by the sale of liquor that has been going on there through the train. Now Sir, I have had some conversation with quite a number of people there, and they tell me that it is so bad that it would be just as well to have St. John's transferred to certain parts of that district as far as the local option law is concerned because at certain seasons of the year so much liquor goes in there from St. John's that the local option law is of very little use. That fact has been corroborated by people all

over the district. Now, I think in deference to the wishes of the people and in view of the fact that the people there have declared themselves in favour of local option that the act should be carried out in the spirit that was meant by those who fought for local option. A great deal has been said here this afternoon about moral suasion, that it is of more effect than the enforcement of laws. Well we have been considering many questions here during the present session of the legislature, and I would ask the honourable gentleman from Placentia and St. Mary's whether he would wait for moral suasion to deal with the question of pure food in this city and country, and I am afraid thers would be many in their graves if we had no such legislation as the pure food bill. And the same would apply to other legislative enactments. If we had to wait for moral suasion to improve the condition of the sealers; until every man interested in that industry was morally persuaded that these regulations presented by Mr Coaker were the best, I am afraid we should have to wait a very long time before we would see the adoption of any such regulations as have been passed by the legislature at the present time.

Statements have been made here this afternoon as to the failure of prohibition, but no case has been cited where prohibition has been in force and has proved a failure. It is stated that prohibition is in force in the State of Maine and that in certain parts of that state the law is not fully carried out. Well there is a difference of opinion on that point, but certain it is that the electors in that state are just as strong for prohibition as they were thirty years ago,and the great majority have found that prohibition is so successful as to warrant their support up to the present time. I do not think that justifies any statement that it has been a total failure. The sentiment in favour of prohibition is growing rapidly in the Southern and Western States. In fact in the past seven years it has grown more rapidly than ever before. It is only a question of time when a great majority of the States will be in the prohibition column. Now if these people have proved the good effect I think the time has fairly come when the people in the outports of this colony should recognize the need for total prohibition, and it has been suggested that the only effective way of dealing with the liquor question in this colony is the total prohibition of the importation and sale of intoxicating liquors. As at present fifteen or sixteen out of the eighteen electoral districts of the Colony have declared themselves in favor of local option, I think this house ought to consider the matter of putting the machinery in force, so that the people can show their sentiments on the question of prohibition

HON. MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of presenting certain petitions on this subject. There is hardly any need for me to say anything on the question now before the House.

I note that the petitioners are asking that liquors should not be allowed to be shipped in subsidized trains or boats. Of course, I have my own opinion about that, but like my friend Mr. Lloyd it is not my opinion that I am going to express. This petition is largely signed, by four hundred of the electors of the District of Harbour Grace. It is their wish that I should give it my heartiest support, which I am going to do. While we are not all of the same features neither do we all think alike on anything that might come before us, but hearing so many gentlemen speaking

one is perhaps led to alter his opinions, believing that there is something in the arguments brought forth by them which leads him to think that their ideas if brought forward would be beter than his own.

I have heard the Rt Hon. Premier and other members speak of the conditions that exist in places where there is prohibition. The state of Maine was referred to, but I hope I shall not live long enough to see conditions in St. John's as they are in Portland, Maine, a prohibition town. Portland is a seaport and there are usually a large number of ships there and I have seen many times women with bottles of whiskey selling them to whoever wished to buy them. Men would do the same thing under the eyes of policemen in the public places

I hope that when we get prohibition no liquors will be brought into the country. Let the law be the same for every person in the land and when it comes before us, I hope to be able to give it my strongest support. I cannot say like some that I have never touched liquor and, as a matter of fact, if the matter comes before us again, I might be able to give the House an explanation on the subject that might be beneficial to hon. members.

I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and I am sure that the House will give it the best possible consideration.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of the district of Bay de Verde, which is signed by eight hundred people of that district. I have listened with interest to the speeches of the hon. members who have already spoken on the subject and my remarks, therefore, will be limited to one section only of the petition, Like my hon. friend, Mr. Piccott, I am not a total abstainer, but I am prepared to sacrifice liquor of any kind if by doing so I am doing my fellow men any good.

Section 2 of the petition appeals to me very strongly for if the prayer of that section is granted there will be no further trouble about liquor on trains or steamers.

As I have said, I do not intend to speak at any length, but I can assure the House that if it is necessary to have my vote to bring about total prohibition, I shall vote with pleasure for it, for I believe that the men who are able to take care of themselves are their brother's keeper. I take much pleasure in presenting this petition.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker. Unlike other members, I have no temperance petitions to present and I think that this fact in itself redounds to the credit of the district of St. George's, which I have the honor to represent. I rise, however, for the purpose of saying that I am in full sympathy with the petitions that have been presented, for I am convinced that nine tenths of the crimes that are committed, nine tenths of the poverty that abounds and countless offences against women and children are brought about through intemperance. We may not all be total abstainers, but as members of this legislature it is our duty to do everything possible to stamp out intemperance among our people. I think that this petition will be a great step to that desirable end, and I am prepared, therefore, to give it my full support.

On motion, the several petitions were received and it was ordered that they be referred to the Department to which they relate.

QUESTIONS.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of

the House, a copy of the returns of special, local and main line grants expended at New Bonaventure for the years 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The statement is being prepared.

MR STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House, a copy of the returns of all money spent by his department at New Bonaventure, in the district of Trinity, for the years 1910 1911, 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The statement asked for for has already been tabled.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the amount of monies expended by his Department at Witless Bay, in the District of Ferryland, and to whom paid, for the year 1913.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The statement asked for will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House, a detailed statement showing amount of monies expended by his department at Witless Bay, in the district of Ferryland, for the year 1913, and to whom paid.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The statement has already been tabled.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House copies of returns of expenditure of all special and surplus trust grants allocated by his Department to Fortune Harbor, in the District of Twillingate, during the years 1912 and 1913, up to date.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I hope to be able to table this statement to morrow.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the amount paid for running the Ferry from Fox Harbor to Hickman's Harbor for the years 1912, to date, and how many months in the year the ferry is to run.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say that there was no ferry service at the places named in 1912. Isaac Smith was appointed in April 1913 at a salary of one hundred dollars a year.

MR, TARGETT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing (a) the cost of Breakwater at Petty Harbor, and (b) the cost of Public Wharf at the Gut, Petty Harbor.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—This Statement is being prepared and I hope to have it to-morrow.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement of the amounts paid for distributing and collecting the Ballot Boxes in Trinity District in the year 1913 and to whom paid.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I hope to be in a position to table this information to-morrow.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the house a statement showing the purpose for which the sum of $100 was issued by his Department to A. J. Mifflin, of Bonavista, on September 24th, 1913, and also, to place on the table a copy of returns for the above named amount.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES – The statement asked for will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement of all moneys spent on the smallpox hospital at Harbour Grace for the years 1911 and 1912 showing, in detail, the amounts spent and to whom the payments were made.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—The statement will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD asked the hon. Minister of Justice if the commission of Justice of the Peace, held by Mr. W. J. Guilfoyle of Riverhead, Harbor Grace, has been cancelled.

RT HON. PRIME MINISTER—The commission was cancelled about a year ago. If my hon. friend wishes to have any further particulars about the matter, I shall be glad to furnish them to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of all moneys spent for repairs to Harbor Grace lighthouse for the years 1912 and 1913, showing the names of the parties to whom payments were made.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to lay on the table of the House the statement asked for.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all moneys paid Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald for board and travelling expenses from April 1st 1910 to December 31st 1912.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to lay on the table of the House the statement asked for.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 61 Vic. Cap. 8., entitled "An Act respecting Salaries," was introduced and read a first time. and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Persuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 61 Vic. Cap 3, entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries," 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 Mr. Coaker, the Bill entitled "An Act to regulate the employment of men engaged in Logging" was read a third time and passed; and it was ordered to 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 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. KENT—The Committee of the Whole House last week heard the statement of the Hon. Minister of Finance upon the financial affairs of the Colony, as set forth in his Budget Speech. This statement, of course, raises the most serious questions that the House or this Committee has to consider. It is always a matter of interest to the members of the House and to the public at large to know what has been done in connection with the financial affairs of the Colony during the period that elapsed since the last session of the House. Hence we all look forward during the session to the Budget Speech, the annual financial reckoning of the Government, with much anticipation. We

always hope that his statements in relation to past transactions and his proposals for the future will be approved of by the whole House and by the country. I am however afraid that neither the statement nor the proposals which we have heard from the Hon. Minister on Wednesday last will commend itself to the Committee or to the people neither as to what has been done nor as to what he proposes to do.

Any person examining the affairs of Newfoundland as they appear at present, and looking back through the transactions of the past few years, cannot but be impressed by the fact that but for the mistakes of the Government we would not find ourselves in the financial position presented by the Budget Speech of the Minister. The Colony is in the position of a country that is entering on a race of development with other countries, and it is upon the men in charge of the affairs of the Government that the main duty and responsibility of keeping Newfoundland well in the front in this race for material prosperity rests. During the recent years prior to the advent to power of the present administration, we made efforts to develop our material resources, but unfortunately for the people the present Government cannot be congratulated for any progress or development made or inaugurated or fostered by them during their term of office. Any person who reads the Budget must be satisfied that such is the case He makes no reference to any specific improvement brought about by his Government or during their term of office, but bases all his claim that abounding prosperity prevails upon conditions that came into existence during the regime of his predecessors.

The first fact that naturally strikes one in considering our position is that during those years nothing of a constructive character has been introduced by the Government. Beyond the building of the branch railways no national development has taken place, nothing that would help to build up the industries of the Colony, our fisheries, our mines, our forests. In fact the record of the Government has been almost a blank. When you consider in connection with this the fact that during their term of office the Government has had the handling of more monies than any other Government ever had in twice the number of years in power, the record is all the more unsatisfactory. They have had abnormal revenues, unprecedented borrowings, but still, whatever increase there has been in trade and in revenue has been due to causes that existed before they came into power

I have pointed out before in this House that conditions of our foreign trade as shown by the official statistics, have in recent years been changed from a favorable to an unfavorable balance. This condition still continues. To-day we have against the colony according to the figures given in the Budget Speech of the Minister, an adverse balance of $1,340,000 in round figures. The year before, the adverse balance was $850,000, and the year before that, it was over $1,000,00 The year before that again the balance was adverse to the colony. If you go back for years previous to 1910-11, you will invariably find a balance of trade in favor of the Colony. What does this mean? It means that our imports exceed our exports, and that we are buying more than we are selling. What we buy over and above what we sell, we have to draw on our reserves to pay for. If we were to submit this to any impartial banker and ask his opinion in relation to this country he would tell you that the condition according to

the figures, was one that showed an unsatisfactory state of trade. The figures in bulk have increased, it is true, but the imports have increased proportionally more than the exports. The increase in the figures as a whole, is mainly due to the enhanced prices of fish and fishery products also to the working of the mills in Exploits Valley.

Dealing with the general trade of the country, the Hon. Minister pointed out that the increase in imports are due to the normal growth of the colony's trade and not to "inflation" made in the figures by the bringing in of large quantities of materials and machinery for installation of paper mills which accounted in the years from 1906 to 1910 for large importations. Then he goes on to say that these figures attest conclusively the beneficial effects of the policy of the Government. He took care not to develop this conclusion that these increased imports were due to the policy of the Government. There is nothing in their record of five years to warrant such a claim. No industries of general value or utility. No expansion of those previously established beyond the natural development of the business of the concerns carrying them on. Nothing to render our fisheries or our fishing business commercially more remunerative. It is true prices have advanced, but this was in no way due to the policy of the Government. It was due to causes operating outside Government influence entirely.

Now, Sir, I say here that it is a pity that the Government by its policy, did not see its way to give better and more intelligent encouragement towards the establishment of industries in this country, such as those at Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls, which would render the importation of materials for their installation and establishment necessary. Excessive importations, due to such causes if within reason, is alright in a new and undeveloped country like Newfoundland. The only increase in imports that can be traced directly to the policy of the present Government, are those due to the building of the Branch Railways, imports that are due to spending the borrowed capital of the country upon these railways. According to the Minister's own figures and reasoning,the imports during the past year due to the building of the Branch Railways, amounted to about $250,000 indirectly through the circulation of the money borrowed and spent in construction work, and according to the returns of imports tabled the direct imports of materials for the Branch Railways, was $324,000. In other words there was about $550,000 of imports from this source. I base the statement in reference to the $250,000 upon the reasoning of the Minister, which is contained in his Budget Speech of last year. The Minister there says, referring to the Railway: "As a matter of fact the average number of men in each of these years (1910-12) working on the railway would not exceed 1,500 for say six months or 180 days, at $1.50 a day, equalling $400,000, or $40,000 per year."

The revenue on dutiable goods represents, according to our tariff about one-third of the value of the imports subject to duty. That would leave about $120,000 or three times the revenue of $40,000 worth of imports liable to duty from this source and the balance of $130,000 would consist of non-dutiable goods and of imports indirectly due to other expenditures than those in paying the daily laborer to whom the Minister's figures alone related making in all $250,000, with the $325,000 stated al-

ready as direct importations for the purposes of the branch railways These are the only imports which we can say are directly due to the policy of the present Government, and these are based upon the expenditure of moneys borrowed by the Colony itself. These figures are low, and would, I think, if other reasoning than that of the Minister was applied work out at a much greater total. The rest of the increase in the trade figures is due in part to the policy of the previous Government—in part to the increased trade all around and to the increased price that is got for our fish, and to the earnings of our people on Bell Island, at Grand Falls and other centres of lumber and paper and other wealth-producing industries which were in existence before the present Government came into power. It is then, I submit quite clear that the present Government cannot claim that any of these industries and increased trade are due to their policy. If, as I said before, they had encouraged the establishment of industries, their returns would show the imports brought to establish such industries and the industries themselves when established would be centres for increasing the wealth, and earning as well as spending power of the country. The balance of trade which exists and which is against the country, is due to the fact that, as a country, we are buying more than we are selling, and are drawing upon our reserves to pay for this excess of purchase. The Minister tells us that the figures upon the values of our exports issued by the Department of Customs, during the last few years have not been reliable, especially the value of our fishery exports. He says that the Deputy Minister wrote the Board of Trade that the valuations put on our fishery exports were so much undervalued that the figures were utterly unreliable and useless. Well, it is very difficult to understand why that is so. There must be something wrong in the Department if it is so. It is provided by the Customs Act that the value of the article of export when the export entries are made out should be sworn to, and surely it is the business of some person in the Department to see that the figures that are provided and the values that are stated and sworn to in the entries, are correct or as near as possible to the value of the articles under export. Surely the Department and its officers having charge of these matters have sufficient information regarding conditions in the colony, to know whether entries made in relation to exports contain the fair and proper valuation of the articles set out in such entries. Certainly there should not be such a discrepancy as would account for such an adverse balance as one and a half million dollars in the course of a year. This is a serious matter, and may put the trade of the colony in a very unfavorable light before the world. When the law calls for values to be verified by oath, surrely we should be able to accept the figures as at least approximately correct Section 100 of the Customs Act, provides:—

"Before a clearance is granted bound to a place or port out of this Colony, the owners, shippers or consignors of the cargo on board such vessel shall deliver to the Collector or other proper officer of Customs, entries of such parts of the cargo as are shipped by them respectively and shall verify the same by oath; and such entries shall specify the kinds and quantities of the articles shipped by them respectively and the value of the total quantity of each kind of article * * * such oath shall state * * . that the values of such articles are truly stated

according to their actual cost or the value which they bear at the time and port of exportation," etc.

It also provides that information must be given regarding the place of manufacture or production. It clearly requires, Mr Chairman, that the value of these exports at the time and port of exportation should be verified upon oath. If there is carelessness upon the part of people passing these entries it is surely the duty of the Department to insist upon proper valuations and not to issue figures upon the export trade of the country which convey such an utterly false impression of the conditions of the country. It is said that these figures are sufficiently large to make a change in the balance of trade in the Colony. If that is so, the authorities allow an adverse balance of trade to be published to go abroad when the figures in the Custom House are, as we are told by the Deputy Minister, so utterly unreliable, as, if converted, to show a favourable condition. By proper intelligence, proper information and proper observance of the law this defect anyway might be very easily remedied, and if my observations have no other effect I shall not have spoken without effect.

I have said, Mr. Chairman, that the present Government have had more money during the years they have been in power than any previous administration, and the Minister in his Budget Speech which he delivered here the other day took the position that one of the objects of a Minister of Finance is to find a surplus, not as the result of economy, but by taking more and more money from the people every year. He has always up to the present time been able to find a surplus because of the very large revenues that had come to him. The reduction in taxation which took place last year we were told was justified because of the surpluses which had existed and because the condition of our finances warranted the reduction.

Well you have to-day a very curious commentary upon the position which the Minister took in this respect last year. If you compare the Budget figures since 1909 they will, I think, teach you a lesson which it would be well for the Government to take to heart. Economy is the direction in which the energy of the Government should be directed and not towards increased taxation and not towards burdening our people with taxes which are unnecessary and which I propose to show before I am finished are utterly unwarranted, unfair and improper. It is to be assumed, Mr. Chairman, that when the Minister of Finance comes into this House with his estimates he has carefully considered the sums necessary to meet the needs of the public service for the following year, and though every latitude should be allowed for unforseen contingencies, that his estimates would cover all the needs of the public service that could be foreseen, and any emergencies which may occur during the year which might reasonably be anticipated by experienced officials. Now if we compare the record of the Government in respect to their estimated expenditure and actual revenue during the past four years we will see how the Minister and the Government have avoided this principle. Take the year 1909-10. That year the Minister estimated that the expenditure of the country would be $2,972,000.00. As a matter of fact, when the year's amounts were closed it was found that the actual revenue amounted to $3,447,988.84. In other words the actual revenue exceeded the estimated expenditure by about $475,000.00 or nearly half a million of dollars. The revenue that year

was larger than during any previous year and it is easy to see how to account for these large expenditures. These large expenditures are due to the fact that the money was coming in and the Government and the Minister fell into the temptation to spend these moneys on current account. They might have had as the outcome of careful financing if they had exercised it in that year a sum of nearly $500,000.00 which would have covered the loans they asked for in the Session of the Legislature which then followed. If that surplus over their estimated expenditure had been available there would have been no need for increasing the public Debt in this respect; and I think, Mr. Chairman if the figures of expenditure for that year were carefully gone into in detail it would be found that none of the Public Services would have suffered, that none of the grants for Education or Old Age Pensions or other such purposes would have suffered. They were matters provided for in the estimated expenditure and could have been met out of the moneys voted without drawing on this surplus of half million dollars at all. Then, Sir, we come to the next year, the same thing happened. In the year 1910-11 the estimated expenditure was $3,055,055.72 and the actual revenue was $3,527,126.43 leaving another balance of actual revenue over estimated expenditure of $472,000.00 or nearly another half million dollars. The same remarks apply to this as I have made on the finances of the year 1909-10.

Of course it will be said, as it has been said over and over again, that they had to spend money for education, for old age pensions and for other humanitarian and useful works of that kind, but I say, Mr. Chairman that these are things provided for in the regular estimates—were foreseen expenditures, and that these excessive receipts should have remained in the Minister's hands after meeting all the requirements for these services and others that were anticipated in the estimates for the year. Of course I do not say Mr. Chairman, that all this money—nearly a half million dollars in each of these years—should have been available for capital expenditure or for reducing the burden of taxation, but I say that the greater portion of it should, and I say that it should have been enough in the years that have been covered by the present Administration's terms of office to have rendered it unnecessary to have resorted to such large borrowings for local purposes as has been the case All the expenditures upon which loans have been raised could under proper economical management have been met out of these surplus amounts remaining on current account after meeting all legitimate and proper expenditure.

Then, again, sir, take the next year 1911-12. In that year the estimated expenditure was $3,332,000 and the actual revenue $3,736,455.87, showing a balance of actual revenue over estimated expenditure of $404,455. Again last year we had an actual revenue of $3,919,040.40, and the estimated expenditure was $3,600,000, leaving a surplus of $319,040.43. In all, during the four years the difference between actual revenue and estimated expenditure was $1,671,556.35. This large surplus might have been saved in four years had your expenditure kept within your estimated expenditures. As a matter of fact the surpluses of actual recepts over actual expenditures during these four years, if we include the hundred thousand dollars that was appropriated in anticipation in 1910 for special works, amounted to $919,000. These actual surpluses for the four

years was also spent on current ac count, and today you have practically no balance to the credit of your current account. In addition all amounts spent by the Government on capital account were borrowed which in view of these large receipts over the estimated expenditures and notwithstanding these large surpluses on your current account for these years As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman the borrowings for local purposes other than railway building including the loan which was authorized the other day amount to over a million and a half altogether. (I am referring to local borrowings only.) Of course, the Minister will say the first loan included an amount on current account for 1908-9, and that this was due to the Government which went before them. Well, I pointed out last year in the House that the Government which went before the present could not be held responsible for that deficit because that Government went out of power four months before the termination of that financial year, and the present Government—which has certainly made a record for itself in the matter of expenditure—came into power and had control during these four months of accounts and expenditure and it had then, of course, the making up and closing of the accounts for the current year. It is another case of the man painting the lion instead of the lion painting the man. Of course, that is neither here nor there with regard to the present position which I am trying to place before the Committee. Notwithstanding all this money that has come into the Treasury what is our position today? Are we in a financially healthy condition today? What does the Budget of the Minister of Finance show us? Now, according to the statement issued by the Prime Minister prior to the last election in his Manifesto he pointed out and accentuated the benefits that railways have been to this country and that the taxation last year as compared with the year prior to the building of the first railway in 1882 showed an aggregate reduction of $800,000 a year.

We find today, in the Budget which the Minister of Finance presented here, that nearly all that has been swept away, and that the thirty years' benefits which the Prime Minister claims to have accrued by reason of the opening of the railway, have been swept out of existence by a single stroke of the pen of the Minister. So far as the taxation borne by the people of the country is concerned, you are putting on today nearly $700,000 of taxation at one swoop. Still, Sir, we are told that the Government has been carrying on public works, has been building railways, that it has been extending the public services of the Colony, and that it has not increased taxation. If that fact stood alone, and if the Government had faced the fact that the works they were undertaking would have entailed increased taxation, that the people would have to pay, and if they had honestly and squarely put the matter before the people and the people accepted it, then, Sir, we could not find fault with them. They could say, 'the people put us here, we told them what was going to happen, and they are to blame and you cannot find fault with us.' But we find, Sir, that these things were not put before the people of the country. They were told that all these things were going to be done without increased taxation, and yet on the very first opportunity that the Administration has to deal with the matter of taxation, it is increased by nearly $300,000 over and above the $380,000 the amount which was taken off last year. Looking at

these facts and looking back at the comments made in relation to the taking off of the duties last year, is it any wonder that I stated and that I repeat now, that the Budget last year was 'an election Budget,' made specially for the purposes of the election, to carry out on the eve of the General Election a promise made to the people at the previous election, and simply for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the people with the intention at the next session of the House not only to restore that amount of taxation, but to increase it by nearly eighty per cent.

The Chairman of Committees left the Chair till 8 o'clock.

The Chairman of Committees resumed the Chair at 8 p.m.

MR. KENT (Continued.)— Before recess, Mr. Chairman, we were discussing the matter of taxation. I was pointing out that the Government had failed to carry out the promise made in the elections of 1908-9, and repeated in the last election to accomplish the work they had undertaken, including the building of railways and carrying out other important public services without increasing taxation, but that they had actually added to the taxation of the Colony nearly $650,000 per year. I pointed out that the Prime Minister in his manifesto in the last election, had stated that one of the benefits that had accrued to the colony by reason of the construction of the railways, commenced in 1882, had been to reduce taxation by $800,000 per annum. And I pointed out that in the Budget Speech of the other day and with which I am now dealing, this total reduction had been practically wiped out by the proposed increase this year of $700,000. In other words all the benefits in so far as they affect the amount of taxation that accrued in connection with our railways, have been obliterated by the tariff changes now proposed. The Minister of Finance brought down here last year the estimates of revenue and expenditure of the year we are now passing through 1913-1914. He estimated that on the statement as fixed by the reduction in taxation there would be a substantial surplus at the end of the year 1913-14. He said, 'For the financial year 1914 we look forward to a substantial surplus approaching a quarter of a million dollars.' The figures upon which he based that were:

Estimated Revenue $4,000,000
Estimated Expenditure 3,734,189

This would have left a surplus if the anticipations of the Minister had been realized, of about $265,000. We are now through about three quarters of the year, and the Minister comes in and revises his estimates of that year. He admits that his calculations did not warrant the conclusion at which he arrived. I pointed out at the time that the premises on which his calculations were based were wrong. He now admits that his calculations were wrong and that in this year instead of a surplus we will have a deficit. Today in face of the facts presented to this House, we find that my statements of last year were justified. The Minister points out that on the tariff as made last year we would have a deficit of $190,000. In other words he was out in his calculations $450,000, that is a surplus of $260,000 is converted into a deficit of $190,000 or a difference of $450,000. Looking at the figures of the Minister, looking at the fact that now when only three-quarters of the year has passed, the Minister has to revise his financial statement, and instead of anticipating a surplus of $265,000 he anticipates a deficit of $190,000. I say, looking at these facts surely the position which we took

last year that the Minister, in making his calculations, in making this sweeping reduction in the tariff, was acting entirely with a view to the approaching election, and not with a view to the best interests of the country, was absolutely borne out. This way of treating the financial affairs of the colony, making them a political football, this putting on and taking off of duties is not going to enhance the reputation of the country abroad. The condition of affairs as disclosed by the information before the House, is one which I submit, should make us pause and consider our position and the manner in which our finances are being dealt with. I have here the Bank balance as tabled a few weeks ago. And I find that one of the items on that balance is a debit balance for $552,678 against the interest of the public debt. What does that mean? It means that we had to borrow the money to pay the interest on our public debt at the end of last year, a fact utterly unjustifiable in view of our very large revenues. The balance sheet shows on the total balances here a total balance in favor of the colony of $498,000. In that balance is included the reserve fund of $500,000. So that without the reserve fund we should be actually $2,000 to the bad. There are other credit balances that cannot be included in your current account. There is $123,700 to the credit of loans 1 Geo. V., 1911, for a small amount to the credit of the 1898 loan, to the credit of our trust accounts. There is also an amount to the credit of suspense accounts. But if we take only these accounts that are fairly referable to current accounts, we find that you have covered by your drawings a very considerable portion on the $500,000 reserve of the colony, practically to the amount of nearly $300,000. The Minister has, of course. to get out of the difficulty, and after providing for the amounts spent last year from the current revenue and supplemented the other day by Supplemental Supply to the extent of $244,000 he introduces a loan bill for $360,000 to indemnify himself for capital expenditures, and to relieve these balances. The year before last the Minister had taken a position which was a sound one and had the Government acted upon it the affairs of the colony would not now be in the position in which they are. He took the position then, in referring to some remarks that had been made in course of debate, that reduction of taxation should be gradual.

The Minister in his Budget Speech 1912, said: "Under these circumstances I should hesitate to assume the responsibility of advising a general reduction of taxation at the present time, pointing out that such reduction, whenever made should be gradual and should depend upon the increase of the revenue, so that we may not dislocate our economic and industrial machinery." That, Mr. Chairman, was the statement contained in the Budget Speech delivered here the session prior to the session just preceding the election. The very next session he goes back on that and comes in here with a most sweeping reduction of taxation, amounting to $385,000, and practically abandoning the position which he took in 1912. Now, if the Minister and the Government during their term of office had gradually reduced taxation. I think, in the light of the figures which I gave this afternoon in relation to the discrepancy between estimated expenditure and actual revenue, they could have very easily given the people of this country the benefit of reduced taxation without finding them-

selves in the muddle in which they are at the present time. But the Government thought outherwise, and today they find themselves compelled, in order to establish equilibrium, as they say, in their finances, to increase the duties upon several items of consumption by our people. In relation to this question of the increase in duties, I think that any person who has even read the changes that have been proposed in the tariff, must come to the conclusion either that the matter has received very little consideration or that the Government did not understand what they were doing; because I think, that the smallest schoolboy would not have undertaken to do what they have done in the way they have done it in changing the tariff. In the first place you will notice,that the main item in the change that has been proposed is a surtax of 10 per cent. We have here a recurrence to the "Odious Ten per cent." which bore so heavily upon our people some thirteen or fourteen years ago, and which was so hard and unfair to the trade of the country. We have it here brought back in all its odiousness. There is also an increase in the duty on liquor amounting to $1 a gallon, and an increase in the duty on tobaccos. The Government has always posed as being the friend of the poor man, the man who cannot afford to indluge in luxuries, but the present tariff bears more heavily upon the poor man than upon the rich man. The man who can least afford to indulge in luxuries is the man who will suffer most from the tariff changes which the Minister now proposes. For instance, take the item of the tax on liquors. We find that there is an increase of $1.00 a gallon on whiskey brandy, gin and rum, while champagne and wines of that sort are untouched except as regards the 10 per cent. If a poor man wants a drink, it is not champagne or port or sherry that he is going to drink, but a glass of whiskey or rum. Why the Government should have taxed one and not the other it is hard to say. Again take the case of tobacco. It is the tobacco that is used by the laborer and the fisherman that is taxed, while there is no tax on cigars, except as regards the 10 per cent. Now the laboring man and the fisherman do not smoke cigars. It is tobacco such as Mont Bernard, Home Rule, F.P.U. and brands of that class which they use, and these are the tobaccos which are taxed most heavily under the present tariff. Then, Sir, I think this 10 per cent. was unnecessary. It is very difficult for anyone to understand why the Government have gone in for this wholesale method of taxation. I fail to see the object of it. The only explanation that I can give is that the Government has got into the habit of squandering money and they must have it in order to meet the extraordinary and wasteful expenditures which they have been indulging in. The Minister of Finance referred two or three times during his Budget Speech to the hope that they would have a surplus. A surplus due to economy and care is alright, but taxation for the purpose of a surplus is wrong. Now, what is going to be the result. If we take the Minister of Finance's own reasoning and apply it to this increase in taxation, we will find that the Government will have at least half a million of a surplus at the end of 1914-15. Now, where is the need of dragging all this money out of the people's pockets, of disorganizing trade and business and rendering uncertain all our financial and business arrangements. The Minister, for instance estimates that the revenue will be

$3,944,000. That is his estimate provided these increases did not go into operation. Now if you add to that what the Minister adds for the normal increase in the revenue of the country through natural causes, the increase, according to his estimate would be about $250,000. That would give you a revenue of $4,194,000. If you take from that the duties which you took off last year—$380,000—it would give you $3,814,000. Now, if you add to that the increase which the Minister here estimates as likely to result to the revenue—$650,000—it will give you a revenue of $4,461,000 for the year beginning in July next The estimated expenditure during the same time is $3,935,000. In other words, it means a surplus, applying his own figures and his own reasoning to his own tariff, of $529,000 for the financial year 1914-15. Are we justified in sanctioning these resolutions when we know how easily the Government can dissipate surpluses?

Now, I submit for the Minister and for the country, that, instead of this increase in taxation, a rational system of economy should be introduced into public expenditure. If that had been done you would not have had the disturbance which is being caused by this increase. Then the inequalities and unfairness of this revision of the tariff must be apparent to any person. Take an item such as tobacco It is really one of the luxuries which the ordinary poor man can afford to indulge in. The result of the tariff is that the tobaccos such as I have mentioned—Mont Bernard, Home Rule F.P.U. and brands of that kind—are more heavily taxed than the higher grades of tobacco. There is a specific duty placed on tobacco. On a pound of Mont Bernard you put an increase of 5c. and you put exactly the same increase on a pound of Garrick. Now, if you work out the percentage you will find that the man who buys a pound of Mont Bernard is paying much more heavily into the revenue proportionately than the man who buys the pound of Garrick. This tariff has really the effect—I won't say intention—of leaning more heavily on the man who cannot afford to indulge in these luxuries that on the man who can. Take butter and butterine. Now butterine is an article of considerable consumption amongst some portions of our people. Now there is a double excise duty placed on that! it has been advanced from 1c. to 2c. a pound. In addition to that there is an extra 10 per cent. on the duties, and in addition to that again the people engaged in the production of butterine have got to pay an increased duty of 10 per cent. on the duty on the butter that goes into the butterine; so that in that one instance, you have got three factors going together to increase the price of that one item. And these are only samples. If I were to go through the tariff item by item you would probably find that the same thing applies. In the opening days of the session the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance—I do not quite remember which, but one of them—referred to the number of motor cars which were being imported, and to the cost of the upkeep of these cars, and he left the impression on the House that motor cars were going to be taxed, but now we find that motor cars are not taxed except for the additional 10 per cent. on duties, while the poor man's tobacco is. It looks, Mr. Chairman, as if the Government had been looking around to see where they could get money. All these items on the tariff are items that enter very much into the daily consumption of our people. There was a bill introduced here a few days ago to put a tax upon the

small mill-owners of $1 a thousand feet. Out of that they hope to raise $25,000 a year; out of the 10 per cent. they hope to raise $320,000 a year; out of the increased duties on spirits they hope to raise $160,000; out of the duties on tobacco they hope to raise a revenue of $110,000; and from the increased duty or excise on butterine they hope to raise $36,000; or in all, as the Minister points out later on in his Speech, an increased revenue of $650,000. Another item is cigarettes. The increased cost of cigarettes will be about 50 per cent. of what they are to-day, when this duty is put into force, while cigars, as I have said, except for the 10 per cent stand as they were before. Now, there is another feature. The Government even did not take the time to consider this matter sufficiently fully to make up their minds whether they really wanted this 10 per cent, or not. They have taken powers to themselves to alter it from time to time. This, as far as the man who used the items to which I have referred is concerned, will make very little difference, as once this 10 per cent. goes on, whether the Government takes it off again or not the cost will not go down to the consumer. It is bad enough to have matters upset now by the imposition of this 10 per cent. Everything is disorganized. Our business people all over the country are complaining, and the man who buys is complaining. The man whose salary or income was a certain amount on this day week, to-day is not worth as much as it was then, because of these duties. The laborer who earns two or three or four hundred dollars a year cannot buy as much for that two or three or four hundred dollars to-day as he could last week. His clothes, his household utensils, his tools, his tobacco, etc., have gone up in price. The business men have got to work out how every one of these changes affect their business. And then you take to yourselves the power to change this. These people may have arranged their business, and after three months, or six months or twelve months they may find that a change is made, and after another few months another change may be made. It looks, Mr. Chairman, as if this tariff were simply made up on the spur of the moment, without any consideration having been given to the matter, and without its effect on conditions here having been thought out. The Minister's own statements, and his own system of working out figures which he has adopted the last two years in working out his surpluses and his revenue and expenditure, if applied to the working out of this Budget, will show a surplus of half a million dolars taken out of the pockets of the people which are not needed for any current expenditure. I for one, Mr. Chairman, do not intend to vote for this tariff. I intend to protest as strongly and as long as I can against the tariff, and to put myself on record against this method of dealing with it.

I would like to refer briefly, to our public debt. We have had already in this session two loan bills. One of them was for $2,000,000 in order to carry on the work of buildings the Branch Railways. The circumstances relating to that loan have already been discussed in this House, and I do not intend to deal with it again, but we were assured, as I pointed out the other day, that these railways would be built for $4,000,000. We have to date authorized the raising of $8,000,000, and I pointed out when this loan bill was in committee, that even this sum would not be sufficient to cover our obligations under this

contract. Then we have had another loan bill for $360,000, not to carry on works which the Government intend to undertake, but in order to indemnify the Government for work which they have already accomplished—work which they knew, when the House was in session last year,would be undertaken and which they had not the courage to come in here and tell the people before the election, would mean the borrowing of $360,000. What did they do? They anticipated last year a surplus of $150,000. As a matter of fact when the accounts are closed, they found that they only had $115,000, but they subsequently found that they had drawn in anticipation of this surplus, more than the amount of the surplus would warrant. Then, the purposes for which the Legislature had appropriated that surplus had to be paid for by money obtained from the Bank, and this loan bill had to be introduced in order to replace them, and to remove the expenditures which were made from the surplus and bring them into the loan account. This, Mr. Chairman, is another example of the manner in which the finances of this colony have been managed under the present administration. When the present administration came into power the public debt of the Colony was $22,000,000. To-day it is nearly $32,000,000, an increase of nearly ten million dollars during the last five years, and that in face of the fact that the revenues of the colony have exceeded during the same period the estimated expenditure by over a million and a half, It is time that this manner of dealing with our finances should stop. The revenue of $3,900,000 which the Minister referred to the other day, should be enough to cover the expenditure We are not a thickly populated or wealthy people. The whole population of Newfoundland, if they were put together in one town would not be equal to even a middle sized town in the Old Country. Our people are scattered all over our coastline. If they were in one town where they would be able to see what goes on day after day, then we would not have the condition that prevails here to-day, because public opinion would be brought to bear on the Government which would prevent such things as this.

There are only about two hundred and forty thousand people in the country, according to the last Census, and none of them, with very few exceptions would be considered wealthy In fact the number of wealthy men could be counted on the fingers of one hand. Still during the past four or five years our public debt has been increased to the extent of ten millions of dollars and our revenue by $1,125,000. Our annual revenue therefore, will increase $1,500,000 from the time this present Government came into power up to the end of the next year or fifty per cent greater than it was the first year the Government assumed office. What have they got to show for all this. The construction of lighthouses, fog alarms, telegraphs and public buildings have not been paid for out of the receipts for current accounts, but by money that was borrowed on capital account entailing an annual charge for interest. Even money was borrowed from the Bank to pay the interest on our public debt.

We are told of the votes for Old Age Pensions and of the increased cost of maintenance of the telegraph system and of the increased vote for education, but what do they, and all the other public works which I have mentioned, amount to compared with the revenues received by the Government since they assumed office. They might have been met fully and further

extended and still leave large surplus of revenue over expenditure for reduction of taxation or expenditure on capital account instead of the extensive and expensive borrowings undertaken by the Government. The Minister places in his Budget a comparative statement in relation to the civil service in order to rebut a statement that the expenditures had taken place under the heading of salaries. Any one who has followed the accounts furnished and the Auditor General's Report cannot fail to have observed that all the salaries and increases are not covered by the estimates,and year after year you cover salaries in your contingencies of every department that have not been put into the regular estimates. The Governor-in-Council, on Executive responsibility, year after year added to the expenses on salaries. During election year, between July and December, nearly fifty thousand dollars, according to the Auditor General's Report were spent on salaries without authority from this Legislature and were not taken into account by the Minister of Finance in his estimates. This method of increasing salaries on Executive responsibility should cease and no salary of any public official should, unless in exceptional cases be added to except with the consent of this Legislature.

There is another statement in the Budget Speech to which I should like to refer, although the matter has already been debated by this House. This statement is in relation to the Railway Contract of 1909. The Minister deals with this Contract and labors to show the advantages of this Contract over previous Contracts, and particularly as to the Contract of 1893 for the construction of the railway across the country. He speaks of the increased cost of rails, materials, locomotives, rolling stock and equipment of all kinds, and he speaks of the difference in facilities for handling materials owing to the nature of the country. Now, there is one clause in the Contract which entirely disposes of the argument of the Minister and that is in relation to rolling stock and extras; and this clause affords an open door through which all these increases may escape to the relief of the Contractor and come to bear directly on the people of this country. The cost of equipment and rolling stock is only barely provided for, and provided for on a money basis in the 1909 Contract.

The Contract of 1893 for the construction of the cross country line specifically provided for a certain amount of rolling stock and specifically mentioned the number of freight and passenger cars required for equipping the cross country line. These items were included under that Contract in the payment of $15,600 per mile and when they were supplied the line was fully equipped as required by that Contract. The 1909 Contract says the obligation of the contractor will not be fulfilled until each branch line is thoroughly and efficiently equipped. There is no definition of what thoroughly equipped means. The contractor may add rolling stock and equipment with the permission of the Government until each line reaches that undefined condition of being thoroughly equipped. The equipment so furnished is not included in the $15,000 a mile but for the purposes of payment is reduced to a cash value, at the same time a value is made of the rolling stock supplied under the 1893 contract which is subtracted from the value of the rolling stock, etc., supplied under 1909 contract, and the difference is to be paid as an extra to the contractor. By this arangement all the force of the argument of the Minister of Finance based

on the increased cost of material so far as it affects the contractor falls. It is really an extra charge on the people of the Colony.

Take the nature of the country through which the railroad was built under the 1893 contract and compare it with the country through which the branch lines were constructed. It was much more difficult and costly to bring the material and supplies into the interior of the country for the purpose of building the cross-country line than in the case of the branch lines. These lines are built along the coast line, and carriage by water could be availed of for transporting materials.

Then, again, under the 1893 Contract we had to pay in Bonds for the construction of the road, whereas under the present contracts we have to pay in gold. The Finance Minister must negotiate our Bonds in London and take the risks of the market. Formerly we gave Bonds to the contractor, and as he was paid,he negotiated them and took the risks of the market, but now the Colony has to go into the market and get the gold at once. For the work must go on. The money must be found in gold and the Colony cannot wait for a favorable market, but must take it as it finds it at the time the money is needed to meet the payments earned by the Contractor.

With reference to the last loan for $2,000,000 the Prime Minister must go to the London money market in the spring and procure the money if the railroad work is to proceed next summer. If the market conditions are any indication of what he will receive for his bonds in London at the present time, he will find that the country will have to pay pretty dearly for the gold required. Towards the end of last year the money market was very hard against borrowings of this kind. There was a slight reaction during last month, but conditions at the present time are still uncertain and even at the best conditions three and a half per cent. bonds do not offer sufficient inducements to investors. Other Colonies are offering more. The Dominion of Canada has increased her bonds to four per cent. and so has Australia and South Africa, and even at that a large proportion of those loans are on the hands of the Underwriters. It is very difficult to anticipate the effect on the market of a new issue of 3½ per cent. Newfoundland Bonds. It is difficult to understand why the Government has not adopted the example of the other Colonies and authorized 4 per cent. bonds. Last year our 3½ per cent. stock fell considerable. Take your 1912 loan. It was quoted in December, 1912, from 92-94, whilst in December, 1913, it was only 87-89. At 89 after making allowances for commissions and other amounts chargeable to the loan, we would, in all probability, net 85 or 86; or in other words the loan would cost 15 per cent. Even if the Prime Minister realizes the same percentage as the last loan we are going to drop, by reason of paying the railway contractor in gold instead of in bonds, six hundred or six hundred and fifty thousand dollars on the three loans, one of four million dollars and the other two, at two million dollars each. Looking at the conditions and the revelations during the present session, and particularly the contents of the Budget. which the Minister of Finance read the other day, is it any wonder that our efforts during the early part of the session asking the Government to open up two districts, by filling the offices of the Ministers of Justice and Agriculture were unavailing and not accepted? Is it any wonder that the Government is afraid to open any constituency in the country to go before the people with such a statement as the Budget discloses? Last year the Government removed duties which the Colony could not afford to do without,

and now at the first opportunity they not only restore an equivalent amount, but impose an additional amount of $300,000.

What now becomes of the statement in the Premier's Manifesto that all the work done had been accomplished without increased taxation, and that these works would be continued without increased taxation? Now, at the very first session, after the people had given him a renewal of confidence he not only put back the old duties as far as amount is concerned, but imposed an additional burden of three hundred thousand dollars on the people of the country. He takes off $380,000 on the eve of an election, and as soon as it is over he replaces it and adds another three hundred thousand. Is it any wonder, then, that when we asked for the appointment of a Minister of Justice and a Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Government voted down the resolution we introduced? The matter, according to the Prime Minister, was not worthy of serious comment. These two important Departments are without official heads to represent them here in the Legislature. Their duties in the House have had to be undertaken by those who receive instructions on the spur of the moment from clerks in these offices, and who cannot possibly be aware of what is occurring in these Departments. However, I think the Government cannot possibly avoid the necessity of filling these offices. I do not think the Governor should allow this House to close without these offices being filled. It is due to the House and to the country that they should be filled. Of course the real reason why the Government has not done it is revealed in the Budget. Truly, Mr. Chairman, it may be said of the present Government that 'the foolishness of our rulers hath destroyed the bounty which Providence has bestowed on the country." We never had a better illustration of the manner in which a Government can interfere with the flowing tide of industrial prosperity in a country. When the Government came into power efforts were being made to build up the material resources of the country, but since then no advance has been made and nothing whatever has been done beyond the building of these branch railways, and the expenditures on them came out of the people's own pockets. If these railway expenditures had gone on side by side with the establishment of industries and the development of the resources of the Colony, there might have been some justification for them. Railways are all right, but you must have development to render them useful, but all the energies of the Government appeared to be directed towards railway construction only. Last year in Canada some of its greatest financiers advised going slow in the matter of railway construction and were of opinion that more attention should be given to development of the material resources of the country. It is the same here and we must give more attention to the development of our resources based upon the increased earnings of our people, and if possible avoid going into debt year by year as we have been doing during the past four or five years.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in reply to the remarks of the hon. member. I think that this Committee fully realizes that the hon. member, Mr. Kent, has painted this Budget as black as he could possibly do it. I had expected that, and I felt certain that everyone else had expected it ,for it is the duty of the Opposition to criticise every measure coming from this side of the House. The hon. member started off by telling the House that

the present Government has spent more money than any of its predecessors. I admit that, but when he made that statement he did not give credit to us for doing anything in proportion to the money spent. I shall endeavour to show this House that the present Government has justified its existence and has given full value for all expenditures made during the past five or six years.

We have had a continuation of the Debate of last year in reference to the question of the balance of trade being on the wrong side of the account. We then discussed that question in all its details, and I at that time endeavoured to show the House how this country had prospered in spite of the balance of trade being on the wrong side. If the trade of the country last year was twenty eight million dollars—the imports fifteen millions and the exports thirteen millions, there was much more reason for that condition of affairs than the one given by the hon. member, Mr. Kent. Let me give one illustration in connection with this question of the balance of trade. If, for instance, the balance of trade was about even at the time the Grand Falls industry was started, and afterwards that company had imported into this colony five million dollars worth of machinery and material in connection with their works, would it not be made to appear that the balance of trade would then be largely against the colony? Under such circumstances would the hon. member seriously contend that this Colony was in a bad position, because owing to the Grand Falls industry the imports were five millions more than the exports?

The hon. member went on to say that in the statement contained in the Budget our exports were undervalued. If that statement is true it is our own fault. I believe that our fish exports are undervalued every year. It was so stated here the other evening by an hon. member who is engaged in the fish business. If this is true there is nothing in the contention tonight of the hon. member that this country is not in a prosperous condition. The hon member also stated that the only object the Government had in view was providing for a large surplus. I am not aware that any person or any government would wish anything to the contrary. There is no reason why we should not desire a surplus. We desire to have sufficient money to meet our bills. That is our position. If we have a deficit it is owing to the fact that we reduced taxation to the amount of three hundred and eighty thousand dollars, but the deficit left by our predecessors in office was caused by an over expenditure on their part. This is the difference between the two deficits. When we came into power we had not sufficient money to meet the bills, and by the adoption of a wise policy we not only paid all accounts but we handed back to the fishermen of the country something like three hundred thousand dollars.

The hon. member said that the Public Debt had increased practically $8,000,000 since we came into office. I admit it, but why did he not tell what we had done for that $8,000,000? If he was just in his remarks, he would give us credit for what we have done for that $8,000,000. I am going to show to the Committee what we have done. We are building four or five Branch Railways today, because we were told five years ago to build them. We got an order from the people and did not do it on our own account. We are building them, because we entered into an agreement

with the electors of Newfoundland to build them. That is the reason why we added $8,000,000 to the Public Debt of the Colony. May I ask the hon. gentleman, if he will allow me. what his Leader, and the late Government did when they tacked $5,000,000 on to the Public Debt. If we spent $8,000,000, we have something to show for it. We built these roads to open up the Colony. You did not justify the spending of $5,000,000 last year. You made some kind of statement, but it did not satisfy the people of this Colony. You never built one mile of railway. You were fooling with the contractor of the day, and finally spent $5,000,000, and the only justification you had for it was that the sentiment of the people was with you. We are doing what we were asked to do. We did not tell the people that we could do it without money it is only nonsense to stand up and say that the Morris Government has increased the Public Debt of the Colony, if you do not tell the reasons for that increase. We increased the Education Grant and gave Old Age Pensions. For years previous to this Government, Sir Robert Bond promised to consider the question of Old Age Pensions. The last time when he was Premier, he said in the Speech from the Throne that he was going to appoint a Commission to enquire into the matter, with a view to giving out Old Age Pensions. The Commission which he had promised to appoint was appointed; but it never reported to the House or country. Sir E. P. Morris promised in his Manifesto to grant Old Age Pensions and after one year, when he had placed things in order, his promise was fulfilled. We now come down and give the Old Age Pensions, according to our means. We gave all that was possible, according to our means, in 1910, and in 1911-12 we doubled that amount. We gave the Pension in 1913, and we have given to a third 400 men a pension of $50 more. We accomplished the Educational Grant and the Old Age Pensions, and yet you say we did nothing. Was not that enough to justify our return to power? We have done other things too. We have heard how many lighthouses have been built during the last four years and I ask is not that something to which we can point? We have discussed the railway question time after time. Why, this country is more prosperous today than at any time in the past, and the railways have tended to make it so. I remember a time when a working man received only 80 cents a day. When we came down with the railway contract, $1.25 was looked upon as an enormous sum. In 1919, 1910, 1911, the lowest amount paid to a laborer was $1.50 a day.

We were told in the House a few nights ago that the fisheries were not properly looked after, and that the revenue from that source within the next ten years would yield 50 per cent. more if the fisheries were properly cared for. I believe that, Sir, but my point is that we have done our best. We cannot do more than we are doing; we have done all that we could afford to do. I believe Sir, that the fisheries of this Colony if properly looked after, would yield that 50 per cent. stated by the hon. gentleman on the other side. Twenty two years ago, there were 150 bankers in this Colony; but where are they today? In 1907, fish in this Colony was $2.00 and $3.00 a qtl. I think $3.20 was the best price for four principal months of the year. That year there were 120 vessels prosecuting the bank fishery. That fleet of vessels have disappeared. You may ask where the crews are to-

night? Some of them are away in foreign lands and some are doing other work, possibly in Newfoundland. We were told the other night that we had added some eight or ten millions of dollars to the Public Debt of the country. However, we have given value for it, Mr. Chairman. We have been charged with hurting the fishermen, through putting the ten per cent. increase on tobacco and liquors. My answer to it is that the fishermen of the Colony are in a better position than ever before. Today they have free lines and twines and pork and sugar and several other articles. Their clothing is almost the only thing on which duty is charged. They pay no taxes. On the articles which I have mentioned they pay nothing. The average fisherman earns about $300.00 but he spends very little on his clothing. And yet, Mr. Chairman, we are wanted to cut down the tariff and not even tax the luxuries of the fishermen. Why do you call out as if injured, when we tax tobacco.

MR. KENT—Because of the unfair distribution of the tax.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The fishermen use the very best kind of tobacco. We are told that we have taxed butterine; but I say that we have not taxed butterine. It is true we have placed a cent a pound on it; but I understand that the fishermen can still buy it at the same price. The hon. member asks what we have done with the grants for St .John's East, during the past four years. I think that the district of St. John's East has received some eight or nine thousand dollars a year. Marine Works have been built and repairs made out of that. The same thing has been done in every Opposition district in the Island. Every district has received its per capita share of Supply, during the past four years. These moneys were spent on improving roads and bridges and building wharves, etc. I can say that in my district, where there are probably 6,000 people, these moneys have been wisely spent. Where there was not one public wharf in that district, today there are 6 or more built out of the grants of the past four years, and I got only my per capita share. In all the settlements in my district improvements have been made.

We have been told that we increased the price of the poor man's liquor. Well, Sir, I don't think we could do a better thing than tax it. If we have put the duty on liquor, it is only a step towards that petition which was presented here this afternoon. That petition asked that we abolish the liquor, and the only thing that can be said against this tariff is that we are trying to tax it out of existence. The man who drinks has got to pay for it. There is no reason at all for the statement that we are increasing the price of the poor man's liquor, because the poor man is not going to drink that liquor. The fishermen around our Island drink very little liquor as compared with the men who have lots of money, who live in luxury, and who drink it night and day. That is the man we are taxing. He went on to say that we found ourselves in a muddle at the present time. Now we are not in a muddle, and no man in this House knows that better than the hon. gentleman who made the statement. He also stated that we increased salaries to the amount of $50,000 a few days ago. Now, that statement is not correct.

MR. KENT—I said, according to the Auditor General's report.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—You will find that according to the Auditor General's report that statement is not correct. I will read now for the information of the hon. gentleman and the House the statement that I made in the Budget the other day:—

'A favorite source of complaint by some dissatisfied elements in the country is that the Government since taking office, has made its expenditures on a most lavish scale and they have sought to create the impression abroad that we have spent most of this money in increasing salaries and providing for political supporters. There never was a more utterly unfounded charge made against an Administration than this, as I shall show by the following summary of the estimated expenditure for 1908-9 and 1914-15. I might observe that the Estimates for the former year were prepared by our predecessors and were presented by us to the 1909 Assembly without any change whatever except that we made provision for an increase of $30,000 in the Education vote, $4,000 for a Tuberculosis Commission, $3,000 for preliminary surveys for the Branch railways, and $15,000 towards Harbor Grace Public building. The comparison is:

Head of Expenditure	1908-9	1914-15	Increase
Public Debt interest	$871,512	$1,124,063	$252,551
Civil Government	148,798	264,858	116,060
Administration of Justice...	183,612	199,493	15,881
Education	264,123	366,724	104,601
Public Charities	287,814	400,274	121,460
Lighthouses	73,651	109,175	35,524
Agriculture and Mines	31,420	56,200	24,780
Marine and Fisheries	92,940	103,040	10,100
Roads and Bridges	172,396	189,679	17,283
Postal Telegraphs	423,620	701,538	277,918
Customs	213,541	260,715	47,174

The increase for these and the lesser services amounted in round figures to $1,000,000, or about $167,000 a year for the six years covered by this comparison.'

Well, now, how can the hon. gentleman make the statement that he has made in relation to the increasing of salaries.

MR. KENT—I would like to say that the Auditor General's report says: 'New salaries and increased salaries, $48,000.' That is the $50,000 I referred to.

DR. LLOYD—These were increases this year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Excuse me. Down in the Customs alone salaries have been paid out of Contingencies. That has been going on for years. Now, I am quoting figures to show where every cent went during the past four years. The Public Debt has been increased $252,000, Civil Government, $116,000, Administration of Justice, $16,000, Education $104,000, Public Charities, $121,000, and lighthouses $35,000. There are reasons for all these increases. What would be the use of our improving the lighthouse service around the Island if we did not pay the salaries of keepers and the upkeep. The same thing applies to

the Agriculture and Mines Department and to the Marine and Fisheries Department. Road and bridges have been increased $17,283. That increase went out per capita to every district in the Island. Then there is the Postal and Telegraph service. Everybody knows how that has been increased during the last five years. And in spite of that the charge is made that the only expenditure we made was in connection with increasing the salaries of officials of the Government.

DR. LLOYD—Not a bit of it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS —The charge was made tonight by Mr. Kent.

MR. KENT—No

MR. COAKER—But he ought to have made it just the same.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—There are people who make charges that they should not make. Mr. Chairman, just one or two more remarks before I take my seat. I picked up tonight a paper called the 'Daily Mail', and in that paper I am once more brought before the public eye. I may say that the contents of this article are all new to me. Here it is. It is headed:

THE STORY CURRENT.

"The story which is in every one's mouth is that just before the extra duty was placed on Tobacco, Messrs. Bowring Brcs. received an order from Mr. Cashin ("Hon." M. P. Cashin is Minister of Finance and Customs) for Five Thousand Pounds of Tobacco (5,000 pounds),

Such an exceptionally large order at this time of the year from Mr. Cashin caused quite a stir, as such was never heard of in mid-winter before

The attention of Mr. Munn was at once drawn to the big order, and he being a keen business man, at once "smelled a rat."

For some time previous it had been discussed along Water Street that there would be increased taxation,and while some thought that the extra duty would be placed on Tobacco, no one was sure of it.

This exceptionally large order from Mr. Cashin led Messrs. Bowring Bros. to believe that there was "something doing," and they took a large quantity out of bond on spec (I hear it was 40,000 lbs.)

No Blame to Them.

No one can blame the Bowrings. To my mind they took a business chance, and they won.

But the whole Colony must blame Cashin, if the story be correct. If it is not correct, then it is a very easy matter for Mr. Cashin and Mr. Munn to contradict the rumour and to publish the facts.

At present scores of people believe it to be correct. The matter has been freely discussed during the last week and I have it from several who are on the inside track, that it is substantially true.

Let Him be Dismissed.

If such be the case, I call on His Excellency the Governor to dismiss Cashin at once and I call on Sir Edward Morris to resign, as we have lost confidence in his party.

I call on Mr. Coaker and the Union members to tie up the proceedings of the House of Assembly until this matter be set right.

I call on Mr. Kent and his followers to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Union members until the matter be set right.

If need be summons Mr. Munn to the Bar of the House, and let the story be either denied or proven.

If true, this is the greatest scandal that has ever been perpetrated since Newfoundland has had responsible

Government, and the eyes of the public are turned on the principals.

Must Clear Himself.

Cashin must prove his innocence.

Sir Edward Morris must see that the People's rights are safeguarded.

His Excellency the Governor must see that everything is fair and above board.

The recent enquiries in the Old Country are fresh in the minds of all who take an interest in public matters.

The Canadian scandals are not yet cold on our lips, and now here we are up against a far more grave and serious charge.

If members of the Executive are permitted to use their secret information and I say secret because everything which transpires at the Executive board is private, then we are indeed undone. The members of the Executive are all sworn to secrecy.

Another Story.

There is also a story that a member of the Upper House, who is in close touch with the Government. tried to buy up all the better grades of soap in the Country, a month ago, and that he did buy in a lot. Did he get a tip too?

I request you, Mr. Editor, to publish this letter.

I send it to you because your paper is fearless, you call a "spade a spade," and I believe the public appreciate you for it.

See that this matter is probed. You will have the support of all--Liberals, Tories and Unionists.

If rumor is wronging Mr. Cashin, I will be the first to apologize to him, but if the story be correct, let him be fired out of office, and let Sir Edward Morris resign and an honest man take his place.

CIVIS.

The man who wrote that article is a liar and a slanderer. That is my answer to it. I was slandered in this House before and it is not necessary for me to relate to-night how I came out of it. I came on top, and if the man who wrote that letter—I don't know whether he is in the House, but I hope not.

MR. COAKER—Do you imagine he is?

HON. MIN. FINANCE—Well,did you do it?

MR. COAKER—No, I did not write it?

HON. MIN. FINANCE—Did you inspire it?

MR. COAKER—I know nothing about it.

HON MIN. FINANCE—Have you control of that paper? You stated in the House a few days ago that you owned that paper and controlled its utterances.

MR. COAKER—No, I did not.

HON. MIN. FINANCE—I beg your pardon, you did. You rose in your place the other evening in relation to a certain statement that had appeared in the "Mail" and said that if you had known that it was going in you would have used your influence—in fact you said that it would not have gone in, and that it would not happen again.

MR. COAKER—No, I don't think so.

HON MIN. FINANCE—Now, I would like to know how long this sort of thing is going to be permitted to go on in this country—when slanderers of that character can take away the reputation of an honest man. How many people in this Island to-night will read that article and will never see the other side of the story. How dare any man send such a statement broadcast. Why did he not first find

out the particulars and then make the charge. This letter merely shows what must be the heart of the man who wrote it, but he will have to prove that charge as far as I am concerned. Then, on the other hand, to read that letter to-night one would think that thousands upon thousands of pounds of tobacco had been taken out of bond within the last few days. But even if 50,000 pounds of tobacco had been taken out of bond, what would it amount to? About four thousands odd dollars! And to read that article one would think that I had gone down to Mr. Munn and made a deal with him to take tobacco out of bond—entered into a contract with him to take out tobacco before the duties should go on. I never saw Mr. Munn within the last three months, except with another individual. I never spoke of tobacco to him directly or indirectly. That is my position to-night, Sir, and I will try to-morrow and put the man who wrote that letter in his proper place. Are we, may I ask, going to have this kind of stuff handed out to us day after day in the "Daily Mail" and the "Advocate" Are we going to stand for the kind of stuff that is published in these papers in relation to individual members in this House? I am glad that the hon. member for Bonavista states to-night that he had nothing to do with this article and that he did not write it. I had a better opinion of him. But if he inspired it or if he knew about it, then he is just as bad as the writer That is the position. In order to uphold the dignity of this House I know what I have got to do, but if I had the writer outside the House I know what I would do to him, or to anybody else who made any such statement as that concerning me. But one cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. Sir, as I said before, that statement has gone broadcast to-night, and how many who will read it will read the contradiction when it comes? What does it mean? Does it mean that I am trying to make money out of my position? Is that it? Because if it is, what is the position? If it is, here is the position in a nutshell. Suppose that charge were true, what would I make? That is the best way to get at it. If I had taken five thousand pounds of tobacco out of bond as charged in that letter, how much money would I make? I would make about $250,00. That charge means that I sold myself out to Mr. Munn for $250.00 and he went down and took 40,000 pounds of tobacco out of bond. I telephoned him to-night when I had read that letter and asked if he had read the "Daily Mail" He said no, but that he had heard about it. I asked him how much tobacco he had taken out of bond, if he had taken any, and did I ever speak to him about tobacco or anything else? He said, no; he told me that he had taken 10,000 pounds of tobacco out of bond, that was all. He said that he had had several calls for tobacco from people around the Island, and that it had been rumoured that the duty on tobacco and liquors was going up. That was his answer to me. And then I am asked to submit to this charge. No Sir- If to-morrow dawns on me, I will put the man who wrote that in his right place. I repeat again that the man who wrote it and the man who inspired it are liars and cowards and if I had them where I would like to have them I would know what to do with them.

MR. COAKER.—I am delighted to hear the explanation of the Minister of Finance with regard to this matter of tobacco, but I would be very much more delighted if he would tell the truth about it. He simply denies one or two statements, but he does not say whether he got any tobacco or not.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I told you that the statement was a lie.

MR. COAKER.—I beg your pardon, now. Did you get any tobacco or not?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—I have told you that that statement is wrong. I am not here to be questioned by you.

MR. COAKER.—And I am not here to be questioned by you. I asked you the question because I want to find out whether the story is true or not. On Monday last, Mr. Chairman, the Manager of the Tobacco Factory came to me and asked me if I would not buy tobacco. He had approached the office on the previous Saturday and did not get any information, and came in person and saw me on Monday morning. He wanted to know whether I would not buy a certain amount of tobacco—5,000 pounds. I said, no, we did not want any tobacco. Well, he said, tobacco is going up. They are going to put a duty on it, and they are all buying large stocks. Well, I said, I don't believe it. I don't believe that any Government is foolish enough to put a duty on tobacco, and in any case I don't want the tobacco. Now, the 5,000 pounds of tobacco that he referred to was made up in the factory for the F.P.U. It was not up to the standard that we expected, and we refused to take it. It had been lying there from month to month, and on Monday he came to me and said that the duty was going on, and if I wanted to get it now was the time. A member of the Board of Trade came in to me on Thursday and said, did you hear what is going around down in the Board of Trade to-day? I said, no, I did not hear anything. Well, he said, it is said down there that a Minister of the Crown is buying a large quantity of tobacco.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Name him.

MR. COAKER.—No, I won't name him. But he said that it was stated down in the Board of Trade Rooms that "Cashin had got tobacco out of bond and they know the exact amount". As far as the article in the Daily Mail is concerned, I did not see the article, did not know anything about it, until I read it here to-day. I did not write it or inspire it. Further, I did not state in this House that I owned the paper. Within the last two or three days we have been told by a section of the press of the trouble between the editor of the Daily Mail and myself, because, it was said, I wanted to support the Morris Party and the editor would not have it and resigned.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I may tell you that if you did support the Morris Party it would have one member less than it has now.

MR. COAKER.—I hope you did not take any tobacco out of bond. No one will be more delighted than I to know that he did not.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Does that justify you if, when you hear an old woman's story——

MR. COAKER.—I did not write the article.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Well, you are trying to justify the man who did write it.

MR. COAKER.—Now, I am not.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—You stated here that you controlled that paper.

MR. COAKER.—I made no such statement.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—In reply to Sir Edward Morris you stated that if you had known that a certain article was going in the paper you would not have allowed it to go in.

MR. COAKER.—I beg your pardon. I did not say anything of the sort.

If I knew that anything was going in the paper that I did not like I would go to the editor and try to get him to keep it out, and he probably would keep it out. I rarely go into his office. I have not the time to go there, and I do not know anything about what is done there.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I would like to ask you if you think it is right to make a statement like that about a man on the strength of a rumor.

MR. COAKER.—If the article had been shown to me before it appeared in the paper, I would have said: Go and investigate the matter, and if you find that the Minister of Finance has really taken tobacco out of bond, then make your charge; but you must have sufficient proof. That is what I would say.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer to the Budget. In his speech the Minister says that for the fiscal year beginning 1914 and ending June 1915 he estimates a revenue of $4,100.000 which should leave a surplus of $165,000.

Why do you want to put on extra taxes, if you are going to have such a surplus? Why are you putting an extra 10 per cent on every foot of lumber that the fishermen use and every article of clothing that he wears? Are you going to play with that $165,000? No responsible man would come and ask the Colony to receive this extra taxation, if we were going to have such a surplus. The only reason that we can see for this extra taxation is that you want the money to throw away.

You want this money so that you might be able to continue the practice of giving 'sops' to your party supporters. If you did not put on the extra taxes, you would be unable to do this In his speech, the Minister states that they are reducing taxation. Where is it? I would like to ask. The country will be amazed when it finds out that he has made such a statement. Just here he wants to take $700,000 from you. I hope that he is not trying to fool the people. I should not like to think that of him.

How could a minister prepare such a speech which is to go before an intelligent public? If you go down-town to-day you have to pay 2 cents for a cigarette and a much dearer price for tobacco than you did formerly. There is no increased tax on cigars or champagne; but the man who wants rum has to pay 15 cents a glass now. Put 500 per cent on champagne, but take it off the rum. The minister takes credit for his government for having increased the demand for labour. What have you done to make the demand for labour greater? Have you opened up a mine or a saw-mill? Have you done anything? You can take no credit for having opened up any industrial company or corporation. I can tell you that many a poor man will be turned against you, when he hears of these increased taxes. There is many a poor person to-day who cannot get a bit of butter to put on his bread. There is many a poor widow who cannot obtain a bit of butter except this oleo which has been greatly taxed. You say we do not pay taxes? Why, I maintain that the fishermen pay nearly all the taxes. Yes, it is the poor despised under-dogs who have to pay the taxes. Why don't you tax the cigars and wines of the rich man? The poor man has to bear a bigger burden than the rich man. You are going to have this extra taxation and the poor people can go to Hong Kong, for all you care. It was not so last fall, however, when you increased the salaries of many persons. "The duties, taken off the necessaries of life in pursuance to a definite pro-

mise made to the people." I wish such a promise had never been made, and I doubt very much whether if there had not been an election last year, you would not have waited until this year to carry it out. As I have said before had you left one cent a pound on sugar you would now have $50,000, from that. Two cents a pound on tea would mean another $25,000, and another $100 on motor cars you would get $12,000 and you would not be in such a predicament as you are now. But you wanted to cry forth the glad tidings "the poor people are free," the necessaries of life are untaxed." We find we have to vote $360,000 for to make up for what was spent last fall, and yet you call that "spending the money economically within the limits of the revenue" My hon. friend, Mr. Kent said this evening that there was $48,000 increase made in salaries and jobs. That shows economy. And now we are asked to give the Governor $2500 more on to his salary. There are plenty of people to help the rich but no one to help the poor but Coaker. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that the breakwater at Musgrave Hr. would cost $2,066. There was $2,000 spent in the district of Fogo for a public wharf. What right had he to do that? Here are the people of Musgrave Hr. sending us petitions for a breakwater. But you went and built a wharf at Fogo because you wanted the people of Fogo to vote for you. And now you have spent $5,000 on that wharf and it is not finished yet. I wonder if it ever will be finished before the next elections. I wonder if there would be a wharf at Fogo or a breakwater at Joe Batts Arm if the Premier had not been through the district last spring. The best thing that ever happened the F.P.U. was the way in which the votes were cast last October, and if we were offered the Government to-day we would not take it. Because you are now going to sink deeper and deeper into the hole. We see now why you did not appoint the two ministers. We asked about it three weeks ago and we thought we would give the Government time. We do not need any explanation now. We can see why. You knew you had to vote that $360,000 and **you knew the people would** be down on you and you dare not open a district to have a member go back for re-election. What is going to happen now? There will be two members appointed to the Upper House and appointed to the two executive seats. But when the time comes when you have to do it do you think there is going to be delight in what you have done? Would it not have been better to have faced us by appointing two acting ministers. Do not be afraid to make two appointments and have the ministers in their places. If you had not reduced taxation and had not created these new jobs we would not be so opposed to you now. But now you are getting nothing but the curses of the country on your heads. You have spent $620,000 more than you estimated last year and now you are piling on a great deal more than you took off. God help the poor suffering fishermen. I do not think the Government can help them. Why are you doing this? What is the necessity for it. $17,000 was the estimated cost of Harbor Grace Public Building, and now you give us a statement showing that it is going to cost $29,000. You say in the Budget Speech that it is going to cost $17,000 and next day you table an account showing that it is going to cost $29,000. Good men make mistakes but that is not the only one. If you put on a tax on sugar of one cent a pound and two cents on tea you would get $170,000. Would not that be a wonderful amount to get. If

you earmarked it you could give every man of 70 years a pension of $80.00. Two thousand men could get $50,00 a year and you would still have $70.000 left. Raise two millions and pay the interest on that. Ear mark that and spend $1,000,000 in developing the fisheries and one million on agriculture. Put a thousand men on farms and give them $1,000 each to open up the country Help 10,000 or 15,000 men to buy motor boats. Add to the wealth of the country. I say that the value of the fisheries could be increased 50 per cent. If you will do that we will help you to do it. For the last five years money has been squandered freely. Every man is asking where the money is going to come from. What is going to happen bye and bye? How is it that you can give so much for this and that. If you happen not to be a member of the F.P.U. it is easy to get a $50.00 family grant in the spring. Where does it all come from. I will tell you. The man who wants his drop of grog has to pay 10 cents now instead of five. That shows wonderful ability, adding on a surtax. You put on four cents pound on tobacco. As a matter of fact they pay fourteen extra. There are fourteen sticks to the pound and they have to pay an extra cent on each stick. You have sewn the seed and you will have to reap. The result will be that you you will have to go out of power. The petitions we have filed against you will be pushed and if we succeed we will have to send men into the districts. Do you think you can win now when you have taxed everything. You will not. It is a pity. You were going on fairly well for a time and making very fair progress, but now you have got to go out. Good men will replace you. I am sorry that we have to turn out one or two men, but you all must go. The country wants all the good men it can get. We thought you were going to retrench. We would have helped you to retrench, but you are evidently bent on continuing your extravagant policies and you have got to go.

HON. MIN. FINANCE & CUSTOMS You said the same thing about Bond and then you joined him and took him as your leader.

MR. COAKER—He thought he was too smart. That is my opinion. If he was not so smart he might have been here with us now.

The country is in a serious position. It is very easy to come here and pass legislation to provide for $600,000 increased taxation, and to provide for a loan of $2,000,000, but you ought to look forward to results. What will happen if you have a bad sealfishery. Things are going to look blacker and blacker. You do not know where it is going to end. Poor old Terra Nova is almost sinking under the load and every man in the Colony who loves the country must take an intelligent interest in what is going on. The extravagance of the administration has placed us in this position and we ae now called upon to place on $600,000 more taxation than was ever on before. I have before me now some figures, which are really too long to read. They are in connection with the arbitrations, the fees. Anyone who looks at this total of $34,000 and remember that it has been divided among six or seven men will understand how it is that we are now taxing the people again. Why should we pay $5 when it could have been done for $1. There are plenty of men who would be glad to take the job on the Bonavista Branch for one fifth of what has been paid. The result will be that when the time comes for the meeting of this House again next year you will not hold the positions that you now occupy.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted; and the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Service."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons tok the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted, and the Bill—"An Act respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Service" was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Municipal Affairs" was read a second time and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill—"An Act to amend the Act 2 Edward VII, Chapter 8, entitled 'An Act to incorporate the United Towns Electrical Company and for other purposes.'

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to amend the Act 1 George V, Cap. 24, entitled 'An Act respecting Pilots and Pilotage for the Port of St. John's.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Targett gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 4th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 4th.

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

MR. DOWNEY—I beg to present a petition from the residents of Crabbe's Station. The petitioners ask that a sum of money be granted towards the excavation of a public well. The water there is very poor, and the people are anxious that they have clean water. I trust that this matter will receive due consideration, and I now ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present three petitions from Pouch Cove, Biscayan Cove, and Bauline respectively, on the subject which occupied the attention of the House House yesterday afternoon, namely the matter of prohibiting the carriage of intoxicating liquors by subsidized trains and steamers to local option districts and the enactment of legislative machinery to provide for the taking of a plebiscite on the subject of the total prohibition of the manufacture and sale of liquors. These petitions have been forwarded to me by the Rev. Mr. Dotchon, Methodist Minister at Pouch Cove, and come, I

understand, from the people comprising his congregations at these three places referred to. Unfortunately they did not reach me until this forenoon, and so were too late to permit me joining in the discussion of yesterday. The subject matter of the petitions were then so thoroughly discussed that I shall not trespass on the time of the House now in further comment, which we shall have an ample opportunity of doing when the proposed legislation comes before this House. In the meantime I would ask that these petitions be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present some petitions from Indian Island, Joe Batt's Arm and other places in Fogo District. The petitioners ask that a sum of money be granted towards a coastal wharf at Seldom-Come-Bye, and a public wharf at Joe Batt's Arm; that $200 be granted for a road, $500 for the extension of a main line road; $500 for extending a road between Gander Bay and Dog Bay; and that a depot be erected at Tilting. Mr. Speaker, no doubt the requests are of importance to the people of the various sections of the country, and I hope they will receive careful consideration.

Telephone connection is very badly needed in Fogo district. The telegraph wires run along within about half a mile of this place and yet the people have to walk nine or ten miles if they want to send a message. It would be a great convenience and a saving of time and energy if these people had telephone or telegraph connection with the outside world. The fishing population have got a number of schooners there, and if they could find out about the movements of fish down around the headlands, Joe Batt's Arm, Seldom and these places where they go to fish during the summer, it would be the means of putting money in their pockets.

I trust that all these various requirements will be taken into consideration by the Government, and if there is any money at their disposal, I hope they will try to meet the wishes of the people of Fogo as outlined in these petitions.

There is just one more, and it is of special importance. This petition is from Musgrave Harbour. It sets out that the people of this settlement have no harbour accomodation, and that it is necessary to have it in order to protect not only their property but their lives, which they often risk in endeavoring to save their fishing property. The petition is largely signed by the inhabitants, and I trust that it will receive favourable consideration. The people there are a very industrions, hardworking people, and every effort should be made to assist them as much as possible in their work I have very much pleasure in supporting these various petitions

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Little Bonaventure,asking for the sum of $500 to complete a breakwater at that place. The petition is largely signed by the inhabitants, and as Bonaventure is a very rough harbour the breakwater would be a very great convenience to the people there. I trust the Government will give the matter its earnest consideration. I also ask leave to present a petition from Hatchet Cove, dealing with telephone connection. This petition is signed by practically all the inhabitants up and down the shore, and they ask that the Government take into consideration the matter of the extension of the telephone service from Hillview to Hatchet Cove, a distance of about ten miles. While I am referring to telephone connec-

tion I may say that I presented a petition here the other day from Cavendish, I think. I have received a letter from Rev. E. Bishop asking me to bring that petition before the House and to call the attention of the Prime Minister to it. He also says that he has written the Prime Minister asking him for his support in connection with the matter. I trust that the Government will see its way clear to grant the requests of the petitioners. As far as I am concerned, I will endeavour to give them my hearty support. I ask that they be referred to the Department to which they relate.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The hon. member is quite correct. That letter was received by me on yesterday. I will give every consideration to it.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St .Juliens asking for the abolition of trawls at that place It appears that St. Juliens is the only place in the district where trawls are allowed. If the law be not enforced in that locality the people there will have to give up their avocation. The petition goes on to say: 'We therefore ask that the use of trawls and bultows be prohibited from the 1st of June to the 31st of October in each year.' I have a similar petition from the inhabitants of Croc on this same matter. The fishermen there think it is a serious matter. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will, I am sure, take this matter into consideration and bring it before the Board, so that the use of trawls on this part of the coast may be prohibited.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from D. J. Rowsell and other residents of Ward's Harbor in the district of Twillingate. The petitioners ask for the sum of $200 for the purpose of building and repairing roads around the Harbour. In presenting this petition I would like to say that I am personally well acquainted with the place, and I know that there is a very great necessity for the expenditure of some money upon the roads there. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present four petitions on an important subject, namely, the change of the mail route, from Pilley's Island, Long Island and Triton. The petitioners point out that by the present winter route people have no opportunity of answering their letters by return mail. The petitions are signed by all the inhabitants of these places, and I hope that next year when arrangements are being made for the winter mail service, that the Postal Department will take into consideration the wishes of these people. It is only reasonable to assume that the people living in that locality know best what are the most suitable arrangements. I ask now that the petition be referred to the Department of the Postmaster General for consideration.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from St. Kyran's, St. Brendan's and other important settlements. This petition is signed by 300 people and they ask for a sum of money to build a line of road from South East Bight to Presque, a distance of four miles. This road would save the people of this neighbourhood a distance of twenty miles. It is a well known fact that in that particular part of Placentia Bay no expenditure has been made for roads, and the people there now ask this House to give them the sum necessary to build this road. I ask that the petition be received and re-

ferred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition. It struck me forcibly the other day, in reading the Estimates, when I noticed that the entire main line grant for the west side of Placentia Bay was only $300. Dr. Lloyd got up and told this House the other day that when he went to Trinity, after an absence of some years, he was agreeably surprised at the splendid condition of the roads down there, and suggested that Trinity had got more money for this purpose than it should have got. Now, if this is correct, I think it is the duty of the Government and the House to see to the matter immediately. I am not prepared to sit here and see any other district get more than its fair share of road moneys while the roads in our district are in such a condition as they are at the present time. The road referred to in this petition would facilitate matters for practically the whole west side of Placentia Bay. Four miles of road would not cost an enormous amount of money, and I hope the Government will see its way clear to grant the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Holyrood, Conception Bay, asking for the privilege of electing a road board. The petition is an important one and is signed by Father Finn and a hundred and thirty others. I have very much pleasure in presenting this petition and I have no doubt that the prayer of the petitioners will be acceded to. I also ask leave to present two petitions, one from Brooklyn and the other from St. Brendan's, Bonavista Bay, in reference to public matters I also ask leave to present a petition from Newport, asking for a telegraph office and that the steamer make it a port of call for the Dundee and that certain moneys be allocated for public improvements there. I ask that these various petitions be received and referred to the Departments to which they relate.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS tabled led statements asked for by Mr. Abbott, Mr. Jennings and Mr. Targett, in relation to various matters.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled accounts of the St. John's Municipal Council to the 31st December, 1913.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House, a copy of the returns of special, local and main line grants expended at New Bonaventure for the years 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913.

MINSTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, in reply I beg to say that the information asked for is in course of preparation.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the amount of monies expended by his Department at Witless Bay, in the District of Ferryland, and to whom paid, for the year 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table that statement.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House copies of returns of expenditure of all special and surplus trust grants allocated by his Department to Fortune Harbor, in the District of Twillingate, during the years 1912 and 1913, up to date.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—That information is in course of preparation.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a detailed Statement showing (a) the cost of Breakwater at

Petty Harbor, and (b) the cost of Public Wharf at the Gut, Petty Harbor.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can get the information he desired from the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I might say that I noticed that that question was referred to the wrong Department, and I asked the Marine & Fisheries Office to furnish it.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement of all moneys spent on the Smallpox Hospital at Harbour Grace for the years 1911 and 1912, in detail, the amounts spent and to whom the payments were made.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, that statement is being prepared.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House (a) an itemized statement showing the amount of $6,000 paid the Reid-Newfoundland Company on account Cape Bonavista Fog Alarm; (b) the amount paid the foreman; (c) the total cost of the Fog Alarm at Capt Bonavista.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES not being in the House, the question was ordered to be put on to-morrow's Order Paper.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement of the expenditures of the Poor Commissioner at Spaniard's Bay last year.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The Department is unable to have this information copied in full, but the original documents will be left in charge of the Clerk for the perusal of the hon. member.

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 provide for the Investigation of Combines and Monopolies"; "An Act to amend the law relating to the Representation in the House of Assembly"; and "An Act to apply to this Colony the Law of England in relation to the Suppression of what is known as the White Slave Traffic," without amendment.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Mr. Higgins for Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 3, George V., Cap. 4, entitled 'An Act to incorporate the Conception Bay Electric Company, and for other purposes," 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 Mr. Higgins for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 2, Edward VII, Cap. 8, entitled 'An Act to incorporate the United Towns Electrical Company, and for other purposes," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 1, George V, Cap. 24, entitled 'An Act respecting Pilots and Pilotage for the Port of St. John's,'" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the order of the day I wish to call attention to a matter which occurred yesterday while the House was in Committee of Ways and Means. The incident had reference to an article which apeared in the 'Daily Mail' of yesterday's issue, charging a Minister of the Crown with taking advantage of his position to his

own profit. This charge was denied by the Minister. Personally, I accept his denial, for I know him to be a man of honour and unimpeachable character, but this matter appears to my mind to bear another aspect. This article contains a charge against a person who holds a high and responsible position, and this charge was absolutely and flatly denied. It is due to the dignity and integrity of this House that this charge be fully investigated by the Legislature. I would like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister who is the custodian of the dignity of this House, what action he intends to take in conection with this matter. It is very easy to get every fact in relation to this matter, and if the statements are untrue, as I believe, I think the man who wrote them should be here and dealt with in a proper way by this House. It is our duty to do everything in our power to impress the public wtih the seriousness of charges of this kind. These charges not only affect the Minister and this Legislature, but the people of the whole country. I feel certain no one desires a fuller investigation into those charges than the hon. minister himself.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I entirely concur with the idea suggested by the hon. member, Mr. Kent, but I might suggest whether it would be desirable for this House to take any immediate action, in view of the fact that instructions have been issued by the Minister to his Solicitor to take a writ for an action of libel in the Supreme Court against the 'Daily Mail.' I am fully aware that this House should be the guardian of its own honour, but it is possible that the Minister's case might be prejudiced if we were now to hold an investigation in a Committee of Privilege.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I agree with the position taken by Mr. Kent, particularly as the financial statement of the affairs of the country is now before the House. I may state that I do not believe the charges made against the hon. minister, nor can I believe them. I had heard the matter discused in the street long before I saw it in print, but I scouted it as a canard, as I do not believe that a gentleman occupying such an honorable and high position would jeopardize that position and that of the Government by being guilty of these charges which have appeared in the Daily Mail. At the same time I think it is due to the dignity of the hon. member and the dignity of this House that this matter should be thoroughly investigated before the vote on Ways and Means is taken.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I agree that the fullest investigation from every standpoint should be made, and that is the desire of the Hon. Minister. At the same time it might be well to consider whether, in view of the pending action, the Minister's case might not be prejudiced by the matter being dealt with by this House.

MR. KENT.—I do not see that any harm can possibly come to the action about to be taken by the Minister in the Court, but it would be far better to deal with this matter in a Committee of Privilege and have it disposed of as far as this House is concerned. We must deal with the matter as a Legislature, and that immediately, for if we await the decision of the Court, this session will have been closed. The question of the truth or otherwise of the charge can very quickly be disposed of as the evidence can be brought within a narrow compass.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I suggest that we allow the Court to deal with this matter first, rather than have an enquiry here at the present time, which might possibly have a very prejudicial effect upon the case

of the Minister. I have no hesitation in saying that if the writ against the newspaper is not issued by to-morrow, I shall accede to the request of the hon. member and have a full investigation by a Committee of Privilege. The Finance Minister endorses what I say in this respect. During the hearing of the action in the Supreme Court the fullest enquiry can be made and the Minister himself will go in the witness box and be questioned on every point which may be raised in connection with this matter. The facts and issues are practically the same as those which would be dealt with by a Committee of Privilege.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned I simply brought the matter forward for the purpose of vindicating the honour and dignity of this House. I believe in the denial made by the Minister yesterday, but the author of the charge should be dealt with by this House. I have known the Minister for a number of years, and when he makes a statement here I fully believe him. I think that in the interest of the Minister himself, as well as in the interest of this House and of the whole country the matter should immediately be dealt with by a Committee of Privilege of this House. Such a proceeding cannot injure him in the prosecution of his case.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I wish it to be clearly understood that what I said or am saying does not raise any doubt on the honesty or integrity of the Minister of Finance. I believe that a Committee of enquiry will fully vindicate him in every particular. I cannot conceive how his case can be prejudiced by an enquiry of a Committee of Privilege.

MR. F. J. MORRIS.—Mr. Speaker, it may be questionable whether a Committee of Privilege would be the right course in this matter. If the charges are false, which I believe, a gross libel has been perpetrated on the character of the Minister of Finance. If it is absolutely false then it is a gross libel, but the question is is it a matter that we as a House have a right to deal with. It is not a libel on the Minister in his conduct as a member of this House, sitting in this House.

MR. LLOYD—Of course it is.

MR. MORRIS—This is something that it is alleged that a gentleman called M. P. Cashin did on the street previous to the Budget Speech being submitted to the House. He is supposed to have derived his information of the increased duty on an article of import because of the fact that he is the Minister of Finance and before his Budget comes down and before it is made law he is accused of using information that he received at the Executive Board, out on the street in a business transaction, in a business conducted by M. P. Cashin. Now that is the charge made against him by that paper, not that he as a Minister of Finance or a member of this House has misconducted himself in this House, but that being possessed of this superior knowledge he availed of his information in a business transaction between himself as an ordinary merchant and another merchant on Water Street. Now I am only putting this position to the Leader of the Opposition and to the House and I am as anxious to preserve the dignity of the House as any man. I have not gone into the matter deeply. I have just considered the fact as I have been speaking. The Speaker undoubtedly will be able to find something in May that will cover the whole question as to whether the Minister has been libelled as a Minister of Finance in this House for something done in this House and as a member of the House. It is not the charge that he used certain knowledge of which he was possessed as a Minister of

the Crown, in a transaction outside the House. It is only a matter of opinion and I wish the hon. member for Trinity to understand that I am merely expressing an opinion and I shall be very pleased if we find that we have the power to deal with the matter. If the Minister had been charged with disgraceful conduct in his position in this House then undoubtedly Sir, it would be a matter for a Committee of Privilege, but, I doubt if in the present instance we have this power.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, with reference to the position raised by the member for Placentia and St. Mary's the Minister is under a duty to this House in regard to himself and others to make no disclosures with reference to the tariff before he makes them here. The charge is that he did make such disclosures. I wish to give my unqualified support to the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition. I do so because I think if the dignity of the House suffers in any way, it is due that some explanation should be made and something done to uphold its dignity. There has been a good deal said about public officials in public prints. Sweeping charges of the worst kind have often been made and to my mind the House has to uphold its dignity and guard the reputation of members and those holding offices in the Government. I trust that the House will see the wisdom of the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition and have a Committee of Privilege to investigate this whole thing.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I may say that when the matter was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition I thought that it was in the Minister's interest and in the interest of all concerned that an immediate investigation be held by the House and in that the Minister concurred. Since then he has had an opportunity of consulting his solicitor who has charge of this case and who is issuing a writ in the matter and he has advised him that it is not in his interest or in the interest of his case that he should consent to that investigation.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker. We have already discovered that the Government were willing to have an investigation into this matter when it was first moved. Now we find that they are taking a different position. We were told last night that the man who wrote the article was a liar and a slanderer. Now we want to know if there is any truth in this matter as far as the Minister is concerned and if the statement is false let us punish the man who made it. I did not know what was in that article till it was read in the House. Now if the Minister is innocent, he will not care for fifty investigations, but if he is guilty he will not want to have one held.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker. This matter has assumed a different aspect now. I fail to see that an inquiry such as has been suggested can any way prejudice the Minister in his action before the Court. I think that a Committee of Privilege can be had in this matter without in any way prejudicing him. If, as has been pointed out, the statements are untrue he cannot be prejudiced and if they are true he cannot be prejudiced either, so that in any case he cannot suffer any prejudice to his case in having such an inquiry. We are now, as I pointed out before, dealing with perhaps the most serious business of the Session. I think we ought to have this matter finally disposed of. When the matter comes before the Law Courts this House will be out

of session and the House will not have any opportunity of passing any opinion upon result of the action or the finding of the Court. We are now here in session which we have been told will close at the end of the week I think the Prime Minister ought to reconsider the matter and have it investigated by the House in Privilege right away.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker. If I venture a suggestion, it seems to me inconceivable that the Minister or any member of this House should desire to have this Committee of Privilege stand over because of the possibility of action in the Law Courts with regard to this charge. The one has nothing whatever to do with the other. The one would be a civil action against the Editor of this paper in connection with his rights; but the proposition or suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition was that this House deal with the matter in Privilege as it affects a member of the House, and I submit that the suggestion having been made we should immediately go into a Committee of Privilege and take the matter up. It cannot possible affect any rights the Minister may have in the Law Courts, and even if it does affect those rights and I say that the position the Minister occupies in this House as Minister of Finance and Customs in charge of the Bill now before the House—the Budget—,I say it affects him more in his capacity of member of the House than in his private capacity. It affects this House and members of this House and the whole country and the only way of dealing with a matter of this kind is by a committee of Privilege. Personally I agree with what has been said already with regard to the charge itself. I do not for one moment place any credence in the charge, but there it is. It has been brought up in this House by the Minister himself and having been brought to our notice, I think it is our duty to deal with it.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, when I came into the House to-day I was prepared to come before a Committee of the House; but since then I have consulted my solicitor and he advises me that the matter should first be heard in the Courts.

MR. CLIFT—Then I would say that it is a pity that the Minister did not consult his solicitor before he mentioned it in this Committee.

MR. LLOYD—Are we to understand that the Government absolutely refuses to go into Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. LLOYD—Then this Bill is going through Committee in charge of a Minister who has charges hanging over him that can be immediately investigated and he bides himself behind privileges he is seeking elsewhere. Whatever rights that gentleman has, he can take them outside this House, but he also has certain rights in reference to this House and certain duties to this House and he is not fulfilling his duty to this House in refusing to go into a Committee of Privilege. There are certain duties of honour and honesty that he owes to this House. Now I am not attacking the honesty of the Minister, but his honesty has been attacked in relation to this House and he has the right to go before a committee of Privilege and have this matter investigated, and he tells us that acting on the advice of his solicitor he refuses to do this—absolutely disregards this House and the rights of this House to have this matter cleared up before we go on with the tariff. This is a matter that affects the House. He is supposed to keep absolutely secret his know-

ledge of the tariff till he comes into this House.

HON. MIN. FIN. & CUSTOMS—That is what I have done.

MR. LLOYD—The charge is that he himself took advantage of this knowledge; and further that his action was a disclosure to others who took a like advantage. Now that is a further charge, that others took advantage of what it is alleged the Minister was doing; and we have this remarkable fact that an extraordinary amount of duty has been paid recently—extraordinary in every respect. Some fifty one thousand dollars was paid in duty on tobacco the last two weeks. That is an extraordinary state of affairs and would not take place usually. The only explanation that can be advanced outside of this is that there was an intelligent anticipation of what the Minister intended to do; because it is an undoubted fact that on the streets of this town it was known what the Government intended to do. Now I will tell you what I was told before I came into the House last Wednesday before the Resolutions were tabled. I was told by a business man on Water Street that there were going to be extra duties put on tobacco, on liquor and 10 per cent. all round. Where did that come from.

MIN. FINANCE & CUSTOMS—It did not come from me.

MR. LLOYD—I am quite satisfied that it did not come from you; but I wish to point out that a most extraordinary position has developed the past few weeks; these tariff changes have been public property and business men have been taking advantage of what it was supposed the Government was going to do, and what it actually did. Now that being so, a serious charge in reference to this matter has been made and brought up in this House. This House has a right to have that matter settled. It is not a matter of the rights of the Minister alone. He is not the only person concerned. The honour of this House is concerned. It is not solely what the Minister wants, or the Leader of the Government wants. This House is a party to this matter, and I say that when the Minister takes the course he is advised to take he is not consulting the dignity of this House and I protest against the action of the Government.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker,—are we to understand that the Government refuses to allow such an important matter to be investigated by the House I was told by the Editor of the "Daily Mail" that he was informed by one of Messrs. Bowring Bros. employees that Mr. Cashin had purchased 5,000 pounds of tobacco from Bowrings. Now let us bring the editor before the Bar of the House and if the statement made by him is untrue and is a libel let us have him punished. But if the Government refuses to have a Committee of Privilege the Minister might as well resign, because the people will demand his resignation. Do you think the people are not looking on. Do you not know what their verdict will be?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word, in reference to the matter, not as regards the Opposition or as regards the Minister, but rather in reply to the member for Trinity, Mr Lloyd, who has made in my opinion a very remarkable statement as regards alleged disclosures of the alteration of duties in the present Budget.

MR. LLOYD—I did not say there were any disclosures.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—You said the whole town was talking about the matter and that you were

informed that certain duties were going to be put on—that information had leaked out.

MR. LLOYD—I did not say that. If the hon. gentleman will only put his recollection to the test he will remember I put another construction on it and said it might have been intelligent anticipation of what the Government was going to do.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is the only construction that can be put on it. I want to tell him that after the speech from the Throne people generally put their thinking caps on and wondered on what articles the increased duty would be placed. The speech from the Throne outlined increased taxation and the people wondered what would be taxed. I was asked not a week ago, but six weeks ago on what articles was the increase going to be put. I did not tell them, Sir. I did not even know. It is a well known fact that certain liquor dealers have been taking liquor out of bond the past six weeks because they assumed that liquor was going to be taxed, and I presume the same would apply to tobacco.

These things are luxuries and the people naturally thought that it would be luxuries that would be taxed. They knew that we were not going to tax necessaries. It was a simple thing for any man to work out, and I do not think anyone can say that any disclosures were made or needed to be made by members of the Government. Personally, I did not know what was in the Budget until very shortly before it was tabled. I must say that it was not a surprise to me, as I anticipated in my own mind what was likely to be done. I did not tell anyone that, but I have no doubt that the gentlemen who benefitted by taking these articles out of bond went on their own judgment and drew their own conclusions as to what would be done. I do not believe,and I feel sure that no member of the Government ever gave the least item of information that could be taken advantage of. The position taken by the Minister of Finance is taken on the advice of his solicitor. I am prepared to accept that position. As to the guilt of the Minister I have never had but one opinion. I know him too well and I know as I pointed out last night that it would take more than that paltry sum to buy his honour. In fact I do not know that it would be possible to name a sum that would do it.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker. My point of view of this matter is not as regards the Minister of Finance. I am thoroughly convinced of what the Minister said when he denied the charge, but I think it is up to us to investigate this matter from the point of view of the dignity of this House. Every member of this House owes it to himself and to the House that when such a charge as this is made the offender ought to be brought before the House and punished and I do not think that we ought to turn aside from a duty like that because of any personal interest whatever. We owe it to the House, to the country and to the people who sent us here, that this charge should be thoroughly and fully investigated Of course, in view of what the Prime Minister says that we are not going to have an enquiry now, we cannot force it. They have got the majority in the House and with that majority rests the duty of vindicating the honour and dignity of the House and if that majority is not capable of living up to the dignity their position demands and if they have forgotten the duty entrusted to them by the people of the country

we can do nothing As regards what the member for Placentia and St. Mary's said I think it has been pointed out by the member for Trinity that there can be no more serious breach of duty by a member of this House than is contained in the accusations made against the Minister. It is for the Government to see that this matter is investigated at once. If you are going to exclude this House from enquiring into such charges made in relation to it then our privileges are absolutely fruitless and worthless.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that a mere suspicion against a member of the House affects the rights and privileges of the House. I can see the point which he has made to the effect that in addition to the charge against the Minister, the honour and dignity of the House are also involved in the charge. Under ordinary circumstances the proper course would be to proceed at once, but the Minister has informed the House that it would not be in his interest to have an immedlate inquiry.

That is the reason why I think that no harm can come to the House in the postponement of the enquiry until the Hon. Minister brings the matter into Court. If we proceed with the enquiry and investigate the matter, the hon. member's position may be prejudiced. That is the point.

As to the question as to how certain changes in the tariff were rumoured around town, that is a matter that we might talk about for ever. It is impossible to tell whence these rumours come, and it is a well known fact that there are always charges made whenever a Budget is brought down. People take goods out of bond on speculation and sometimes they are right, and sometimes they are wrong. However, it is not fair to assume that the Minister of Finance can be blamed in any way for this and during my long experience in public life, I have never known a case in which a Minister profited personally.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, last night the Hon. Minister of Finance said that the man who wrote the article in the 'Daily Mail was 'a liar and a slanderer,' and denounced him in the strongest terms. He seemed to be only too willing to get an opportunity to exonerate himself before the whole country, but now he has refused to have the matter sifted out. I do not pretend to understand the technicalities of the law, but from a common sense standpoint there can be no reason for the attitude which he now takes. There is a suspicion abroad now and very soon it will be in the minds of all the people of the colony. All who read the papers will have a suspicion unfavorable to the Minister and to the honour and dignity of this House unless the matter is dealt with promptly. If it were my own case I would court inquiry into the matter, and I would not hesitate a moment to allow the whole question to be dealt with by a Committee of Privilege of this House. I cannot see what is to be gained by postponing the enquiry for most libel suits are begun in one year and finished in the next. Possibly this suit may be settled more quickly but the general rule is that they last a considerable length of time. It is wrong altogether to retard the enquiry, and the guilty party should be dealt with promptly. If the suspicion is allowed to rest in the minds of the people it will take a long time to remove it.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I rise to give my unqualified support to the

position taken by the Leader of the Opposition, for I think the dignity of this House demands that there should be an immediate enquiry into this matter. If the editor of the paper is guilty, he should be punished, but if he is not, then the Minister must be guilty. We should have an investigation so that the matter may be cleared up promptly.

Pursuant to order and on motion of 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. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman, when the House was in Committee on Ways and Means last evening the Leader of the Opposition dealt very fully with the Budget brought down by the Hon. Minister of Finance, and he went into the figures that were laid before us in a manner that showed that he had a very good grasp of the financial situation. He criticized the Budget in scuh a manner, that I thought it would have brought from the Minister some reply on the various financial matters with which he dealt.

He pointed out that the Minister in his Estimates last year was something like $450,000 wrong, and that instead of having a surplus of $250,000 we had really a deficit of nearly $200,000. He went on to show that during the tenure of office of the present Government no measures had been introduced of an industrial nature or developments that could go hand in hand with their policy of railway building. He submitted also that it was the duty of the Government to have brought about some improvements in order that the large increase in expenditure might be justified. To all these points the Hon. Minister has made no reply. As a justification for the existence of the Government for the past four years, as a justification for the large expenditures of public money he pointed to the light houses, fog alarms, Old Age Pensions and the increase in the votes for Education and Charity. I submit that all these votes were really taken out of one pocket and put into another, and he did not in any way answer the speech which was made by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not feel, therefore, that it is incumbent upon me at the present time to make any observations in reply to what my hon. friend has said.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition also dealt with some figures that appeared in a statement tabled in connection with the balance to the credit of the Government in their accounts with the Bank of Montreal. This account is on the face of it very complicated, but I have no doubt that the Minister would be able to afford me some information that I would like to have before we proceed any further with this Bill.

For instance, in the first item in this account, there is an overdrawn balance of $18,112.00 under the heading of Old Age Pensions. I would like to know how it is that the vote for Old Age Pensions has become overdrawn by that amount.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Because the interest had not been credited to that account.

MR. CLIFT—The interest would be about $8,000. What about the remaining $10,000?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—It would be taken from current account.

MR. CLIFT—This statement was drawn up on Feb. 15th, and the in-

terest is paid on January 1st. One would have thought that the interest would have been placed to the account before.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is a matter of book keeping in the Bank of Montreal.

MR. CLIFT—Will the hon. gentleman inform me if the various balances carry interest or not.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes. For instance, the sum of $18,112 is a balance carrying interest at 3½ per cent.

MR. CLIFT—In the Department of Agriculture and Mines there is an over drawn account of $3,051.29, which I presume carries interest.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That balance is on the credit side and we receive interest on it. My hon. friend should try to understand what the statement says before he starts to criticize it.

MR. CLIFT—This account does not show any interest and I am speaking only of the balances as they appear on the table. That is the reason why I am asking for information from the Minister and I would like to obtain it from him as civilly as he knows how to give it. Now, there is another overdrawn balance in the Department of the Colonial Secretary, amounting to $3,475.00. Will my hon. friend explain this?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I am not in charge of that department and, therefore, I am unable to give you that information.

MR. CLIFT—There is a balance of $19,491.00 under the head of Contingencies 1913-14. Is that General Contingencies?

HON. MIN. FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I presume so.

MR. CLIFT—My hon. friend is familiar with the fact that there are balances on this statement and I would like to know from him why they are outstanding. It seems to me that if the book-keeping and accounting were made up as they should have been, by the end of the half year, that these balances would have been adjusted.

There is another balance of $552,678.00 under the heading of Interest on the Public Debt. I should like to know why that balance is remaining there when the half year's interest was due on Dec. 31st last. Why was not the Bank reimbursed? The exchequer's account was only in credit on that day $529,000.00, which was not enough to pay the interest account.

Taking the balance of the balance account, we find the Public Trusts account overdrawn $97,000.00; Public Charities $10,000.00 and public works $75,000.00. Taking the whole amount in the Bank, we find that it is $498,000.00 and, therefore, the reserve fund of $500,000.00 cannot be said to be intact, as it should be. I admit that it is not a very serious matter to have $2,000,00 less than the reserve, but when my hon. friend states that the reserve is intact he is stating what is not correct. Not only should that reserve be there, but all the other trust funds should be intact. Some of these are not there at all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Finance has been pleased to refer frequently to the legacy left him by the late Government. In fact, in all his speeches since he became Minister of Finance, he has referred to it. What remarkable speeches they have been! The last one was the most remarkable of all. To hear the Minister refer to that deficit of the Bond Government one would have thought that it had committed a crime that had never been before committed by a government. He made it seem as if it were a terrible thing to go out of office, leaving a debt behind. This

terrible deficit amounted to $330,000. By the way it was spoken of by the supporters of the Morris Government, one would have thought that this amount had been pocketed by the Bond Government. On the contrary, this sum was expended upon public works chiefly. If a change of Government had taken place at this last election, the Morris Government would have left behind a debt of $600,000. It was the policy of the Bond Government during the last four or five years in office to construct all public works and buildings out of the Revenue Account. If the present Government had taken the amounts spent upon roads and other public works out of the Revenue Account, instead of showing a credit balance of $115,000, they would have shown a deficit of $200,000. I mention this, Mr. Chairman, to show that the crime committed by the Bond Government in leaving a deficit of $330,000 was as nothing to the crime committed by the present Government in having left a deficit of $600,000, if you had gone out of power last October. Enough has already been said about this objectionable and obnoxious tariff that is being imposed upon the people. This taxation is to my mind wholly unnecessary. If the Government had exercised proper economy in the control of the Government service, it would not have been necessary to add on this extra 10%. Whatever benefit was received by the removal of the tax upon sugar and tea will now be cancelled by the increased tax of 10% on all dutiable goods. I cannot therefore, Mr. Chairman, congratulate the Minister upon his Budget Speech or the Government upon the manner in which they have gone to work to raise a revenue to meet the debt increased through their blunders. In one speech, the Minister came down and asked for a revenue of $3,000,000. In his speech last year, he came down and asked for a sum of $4,000,000 and to-day he is asking for a sum of $4,500,00. The Minister is placing an extra 10% on all dutiable goods, because he thinks that the country is more prosperous to-day than ever before. I hope that the money markets will be more favorable than at present when the Prime Minister goes to England to obtain the loan. No matter how we may disagree in public matters, if we have any regard for our land, we would like to see the Prime Minister obtain this sum at the best possible rate of interest. It is scarcely fair for us to say anything detrimental about the financial position of the country at a time when the Prime Minister is going to the money markets with a loan.

MR. JENNINGS.—I wish to make a few remarks on the subject now before the Committee. I am going to deal with this subject from the fisherman's standpoint. I know that, if you earn $200 and spend $350, you will be in debt. You may mix the figures all you please, but that will not alter the actual facts. I don't see why the same does not apply to a country as to an individual. It has been said in this House that the fishermen are not heavily taxed. I shall give you an estimate of the expenditure of a fisherman who earns $500. He would pay some $140 on general food on which at present there is no taxation. Possibly $60 would be spent on salt and other fishing supplies. The remaining $300 would be spent on dutiable goods. That is $300 out of the $500 would be spent on dutiable goods. I have had some forty years experience of the earnings of fishermen, and anyone who says that the fishermen are not heavily taxed is entirely wrong. Out of this $300 spent on dutiable goods, some $90 would be paid into the revenue of the country. Yet it is said the fishermen do not pay taxes. Reference was also

made to the price obtained for labour twenty years ago. The wages paid when the railroad was constructed across country has been compared with the wages paid at present. I do not think that any reference has been made to the cost of provisions at that time. I remember being down about Badger Bay and I remember writing letters home there for labouring men and they could then get flour for $3.80 a barrel. Taking all this into consideration the increased wage is quite necessary for a man to live as well as he did that time. Now the question is where will the increased taxation bear the hardest. It will certainly be on the working men and on the poor. I believe that there are many families that will have to economize on account of this. Many and many an old garment will have to be taken out this winter and repatched and economies will have to be practised to an extent that members in this House know nothing about. It is only those that have gone through it that can realize it. I know pretty well how the fishermen economises his means to live independent. Many an old garment that in the ordinary course would be put aside will be taken out and made serve for another winter. Many poor children will have to go to school without sufficient clothing to protect them from the cold on account of this increase in taxation.

I am a believer, however, in the idea that there is room for education of the people as regards the finances of the Colony. There is a very wrong idea abroad that there is no bottom to the Government chest. I do not know where the idea started, but it is certainly spread abroad and you have got to educate the people up to the idea that all the money that is spent will eventually rebound back upon them and have to be repaid. If they get to understand this they will not be asking for things that they know the country cannot afford. I do not believe that they would have asked for railways if they knew the country could not afford them. They certainly would never have asked for them if they thought they would increase taxation. As I said before these taxes are going to bear hard upon the poor man with a family of five or six who probably had to pay $90.00 last year will this year have to pay $100.00. As I said when starting I did not intend to take much time as I want to give the fishermen's viewpoint on this matter and I think I have stated it as fairly as I know how.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, the reason that certain wines are not included in the articles on which the duty is increased is that they come from countries like Portugal where we send our fish and they have been the subject of negotiations for a still further reduction in the hope of getting a still further reduction on our fish going in.

MR. LLOYD.—May I ask the Minister the reason for leaving cigars without any addition.

MR. CASHIN.—There was no special reason except that we consider them high enough. Of course the 10% applies.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a few remarks, chiefly on the policy of this Government which has brought about this additional taxation that we are faced with at the present time. The matter of figures and statistics have been gone into very thoroughly by those well qualified to handle it. The errors, omissions, transgressions and bad management of the Government have been pointed out and proved conclusively to the satisfaction of this country and of this House.

Now when Sir Edward Morris assumed control of the Government or

when he took it into his head to leave the Bond party and come out for himself and try and rule this country and its destinies it was said in the public press that if Sir Robert Bond were returned to power he would find himself in such a position because of the difficulties in which he had involved the Colony that he would be compelled to bring about Confederation to protect himself. That was said in the public press about the Bond Government. Now what can be said about the Morris Government at the present time. We are brought to such a condition of things that if we want to finish the work we have under construction we have to add to the burden of our already over burdened taxpayers, or we will have to go into Confederation and get the great Dominion to assume control of our affairs That is a plain fact that cannot successfully be contradicted. An individual who overdraws his account and cannot meet his obligations when called upon, what is the result? A receiver is called in and takes control of his affairs and he will have to compromise in some way or get someone to back a note for him or he may summon his creditors and show that he has an asset whereby he can pay his creditors in time. All we can show to our creditors now is that we are taxing the people more. I do not believe that this country can bear increased taxation at the present time. Another thing that was said before Sir Edward Morris assumed control was that the country was struggling under the burden of the taxation put on by Sir Robert Bond. Well, what is the condition of things at the present time? Have we not to find two million dollars to pay for branch railways; and I understand that there are overdrawn accounts of almost a million dollars awaiting adjustment. This condition has been brought about by the Prime Minister and those associated with him. Of course he may be able to give an apparently satisfactory explanation of the financial condition of this country and make it appear all right; but viewing it from the standpoint of local men we do not think it is all right when we are brought to this condition of affairs. Our public debt has been increased by $10,000,000. That is not a condition of things we can accept silently and without criticism. We would not be true to our principles or the men who sent us here if we allowed this vote for increased taxation to go silently. We protest against it because it has been brought about in this way and the people have been deluded and deceived into thinking that we were living in security and prosperity and that taxation was being lightened instead of the imposition of this additional burden we are now brought face to face with. Can any party or government take pride in this achievement? I look to see nothing but resentment from men of intelligence against the Government that brought about this condition of affairs. We may go further and say what was predicted when this Government assumed power; but it is unnecessary for me to do so. It is known generally to almost every man in this Colony. They know now the truth of these things, but they will realize them more fully when they suffer the loss of certain necessaries they would enjoy but for conditions that will be brought about by these increases. These things have been brought out by Mr. Jennings, the member for Twillingate, who spoke from the practical standpoint. He has shown us the conditions under which the working man in this country has to live. He can appreciate the condition of things a great deal more than many who have not had to economize in any way. We know that extravagance in

Governments as well as in individuals will bring its own retribution, but we never thought it would bring about such a condition of things as exists now. Everybody last year and the year before wondered where the money was coming from. Even their strongest supporters often wondered where all the money was coming from that was being scattered broadcast. Well now they know where it came from. They went into the money markets of the world, obtained these large loans and scattered the money broadcast. That is a condition of things that could not last long. Now we find that we must increase taxation to meet this condition of things. This was prophesied by Sir Robert Bond. Imagine if he were here on the floors of this House what a scathing arraignment of the Govern ment he would give us in his eloquent language. I am sorry he is not here. Sir Edward Morris also regretted it on the opening day. I do not know whether he regrets it at the present time or not. Be that as it may; if we cannot express our views on this matter in such eloquent and telling language as Sir Robert Bond and others yet we can in our own plain way bring to the knowledge of this House what we think on this matter. We want to show our disapproval of and we want to protest against the condition of affairs brought about by the Government. We have been told that the country is prosperous. Is the labouring man prosperous when he has to send his son and daughter out to work to help earn something to keep the family when the son and daughter should be at school. That is the condition of things now. You say that we are prosperous, but in my opinion we should never consider ourselves prosperous until the head of a family can earn enough to support and educate those dependent upon him. Then we are prosperous, but not till then. Prosperous indeed! maybe some of the members of the Government are prosperous, but the same does not apply to the producing classes—those who produce the wealth of the country. The truth as to the present condition of things has now been brought to bear on almost everybody, and it will be difficult to get them to trust you in the future.

What has the Prime Minister said in connection with building the branch railways? The Minister of Finance said last night that they had a mandate from the people. They had a mandate to spend four millions but not a mandate to spend eight. That is where the great difference is. If you had told them the true condition of things or that you were going to increase taxation to finish these railways perhaps there would be a different party ruling this country.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—We told them last fall we would need more money.

MR. HALFYARD.—Were you true in your statements then? Did you tell them you were going to increase taxation? Half the truth is worse than a lie. You will find, however, that you cannot deceive the electorate any longer. The statements made by the Prime Minister in this matter remind me of a story I heard of a half witted fellow who used to go every day behind a turf heap to say his prayers. Some boys one day got behind the turf heap and heard him praying and he was praying away at a great rate saying what a miserable sinner he was and that if the turf heap fell down on him he would be only getting what he deserved. The boys behind the heap turned it over on him and he jumped up in a rage and said that it was frightful that a fellow could not say a thing in fun without Providence taking it in earnest. Now

that is the trouble with the Prime Minister. He may have spoken in fun but the electorate took him in earnest. When he said the railway would cost $4,000,000 and the annual interest charge would be $140,000, the people believed him. Well they know now how true this was and it will not be easy to fool them again.

It being now 6.30 p.m. the Chairman of Committees left the chair till 8 o'clock.

The Chairman of Committees resumed the Chair at 8 o'clock.

MR. HALFYARD, (Continuing.)— When the Committee rose I was referring to the apparent insincerity of pre-election promises. Statements made by politicians, which the electors looked upon as being made with sincerity, were found soon after the election to have been savoured with insincerity. This is a fault common to all politicians and it has been brought to our notice very fully of late years. The country has been asked to assume very heavy obligations, and there will be increased taxation, whereas the general impression conveyed to the people of the Colony was that vast improvements would be made without increased taxation, but there have been no improvements whereby the fishermen will benefit.

The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister in discussing railway extension was fond of asking the question: "Does a dose of medicine pay?" I presume that he looks upon a branch railway as a dose of medicine to the Colony. All will certainly say that a dose of medicine taken in proper quantity and by the order of a doctor who has made a thorough diagnosis of the patient's case is a good thing for a man's illness, and results in much good to him. However, if the doctor does not understand the patient's case the medicine may do the man a great deal of harm, as in the case quoted by my hon. friend, Mr. Jennings, in a former debate, where a man was given carbolic acid by mistake.

We have had our dose of branch railways but in our case I do not think the doctor who prescribed the dose made a proper diagnosis of the case. otherwise the bad effect would not have been so apparent as it is at the present time. A mistake was made first in the mileage and then in the cost. That 'dose' will entail upon this Colony eight millions of dollars that we know of and a further amount that we have yet to be told about and this has happened in the face of the fact that the Colony was led to believe that the cost would be only four million dollars. Any doctor who muddles the case of his patient in that way certainly does not understand his business and shows plainly that he is only a quack doctor.

As a matter of fact, the Colony has been almost poisoned by an overdose of branch railways and it will take years before the country recovers from the shock of this tremendous over-expenditure of money. It will mean that additional burdens must be heaped upon the people of the island, and not only upon those ,who are now living, but upon future generations.

Political expediency has brought about this state of financial affairs. We all believe in branch railways to a certain extent, and we should like every hamlet in the island to have the advantages of 'the iron horse,' if that were practicable, and the country could afford it. However, it is not proper for a party to try to gain political power, and the control of the affairs of the country by involving the couutry in a policy that will cost us

more than we can afford. The trouble was that when there was a line suggested to Bonavista, which is represented by three members of this House, it was also suggested that it would be advisable to have the line built to Trepassey, so that the party could count on three men for Placentia Bay And so on until finally it was decided to build a branch line to Fortune Bay, Bay de Verde and to Bonne Bay. These five branch lines constitute the over-dose of medicine from which the colony is suffering to-day. It has been argued by members opposite that they had a mandate from the people to build these branch railways but I make the statement now, and I know it cannot be successfully contradicted that the Colony would never have sanctioned the building of these branches if the whole matter was put before the people as it has been revealed in this House during the present Session.

There has been some money put in circulation for a short while by the building of these branches, and the result has been that we have had somewhat abnormal revenues, but there will be no new industry to the Colony as a result of the building of these branches and there will be no lasting good effects to the people. You cannot point to anything in connection with these branches whereby the earning power of the people will be increased. There has been no industry started as yet by reason of the building of the railway whereby the earnings of the people have been increased. We now find ourselves in the position of having everything of a public nature at a standstill as no extra moneys have been voted for education, lighthouses or any other public works. The Government have made large expenditures under these heads from moneys obtained under various governments and not out of the current revenue of the Colony. The ordinary man is not aware that these public works have been paid for out of capital account. The Government are now demanding more taxation on an already over-burdened people, to meet last year's deficit of two hundred and seventy thousand dollars. The taxes on certain articles last year were taken off, but as soon as the elections were over they were put on again, and additional taxation was also imposed. This taking off and putting on of taxes was undesirable, for one of its chief objections was the disorganization of trade. Small shopkepeers last year suffered to a large extent by reason of the reduction of taxation. I do not think that the Government gained a vote by that action, but they made the excuse for doing so, on the grounds that they were carrying out a promise previously made to the people. It would have been much better as things turned out if they had broken that promise and not reduced taxation. They are now trying to get back that three hundred and eighty thousand dollars and a great deal more besides in the way of taxes. While this changing of the tariff means the disorganization of trade, there are some merchants who are in the happy position of being able to make money out of it, for those who hold large stocks make heavy profits on their sales. On the whole interference with the tariff in this way must cause a great deal of dissatisfaction. Even if the Finance Minister proposes next year a reduction of the surtax by five per cent. the dissatisfaction will remain for the goods will be sold at the same price, because the man who imports is not in a position to tell what the Government is going to do next in connection with the tariff.

Children could not have made more blunders in this connection during the past two years than the present Government. No right thinking man can retain his seat and vote for this Budget. With regard to the spending of public moneys I would like to mention that it was brought to my notice last night that during last year the sum of two thousand two hundred and six dollars was expended on a Breakwater at Musgrave Harbor, in the District of Fogo. It was only this afternoon that I presented a petition from the people of that place asking for moneys to repair that Breakwater. I suppose that money was transferred to another part of the District without consulting the people. If that is the case I consider such a course of action very unfair. During the election of 1908, one of the candidates for Trinity District supporting the present Government, made a great deal of capital out of the fact that public grants intended for one section of the district were transferred to another part of the District. That candidate had maintained that the money should not have been transferred until the people had been consulted. That money intended for Musgrave Breakwater last year, and spent in another part of the District should now be spent on that object. If moneys are allocated for a particular work the people of a place where that public work is situated should have the spending of the money, but do not give the people the money one day, and take it away from them the next. I am not going into the matter of the figures of this Budget, because they have already been dealt with by the hon. Leader of the Opposition in a very thorough and capable manner. It is the duty of every hon. member of this House, to scrutinize every expenditure with a view to compelling the Government to carry on the business of the country in an economical manner. We should never be ashamed of a Democratic form of Government. The Government should give due regard to the prosperity of all classes of people, and our finances should be established on such a sound basis as to secure steady employment at a remunerative rate of wages; due regard should also be paid to those whose capital is invested in the various interests of the country. Economy should be practiced and extravagance discountenaced if the public affairs of this Colony are to be placed on a sound basis. The policy of the present Government seems to be the obtaining of a surplus, whether wisely or not. and the spending of it amongst its adherents and those who are hand in glove with them. Such a course is not in the interests of the community of the whole for the prosperity boasted of is not derived from the earnings of the people, but from the spending of the capital borrowed from abroad from time to time.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with some attention to the remarks of the previous speakers upon those Resolutions, and particularly to those made by the Finance Minister. That gentleman made one remarkable statement when he said that it was gratifying for him to be able once more to congratulate the country upon our continued prosperity. I do not believe that the House took the hon. member seriously when he made such a statement. The people of the country generally are not enjoying the prosperity referred to, and the hon. member's remarks can only apply to a few individuals who are supporters of the present government. I make this statement for the reason that during the reign of the present Government many persons were oblig-

ed to leave the country to seek a livelihood in other lands. Each year hundreds of people have left this country to engage in pogie fishing and other pursuits in the United States and Canada, because they were unable to secure employment here. The Finance Minister and the Colonial Secretary have stated that there was employment for all those who were able and willing to work. If that is so why do so many people leave the country? I have no hesitation in saying that within the past few months a great depression in trade in this town has been evidenced, and there has never been less employment for our people. Is it not a fact that work is much scarcer around the dock and other such places of employment than usual? How many carpenters, masons, and other tradesmen and laborers are out of employment to-day and yet we are told that the country is enjoying continued prosperity. The statement is not borne out by facts. I contend that if the Government had done something for the benefit of the country the present conditions of things could not exist today. Many persons can only obtain work for six months out of the year, and are obliged to provide for themselves and families for twelve months out of the money earned during that period. If the Government had carried out some policy which would provide employment for the people through the year there might be some justification for the statement that this country was in the enjoyment of increasing prosperity. I do not mean to say that a certain amount of prosperity is not enjoyed in some parts of the country,but as a whole this country is not enjoying the increased prosperity referred to by the hon. Minister of Finance.

As I said before we have to look facts in the face and the general conditions all over the country today. We would be more likely to believe in it if we found that there was all over the country at present plenty of work for everybody, but this prosperity exists among the supporters of the Government. The Reids have got the biggest share of the loan for railways. Bishop, Ryan Crosbie, the 'News' the 'Herald' and those other newspapers have all had their share in the pickings of the last four years. This prosperity is a false prosperity, it is based not upon the earning power of the people, but upon the capital of the Colony. It is based upon the spending of borrowed money. What have they had at their disposal during the past four or five years from 1909 to 1913. they have had $14,000,000 of revenue, and in addition, $7,000,000 of borrowed money. What do they show for all that? There is very little improvement in the Public Services. The people have contributed the greater portion of this out of their taxation in order that the Reids may be able to share the profits of railway building. I have no objection to them getting a fair share of it, but it is well known that that railway could have been built at a much lower price than has been charged by this Company. All the good that the Min. of Finance and Customs has talked about can only be looked for in the dim and distant future. The Minister cannot point to one single industry that has yet been established. There have been none in the country during the past four years. He has only borrowed a lot of money and spent it on his five branch railways, which have already cost $6,000,000, and will cost another $2,000,000. It is a remarkable thing that after the railway was to be built for $4,000,000, they have now asked for $8,000,000 and still do not know if that will be enough to finish

the work. Had the Government done something in the way of providing the fishermen with motor boats, and the opening up of new markets for the fish, which will have to be done sooner or later, they would have been able to justify the statements they have been making the past few days, but they did not, they have thrown it out broadcast here and there, and so far as doing anything of a tangible nature is concerned, we have to look for it in the dim and distant future. We have no hope of any returns from it. There was another statement made by the Minister of Finance and Customs that the fishermen pay no taxation in this country; he contradicted it afterwards in saying that by the introduction of motor boats in the fishery there would be 50 per cent. increase in the fishery, and consequently in the revenue; who in such a case would pay the revenue? Is it not the fishermen? I have taken the list of some of the dutiable articles that come in this country, are not these used by the fishermen? We imported last year $76,000 worth of boots and shoes, and now on this he wants $8,000 more. We were talking a few days ago about combines. The boot and shoe industry in this country are paying enormous dividends. He ought to have considered this before he gave them further protection. It is cruel and unjust to expect the people to pay 4 per cent. more on their 40 per cent. on these articles to help out those companies. We do not object to a fair return upon their investments in the enterprise, but we do say that the dividends of some Companies are too large, and the Government should do something. We would not object to their paying 10 per cent, or 12 per cent. but they pay 25 per cent. or 30 per cent. Do not the fishermen use leather? Last year we collected $30,000 revenue on that, and now he wants $3,000 more. On rubber boots we collected $54,000; now he wants $5,400 more. Canned meats are chiefly used not in the well-to-do people's houses, but in the poorer people's houses, and on these we collected $10,000, and now he wants $1,000 more—is that just or fair? Do the people use nets in this country? We collected last year $12,000 on nets and netting, and now he wants $1,200 more from the people. Do not the people use oatmeal? On that last year we collected $3,000. Do not the people use paints, oils and varnishes? Do not the fishermen use them on their skiffs and schooners and houses? We collected $45,000 on that last year, and now he wants $4,500 more. Potatoes —the outport people do not buy very much of them—but the people in the town have to buy them, and on them we collected $13,000 roughly. Who use readymades to-day, the well-to-do or the fishermen? We paid on these last year $164,000, and to this we have now added $16,400 by this Budget. I would like to call the attention of the Government the large dividends paid by the clothing factories in this town. It is true that clothing may be cheaper in this country than it was a few years ago, but when you come to consider the machinery which lessens the amount of employment, that advantage is not to be considered. I submit that before the Government put this new duty on they should have considered that they were giving fresh protection to an industry that is already paying enormous dividends. 45 per cent. is paid on readymades to-day, and now it is to be 49½ per cent. The people should have these articles cheapened to them. The Government should have taken this opportunity to show that they were really interested in the welfare of the people. Sewing cotton, pins, buttons, needles, etc.—do

the fishermen use these? Last year we paid $18,000 on these, and now it is to be $1,800 more. The statement of the Minister of Finance that the fishermen to-day pay no taxes is not warranted. On soap we collected last year $28,000. And now it is to be $2,-800 more. Does the Minister say that the fishermen use no soap? A great many people have been saying it. He used lots of soap upon the Opposition a few nights ago. There was 75,000 gallons of rum imported into this country last year. The Minister of Finance said he was going to tax rum out of existence, but he will not get anybody to give up a glass of rum because it is a few cents dearer. The chief spirits used by the fishermen of the country is rum. And the Minister is going to take $100,000 more out of the pockets of the fishermen who use rum. The people will buy their rum just the same. It is the women and the children who will have to pay another $1.50 or $1.80 to go into the stomachs of the men who use rum. It is most unjust. Writing paper, ink, pens and pencils—do the fishermen use no writing paper or ink? Last year $45,796 was collected on these,and this year it be $4,600 more. Oil clothing? There is another highly protected industry. Help some more of the favoured few. $3,000 more out of the pockets of those who use oil clothing. Gasoline. Do not the fishermen use it? On that we collected $97,000 last year. Tobacco, $100,000 more is to be extracted from the people who use tobacco. The fishermen have to pay that increase. Apples. You are going to make it harder for the people to buy apples. Fruit is one of the most necessary and wholesome articles of diet. The fishermen should be eating more of it than they are to-day. You are going now to collect 55c. instead of 50c. a barrel. Biscuits. There was a very large amount of these imported last year, despite the fact that we are told there are firms in town making a very large profit out of this industry. They have increased the price of biscuits 2c. a lb., and to-day you further protect them. All this means emptying the pockets of the poor in order to fill the pockets of the favoured classes interested in these industries. On china and earthenware last year we paid $19,000. Do not the fishermen use these articles? Now they will have to pay another $2,-000. Clocks and watches, paid $7,000 last year. Now they will pay $700 more. Coffee. The Minister of Finance knows what a good thing coffee is on a cold day, and yet he is going to increase the price of coffee; another $1,000 out of the fishermen of this country. There is another article that they use a lot of—confectionery. I do not suppose the Minister of Finance will deny that the fishermen like a little sweetmeat occasionally. Does he want them to give up the use of confectionery? We collected last year on this $29,000, and now we are going to collect another $3,000. Who use cordage if not the fishing classes of the country? Last year that paid $6,-000, and now it is to pay another 10 per cent. Dry goods last year paid $174,000. Does the Minister of Finance say that the fishermen use none of these? Yet he is not satisfied. We must pay $18,000 more. There was also raisins and currants. Does the Government mean to say that the fishermen do not use these articles? Last year they collected $33,000 on this account, and this year they are asking to collect $3,300 more. Then there are pickles, syrups and baking powder, the fishermen use these articles. They are now collecting $72,000 on these articles, and this tax means another $7,-200 on to that. These articles are necessities to the fishermen. Then there are axes, saws hatchets and hammers. They collected $17,000 on

these last year, and they are now going to add another $1,700; then there are articles of cutlery, guns and other similar things, these are used by the fishermen. They collected on these articles $85,000 last year, and they are now wanting to collect $8,500 more. The next item is anchors and grapnels. Last year they collected $6,000 on these,and they are now asking for $600 more. These articles are used by the fishermen alone, and this will be an additional tax on them. I could go on enumerating a number of articles totalling three-fourths of the revenue, and if the Minister of Finance makes the statement that the fishermen pay no taxes we can bring facts and figures to show that they are paying three-fourths of the revenue still. I wish strongly to protest against this increase of taxes that has been made here to-day. I am a taxpayer, and protest now in the interest of myself and in the interest of the District that I represent and in the interest of the country in general; it is unfair and unjust; it is cruel; it is an imposition upon the people and making life more difficult for the poorer classes. The man of property and men with incomes can pay more into the revenue than the people of the poorer classes like the fishermen. The whole system of taxation should be gone into by the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister, and they should get together and look over this between now and the next session of the Legislature. They should devise a scheme whereby the people of money and not the poorer classes should pay the higher proportion of the taxes of the country, and the men who do the country the most benefit should not be made bear so much of the taxes of the country, when they can so little afford it. If a man makes $10,000 a year and another man only $400, or $500 the later man should not be expected to pay one-half of his income in taxes and the other man only one-tenth. In other words to-day by the system of taxation which we have in force the people who have the smaller incomes have to bear a very much greater proportion of taxes in proportion to their income than the people of money. We had before us a Municipal representation bill the other day and it was stated that the people in this city of money were prepared to pay more in taxes. The poorer classes are not dealt with properly, and the men of means are satisfied to pay more. The Government should recognize that if this applies to the city it also applies to the country, and we should be getting a just proportion from these people who can afford to pay. There is one country to-day that recognizes the principle that the man of means should be called upon to pay more than the poorer man. In New Zealand to-day 12,000 people pay about one-third of the revenue. In fact with the land taxes that they pay they pay nearly one-half of the whole revenue collected. Taxation has been imposed in proportion to a man's income. They have had in the last two or three years death duties in force, and if we had death duties in force in this country we would be able to collect some thousands of dollars that we do not now get, and I consider that the time is ripe when death duties should be imposed. No man to-day who has been protected by the laws of the country and has been thereby helped to obtain the wealth which he now possesses should object to pay a just proportion of that wealth in the upkeep of the Colony's Civil Service. There is a large sum collected every year in death duties in England, Australia and New Zealand. We should collect the same. I consider that estates of more than $10,000 that are left by people should be called upon to pay some

duties, and if that were brought into effect by the Government of this country we should collect some $50,000 yearly, that would help to lighten the burden of taxation on the community. I daresay if we had an income tax we would collect more. Rich men getting $20,000 a year are not paying any proportion worth mentioning of that income; while we expect a man earning only $500 a year to pay about $90. I do not believe that a man of wealth pays more than $50 to the revenue in proportion to the $90 that is paid by the poorer classes, and I consider it a very unfair distribution in that way, and that the wealthy classes should be made to pay a just share of the taxation. I hope that by the time the debate closes the Minister will see his way clear to rectify the things that have been mentioned. We could well afford to cut out the duty on readymades also clothes, boots and shoes, etc., that are paid by the poorer classes alone. What do we want large surpluses for? When we have these large surpluses we become extravagant. The best thing is to end that bill and give the lower classes a chance to live. One hears a good deal outside about the increased cost of living; but we are here to-day asked to increase taxation by ten per cent. all round, and that will do far more than anything else to increase the cost of living and make it still harder, and if this Bill passes I am glad that I am on this side of the House when it comes up.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman just one word in regard to that matter discussed to-day, and I also want to make a few observations upon the matter before the House. The Honourable member for Burin who takes such an interest in writing in the "Daily News" stated that the speech of the President of the F.P.U. did not contain either facts or figures that had been anticipated, and perhaps he was getting all he wanted and had had enough in this Session. Last night I promised some figures in connection with the Arbitrations. I am now going to give them. I asked the Minister of Finance if he thought that he was justified in passing this Bill and asking for $700,000 more taxation, to spend it in the way in which it was spent in the last five years. I mentioned the case of the arbitration cases. He said that they were not going to do the work without being paid but there is such a difference in paying men.

Mr. Goodison received $4779.00.
Jordan Milley $2940.00.
John R. Bennett $3600.00.
C. H. Emerson $3313.00.
W. C. Winsor $3907.00
W. R. Howley $6303.00.
M. P. Gibbs $7109.00.
R. A. Squires $2252.00.

It is not good for me to mention the cents. That is why they asked the increased taxation. Is it any wonder that the Minister is asking for $700,000 more? I wish he had been at the meeting I just left and the Prime Minister would have seen a big crowd of angry men. It would have done him a lot of good to have listened to the cheers.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER.—I asked for an invitation.

MR. COAKER—You would not have been heard.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Any other night that you wish to hold a meeting, I will accommodate you, and speak there.

MR. COAKER—It would not be safe for you.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER.—I would take the risk.

MR. COAKER—You were not willing to take the risk this afternoon you

are willing to go now when it is over. I mentioned that the Newfoundland Produce Co. only got $14,000, but in 1913 they managed to increase it to $31,000. $9321 was paid on the Dredge $8985.00 on the "Fiona" but what is the use of talking. They paid $466. in sending the "Fogota" to aid some men. She was gone two days and they paid $466.00. Last year Bishop & Sons received $12311.00; that is only a flea bite. Mr. Whiteway received $4917.00, and God knows all was spent properly. Moore and Co. got $10,479,-00, $1850.00 in payment on a contract I do not know what for. $4000 on the General Hospital contract I do not know what for; $1,700.00 on the new building at Harbour Grace.

MR. MOORE—It is only fair that the Honourable member should let me explain.

MR. COAKER—When I have done you can explain as much as you like.

MR. MOORE—The Government asked for tenders and every one was asked to come in and give them. Our figures as you know were below the others. No one was down as low as $1850.00; the nearest one was Pittman and Snaw, $1950.00.

In the General Hospital contract our figures were $1700, under the next figure.

MR. COAKER—Wonderful generosity.

MR. MOORE—I did not vote on that contract.

MR. COAKER—That is no excuse. You are here to vote.

MR. MOORE—I did not vote on that contract.

MR. COAKER—Then the Chronicle Publishing Co. got $7835.00 and the Daily News $8519.00; that is a nice little sum to get. I have not the slightest doubt that the figures stagger the members on the other side because they say we have got it. They would be fools not to get some; but that is only one of the accounts. We would not mind having this expenditure if you did not have to ask for another $700,000.00 to get the country out of the scrape. But all this expenditure is nothing but extravagance and there is no attempt to retrench. If you only retrenched and spent a little on agriculture we would not mind. The remarks made by the member for Port de Grave, Mr. Grimes, ought to be sufficient to convince the House that the Fisherman pays a great deal more than anyone else towards the revenue of the Colony. In his speech the Hon. Minister said that they only pay a very little, in reality they pay a larger proportion. Mr. Jennings said they paid 30%, it is more likely that they pay 40%. A man who buy $300 worth of dutiable goods pays $120 of that into the revenue. I have been wondering when we will finish the business of the session. It has been rumoured that the House will be prorogued about Saturday, but what have we done to-day and what will we do to-morrow? How long will we be over the Budget? I am afraid it will be Monday or Tuesday. We will have more to say about the tobacco business, enough to take up another day, and when we get through that, how do we know that we will have a Government at all?

I can tell the honorable Minister of Finance that if he allows this increased tariff to go through that he will go out of the House with the name of being the most unpopular Finance Minister that ever sat at the table. I trust that the honorable Minister will reconsider his case and not arouse the country against him, as he will do if he passes these resolutions.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, just a word or two in relation to some of the matters be-

fore the Chair. I do not intend to address the House at any length; but there are some matters that I would like to refer to, before the resolutions pass.

The hon. member thought fit this evening to make it appear that when I was at the Hague I kept my mouth shut and did nothing. There was no point whatever in such a statement for my duty there was not to take part in any of the arguments before the tribunal, but to aid the other lawyers associated with me and to give them as much information and advice as it was in my power to give them. When we were at the Hague we had as our representatives several of the leading lawyers in the British Empire, including the Attorney General of England and an ex-attorney General. Canada had half a dozen of her most eminent lawyers on the case, including the Attorney General, who was the British Agent, Newfoundland was represented by the Attorney General,an ex-Attorney General and an ex-Judge of the Supreme Court. However, we were only allowed to have one counsel address the tribunal although the English Attorney General, Sir William Robson, and her ex-Attorney General, Sir Robert Finlay, great legal authorities, both addressed the Court on behalf of Newfoundland. We chose the late Sir James Winter as the one who should address the Court on our behalf, but the great work of the case was performed by Sir Robert Finlay, who occupied a week in opening our case, and Sir William Robson, who occupied a week in the closing argument We were allowed to be heard between these two speeches and the late Sir James Winter was selected on my motion to address the Court, We considered that he was best able to submit our case, and I am sure that anybody who knew his qualifications and his great powers of argument would say that we were right in selecting him. I certainly did my share of the work, for I did not miss a single session of the hearing nor one of the conferences that were held every day in the morning and in the afternoon. I leave it to those who were associated with me to judge as to the amount of work which I performed and on account of which I have received $7000.00. This is not a fifth not even a sixth of what the lawyers of Canada were paid for similar work. It may appear to be a very large fee, but I have earned that amount in one term of our Supreme Court in private practice before I received a cent from the colony. I can go back to the Bar to-day and earn as much as I have received from any Government. Now, Sir, I hope this is a full explanation. The leader of the opposition, may pardon me for congratulating him on the very ably argumentative character of the case which he has submitted. Although I do not agree with the principles laid down by him or the fairness of his arguments, he showed great industry and acquaintance with the whole subject matter before the chair. His arguments, although they were not what I would consider a fair presentation of the case, nevertheless contained nothing of an objectionable nature and under the circumstances one can forgive the attitude which he took.

However, I want to take issue with my learned friend on some points raised by him. During the past two or three sessions he has availed of the debate on the Budget to lay down the principle that as the balance of trade for the past five years has been against Newfoundland it is an indication that we are not advancing and not prosperous. He points out session after session that, because Newfoundland imports more than she exports, therefore she is going back. In other

words, we are sending more money away with which to buy goods than the value of the goods which we export and he contends that it should be otherwise and the balance should be in favour of the colony. He claims that when we send away less goods than we bring into the colony it is a sign that the country is going back and that the day will come when we shall not be able to pay our bills. That is the effect of my learned friend's argument.

This point has come up session after session and I have pointed out over and over again that this balance against the colony is no indication whatsoever that the Colony is not prosperous and not advancing in leaps and bounds. Furthermore, I am prepared to prove it. Take for example, England, for fifty years the balance of trade has been against her and last year it was over two hundred million pounds against her. I am speaking entirely from memory, as I have not the exact figures by me, but I think that last year the total imports of England were over six hundred million pounds while the total exports were about four hundred million pounds. I think that if any hon. members will look up the figures they will find that these are fairly correct.

It is the same in Canada. Last year the total imports into Canada were $692,000,000.00 and the total exports were $393,000,000.00, a difference of $300,000,000,00 against the country. Yet Canada is at the present time one of the most prosperous countries in the world. I have here a statement of the trade of Canada and it shows that during the past six years the total imports exceeded the total exports by 856 million dollars. According to my learned friend this tremendous amount of money would be owed by the Canadian importers to the English and foreign exporters.

Take our own case. The total imports for the past ten years that is from 1904 to 1913 have been $120,000,000.00 and the total exports $121,000,000.00, a difference of about one million dollars for the ten years, or an average of $100,000.00 a year for the past ten years in favour of the colony. However, if you take the last five years it is entirely different. From 1909 to 1913 our total imports were $68,000,000.00 and our total exports $63,000,000.00, leaving a balance of $5,000,000,00 against the colony for these five years. According to my learned friend's argument the importers of the colony ought to owe that amount to the parties from whom they buy. That means practically that our trade is insolvent, for that is the logical conclusion of his argument. Let me point out the fallacy of that argument.

In the first place you have to make certain that the value of our exports has been correctly estimated and that they have not been undervalued. Now I am prepared to state and to prove that our exporters have been placing a value on our fish which is less than that which they receive in foreign markets for it. The exporters have put it down at a price which was paid for it here and they have taken no account of the profit which enables them to carry on their business. They have not taken into account the drums and other expenses which return to the country as so much money for those who have earned it, when the fish has been sold in the foreign markets. I have asked Mr. LeMessurier, the permanent head of the Customs Department to give me his views on this matter and he has informed me that in 1911 the exports of fish were estimated at $8,799,000.00, whereas they should have been at least $10,000,000.00. In 1912 the exports were estimated at $10,639,000.00 and they

should have been $11,703,000.00 or over a million dollars more. In 1913 the total exports were valued at ten million dollars and they should have been twelve millions. This goes to show that if our exports were properly valued there would be no balance against us and we would not have it proclaimed that the Colony is bankrupt as a business concern. I do not charge my learned friend with stating this intentionally but I submit that this is the effect of his arguments.

There are other matters also to be considered. What is the explanation of the fact that England after a thousand years of civilization and admittedly the greatest trading centre of the world, has such a tremendous balance of trade against her? Does she have to draw on her reserves to pay her bills? The answer is that she does not have to draw on her reserves at all but her people have money invested in every part of the globe and millions of pounds sterling are paid into England every year in the shape of dividends and interest. There are thousands of people in England to-day who need not work an hour during the year and who can live in ease and luxury on the money that they have invested in other countries. When these statements of imports and exports are prepared none of these amounts are included but that is why the people of England can export much less in goods and merchandize than they import and still remain a prosperous country.

Let me illustrate our position. If every person in Newfoundland was catching fish and we had nothing else to export from the Colony except fish, we should become insolvent if we had not enough fish to send away to equal in value the goods which we imported. We might go along for some years importing more than we exported but in the end we would become insolvent. However, that is not the case at all As I have pointed out, I do not admit in the first place that the trade of the Colony is against us at all but I contend that if the exports were properly valued the balance would be in our favour. Only last fall in connection with this very matter, Mr. LeMessurier wrote the following letter to the Board of Trade:—

LETTER FROM MR. LeMESSURIER, ASSISTANT COLLECTOR.

Customs Department,
St. John's, Newfoundlan,d
23 October, 1913.

Sir,—I desire to draw the attention of Exporters of Codfish and other Newfoundland products to the way in which the values are entered at the Customs. On a close examination of the Statistics of Exports their utter unreliability and uselessness is very apparent. The Exporters are the people to blame, and they only can correct this evil by furnishing proper and reliable information.

Section 100 of the Customs Act compels shippers to furnish entries of the articles shipped specifying the Kinds and Quantities and the value of the total quantity of each kind of article &c., and the value of such articles are truly stated according to their actual cost, or the value which they truly bear at the port and time of exportation.

Section 107 provides that "The owner, shipper or consignor of any goods who refuses or neglects to make report and entry of the articles shipped or laden by them respectively, as required by section 101 or by the next preceding section shall incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars for each such offence."

I have pointed out the liability of the exporter, permit me to further show you the result of his work in

furnishing the Customs with erroneous figures.

The Customs Statistics for 1911-1912 give the imports as $14,733,490 and Exports $13,874,809 an overplus of imports over Exports of $858,681. The figures for 1912-1913 give Imports $16,012,365 and Exports $14,-672,889 or a difference of $1,339,476 showing a falling off in Exports as compared with imports of nearly $500,000. The imports for 1912-1913 exceeded the imports of the previous year by $1,278,875, and the exports only increased $798,080.

On looking through the statistics, in order to discover the reason for such a falling off, I note that the quantities of exports are in excess of other years, and that the values of all commodities with a few exceptions are lower than the former period. The export value of paper for 1912-13 was $1,990,229, as against $1,201,656 an increase of $788,573.

The quantity of Dry Codfish exported in 1912-13 was 1,408,582 qtls., as against 1,388,178 qtls. exported in 1911-12, an increase of 20,404 &c., &c.

In 1911-12, 1,388,178 qtls. of Codfish valued at $8,001,703, or an average of $5.74 per qtl., whilst the average value of Codfish for 1912-13 was only $5,67.

Exporters must see that in the face of facts, the increase in value of Labrador and Shore Fish last year, that the prices quoted are ridiculous.

Take the average price for shipments to Brazil for 1911-12 it was $6.26 per qtl. and in 1912-13 it was $6.11.

Fish increased in value and did not decrease, and it is perfectly absurd to publish the values at such figures when no Fish Exporter would dream of selling a cargo of Brazil fish F.O.B. less than $7,50 per quintal, if not more.

Time does not permit me to give you the analysis of other values, but they are all underrated and too much so. It is impossible to get a fair idea of the Colony's trade if the chief factors in the trade will not furnish reliable figures.

In writing this to the Board of Trade I desire to warn Exporters that if fair values of exports are not given in future I will be reluctantly compelled to enforce the law. I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) H. W. LeMESSURIER.
Assistant Collector.

W. G. Gosling, Esq.,
President Nfld. Board of Trade.

That is Mr. LeMessurier's letter and it points out that the goods exported from Newfoundland are undervalued and the figures supplied are not correct, and that if they were correct the balance of trade would not appear to have been against the Colony for the last five years. But I do not rest my case upon that alone, although the figures show that if the proper valuation were placed on the fishery products and the minerals and timber the balance would not have been against the Colony, but that there would be sufficient to make up the difference. Large parts of many of the incomes in this country should be added to the value of our exports and computed as purchasing power, for they represent dividends or capital invested outside the country. Take Ayre & Sons and Knowlings; do they get nothing in their stores except from the produce of the fishery? Last year $500,000 in gold was left in Newfoundland by tourists. That may be a little above the mark because I have not exact figures but there were about 5,000 tourists and sportsmen in the country at all points and it is estimated that they left $100.00 each at the least. That is an increase in the purchasing power of the Colony, and has to be added to the value of the exports in producing and bringing

back the imports. Every dollar spent here by them, spent at Ayre & Sons or Bowring's or Knowling's, or spent at a hotel; that is so much money spent in the Colony that must be added to the amount that would go away to purchase the imports that come into the country. But that is not all; as I said before, there are hundreds of people living in the country who are not living out of the fishery; they are living out of investments, debentures, and foreign investments, and their dividends from all of these go to pay for goods and make up the money that purchases our imports.

Our local industries pay about $600,000 in wages alone. I am not talking about Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls and Bell Island, and the value of their exports and imports, but the local industries alone in St. John's and in other parts of the Island pay about $600,000 in labour and wages and all that $600,000 leaves the Colony as purchasing price for the goods that are brought back. Then there is $150,000 coming in in the way of life insurance and a great portion of that, if not all, goes in the purchase of our imports. Then there are investments abroad in Canada and the States and in England and other countries that bring about $100,000 a year. Then there is all the interest from debentures. There are to-day $25,000,000 invested in debentures and while the whole of that income is not spent on the imports a very large portion of it is; a very large proprotion of that interest goes away to swell the purchasing power of the Colony and thus increase the imports. What is true of Canada is true of Newfoundland and in Canada they have a difference of $3,000,000 between the imports and exports and that is due in part to the same reasons, so that there is nothing whatever in this contention. It is put forward year by year that the balance of trade is going against the Colony and that it is a sure and certain indication that the trade of the Colony is not solid. I hope I am not mis-stating the case, that is how I understood it. I hear this same argument brought up year after year in exactly the same way, and year after year I have to contradict it likewise. The difference between the exports and imports is accounted for, first because of the imperfect and incorrect valuation of exports. In other words acording to Mr. LeMesurier the value of exports last year if properly made out, would on the whole have left the balance of trade in our favor. In other words the valuation is under-estimated in the exports, and this under-estimates the purchasing power of the Colony. What ought to be done is this. Exporters ought to put down for every quintal of fish the amount that it will net after everything has been paid, that represents the purchasing power. They have to pay $5.00 to the man from whom they got it; then there is the freight and other charges; the charges for the packages and other things which are used which all go to make up the real price that is received by the merchant. Now if these exports are under-estimated the name of the country suffers. It does not lessen the value by one cent but it injures the name of the country on the value of its exports. That was one branch of the argument of my learned friend and the other branch was in relation to the adopting of the duties and to the increase that is at present proposed in the tariff. He referred also to what he called the "obnoxious" ten per cent. which was placed on duties in 1898 and taken off in 1901. I know a little about that because it was in the administration of which I was a member that that duty was taken off after we had allowed it to continue for a year after

we came into office. We came in in 1900 and in the year after we took it off. The reason we took it off was because we intended to supply its place by other duties. We took off about $250,000 a year in duties and we put on a little more. I speak from memory now but I think that we put back about $270,000 in 1903. We raised the duty on nearly all the articles referred to by the member for Port de Grave. The action that we are performing in this Committee to-night is not to increase the taxation in the sense in which it has been put to the Committee but more to provide for the various increases in the Public Service of the Colony. To hear the speakers to-night one would imagine that we were here for the purpose of making this increase to defray the cost of the railway but such is not the case. When we have laid the last sleeper and built the last wall of branch railways the cost will be about $8,000,000 and at 3½% that will be about $280,000 a year, but we have found the whole interest for that independently of the duties. When we came into office there was no tax on Bell Island mines; to-day they are contributing $100,000, that is nearly one-half the total interest on the railway branches. Sir Robert Bond criticising our action in taxing Bell Island said that it might drive the Companies out of existence, while the hon. member for Bonavista states that he thinks that we have not got enough from them and that instead of seven and one-half cents a ton we ought to have got fifteen. I want to point out that as far as railway expenditure is concerned every dollar of that money has been found just the same as if we went out of the House and picked it up where it had never been discovered or exploited by those before us. We got $100,000 from Bell Island and before the end of this year it will be $150,000 because they are making provision for a large increase in the output. The balance of the money is accounted for as follows: The highest income ever collected in the Crown Lands Office before we came into power was about $59,000 and we got it up to $250,000 and the average under the present administration is $140,000. So that for the interest on the railway loans we have been absolutely independent of the tariff. But it may be asked where all this money is gone. What have we done with the money we have collected in the past four years? Because we are expending to-day nearly $1,000,000 a year more than was expended by our predecessors. What has been done with that money? How has it been spent? Our estimates this year for the public service amounted to $955,000 more than our predecessors. The country wants to know how that is made up, and wants to know further whether that expenditure is necessary, whether there is any extravagance; whether there is any service that can be cut down. One item is increased that has been referred to, the interest on the loans necessary to build the railway. If we want railways built we must pay for them. There would be no railways to Port aux Basques if thirty years ago we had not taxed ourselves to put those railways there. If we want railways or lighthouses we have got to pay for them. When the people asked for all these public works besides the branch railways and the country's need had to be satisfied, we had to find the money. The Civil government of the Colony has increased enormously. The hon. member for Fogo, Mr. Halfyard, presented a petition not long ago, and if the prayer of that petition were acceded to it would cost somewhere about $10,000. It is a very simple matter to come in here with petitions and ask for $10,000 but when you multiply that by every member of the House

you have $400,000. We had a debate here the other day about the wretched way in which postmasters are paid and! every one on the other side of the House was asking that there should be an increase of salaries for all the 1300 postmasters between $5.00 and $10.00. We have increased all the public service yet we have only made a step in that direction that every one cries out about. Hon. members do not realize what it would cost. Then we have introduced Old Age pensions; that cost $60,000 a year. Everyone on the other side of the House is now crying out for more. My hon. friend, Mr. Coaker, referred to the poor way in which a number of poor people have to live when they arrived at old age. We all know that they built up the country when they were young but he asks us to add to the amount which we annually vote and grant more pensions. We have voted $60,000 a year for 1200 old men over seventy. We cannot do more than that at the present but as we have said before when the revenue increases and we are able to do it we will increase that $50.00. It must always be remembered that every dollar given to one man has to be taken out of the products of our people, who are none too well off themselves. Then we have voted $5,000 for widows and orphans of those who are drowned, giving them $100.00. That is not half the amount we ought to be doing nor a third but the means of the country are being strained to-day; this amount ought to be doubled or trebled and we hope to do so in the future. Then there is an increase of $7,000 for fuel and light for public buildings, for the price of fuel has gone up all over the country. Then there is $10,000 for insurance and $21,000 a year for repairs and new public buildings. Then there is $15,000 increase in the cost of the administration of justice, of which $13,000 will be for the Constabulary and the balance for the Penitentiary. Then we have increased the vote for Education by $14,000. When we came in the total vote for education was $260,000 and it is now $364,000. That is an increase of over $100,000 in five years or a greater increase than was made in ten years by our predecessors. Then under Public Charities we voted $6,000 more for charitable institutions, of which $600 went to the Lunatic Asylum, $1200 to the Hospital, $2,600 to the Poor Asylum, $300 to the Public Health Department, $700 to the Tuberculosis Committee and $600 for other charitable purposes. There was an increase of twenty-five per cent. in the vote for widows and orphans and I wish it was more. Then there is an increase in the vote for the conveyance of the sick and also $1,500 for the conveyance of sick fishermen from Labrador. Then there was an increase of $35,000 in the vote for lighthouses. We increased the vote for the Department of Agriculture and Mines $24,000 and the vote for the Department of Marine and Fisheries $10,000. Then there was the increase of $5,000 for lobster propagation, $12,000 for dredging, $10,000 for fog alarms and lights, $7,000 for roads and bridges and $10,000 for ferries. Then there was the great increase in the cost of postal telegraphs, for we added fifty new postal offices over the country. For salaries in St. John's for the postal and telegraphs department there was an increase of $21,000 and in the outports $32,000. The maintenance of the telegraph system meant an increase of $14,000 and the Commercial Cable Company, $6,000. Down in the Customs House to collect the new revenue, salaries have been increased $3,500. The tidewaiters of St. John's have been increased and there has been an increase in the amount of contingencies.

These and other increases make a total of $985,000 and I want to know what one of these services you can curtail or do without. There is hardly a service the vote for which we have not been asked to increase during the present session. There is not a salary that is not claimed to be under the amount that it should be and that is so with every other item in the whole service.

My learned friend then attacked the principle upon which the tariff is based and I listened with a great deal of interest to him and also the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Jennings, a gentleman for whom I have a very high regard and whose statements and arguments are always worthy of careful consideration. I listened to all that he said with the greatest care and attention but I think I have to differ with him in the amount which he claimed is being paid towards the revenue by the fishermen. I think he said that of the $500 which an average fisherman spent, $200 would be spent on goods on which there was no duty but that the other $300 would be spent on goods that paid duty. I think that if my hon. friend will consider these figures he will come to the conclusion that these figures are rather too high as an average for the whole Island. The average fisherman earns $400 for each family. I would like to see the figure more. I think that is a very fair estimate. For 50000 fishermen this means an earning of $20,000,000 which is a very large amount of money. It is interesting to know what the average fisherman pays towards the revenue today as compared with what he paid in 1880, when we started our railway and the late Sir William Whiteway put forward the policy of railway extension for the development of the Colony. At that time nearly all the principal articles were heavily taxed and we were told that the railway policy would mean that the people of the Colony would be taxed out of existence. I claim to-night that if it was not for that railway and the development that was brought about by the railway we would have been bankrupt or a part of Canada. We were told then that we would not be able to obtain enough money from the railway to pay the interest on the cost. Members of the Opposition in those days told us that it would not pay for its axle grease and that it would be a "white elephant" for the Colony. It was useless to tell them that there never was a railway yet that had to remain idle, that there was no case in any country where the railway did not prove to be the horse and carriage, the bridge, the ferry, everything in fact that helped to develop the country. They laughed with scorn at our arguments but I wish that the fathers of that movement were here to-night. I wish the late Sir William Whiteway were here and could know that we have been able to place flour, pork, tea, sugar, molasses, kerosene oil, lines and twines and a number of other goods on the free list. Not alone have the taxes been not increased but the fishermen to-night are taxed less by nearly fifty per cent. than they were in 1882. It is impossible to dispute these facts and I have a fisherman's account here, taken from a merchant's book in 1882. It is an ordinary fisherman's account for $414, which I obtained at random and to which I have applied the tariffs of 1882 and 1913. In 1882 he paid duty on flour, bread, pork, beef, molasses, sugar, salt, kerosene oil, tea and currants and every one of these items is duty free to-day. According to the tariff of 1882 he paid to the revenue on that account $47.19 and according to last year's tariff he paid $23.97. Of course I know the

stock argument that will be made against that, namely, what about the ad varorem duties that he paid? What about the increased price that he had to pay? That is a mere bagatelle. The point I wish to make is that the fishermen are paying less to the revenue and earning more now than they did in 1882 and I am glad of it. They will never get as much as I would like to see them get and they know it. I say the same of the labouring men. I would like to see them all to-night supplied with all the comforts of life and much pleasure as it would afford them to be so placed it would afford me more.

I think the people realize that they are living better now than they used to, that they are more comfortable, that they have better food and better times than they had in former years. They realize also that the Colony cannot grow and prosper without the need for increasing the public service and the public service cannot be increased unless we increase the revenue. That is a fundamental principle that will not be disputed. Our people are willing to give a reasonable contribution towards the public revenue when they see that the public are being repaid in improved public works and utilities. Why is there an increase in the tariff this year? I shall tell my hon. friends. Last year the Government reduced taxation by $400,000 and we put pork, beef, sugar and tea on the free list. We put them on the free list because they are used in larger quantities by the poorer classes than they are by the well-to-do. The poor man drinks a number of cups of tea during the day but not so with the well-to-do, who has his wines and his coffee. That is why we put these articles on the free list and were it not for the growing requirements of the public service, we would not be looking for more revenue today. We have found that we want more revenue. We have to collect more to pay it back to the people in other ways. We cannot put lighthouses around the shores unless we have the revenue to pay for them and so it is with other public works. Accordingly we come here and ask for more revenue and as far as we have been able to do it, we have based our additional taxes on a reasonable and equitable basis. This surtax is the most reasonable and fair way to tax the people and it will not take much time to show that this is so.

If the account, to which I have referred, is correct, a fisherman pays thirty or forty dollars a year taxes to the revenue on his account. If the surtax is added it will mean that he will pay ten per cent. of that amount in addition. That is at the most four dollars. What will the well-to-do man who contributes say $4,000 a year towards the revenue, have to pay extra as a result of this surtax? He will pay an extra $400 to the revenue. There are not many, of course, who will contribute this amount but there are men in the Island who have an income of $20,000 and spend it. On some of the articles which they use they have to pay two and three hundred per cent. duty. The larger the sum which a man spends the more he pays to the revenue. I do not know a more equitable way in which to look for revenue. A man brings in a motor car, worth about $4,000. He has to pay an additional $1600 before he obtains a permit from the Custom House, for the duty is forty per cent. and then he will have to pay a further ten per cent. duty or $160 more. On that one entry alone he has to pay more in surtax towards the revenue of the country than four fishermen pay for their four families. That is a fair basis and it is the basis on which taxation is imposed in other countries. Take the income tax in England, for example.

It is based on the same principle, for the greater a man's income is the more he has to pay to the revenue. The man who lives extravagantly is the man who has to pay the most duty.

Then there is an increase in the duty on spirits. What is one and a half cents on a glass of rum, which after all is a luxury? If we placed a tax of that kind on each loaf of bread or on anything that was a necessity, there would be some grounds for objection to it but it is not necessary for any man to take spirits and even those who take it have to pay but very little more for it, a glass of spirits that cost ten cents before, now costing eleven and a half cents. There is a small tax on butterine but I undertake to say that it will not put up the price on that article of food one cent or even half a cent in the pound. I want it to go on record that it is my opinion that this tax will not increase the price of butterine a half cent. The protection that this industry receives will not permit them to increase the price. Then there is a tax of one dollar per thousand feet on lumber to be paid by those who are cutting on public lands. Last year there were one hundred and fifty mills cutting on the three mile limit and they cut twenty five million feet, which is more than the mills which have regular licenses cut. I venture to say that this tax will not make lumber go up one cent a foot, for competition will keep the price down. This is the tariff that there is so much talk about. I think it will be found that when the people have taken into consideration the work that we have been doing, it is the best possible tariff that could be expected. When the people of each district throughout the whole Island sum up the improvements in the public service that this Government has made since they come into power, the telegraph extension, the improved roads, the ferries, the public wharves, the lighthouses and the increased grants to every branch of the public service and public charities, they would be willing to pay towards the revenue double the amount that we are asking to-night. Take the cross-country service alone which is now a daily service and estimate what that is worth to the Colony. In the old days when there was no communication merchants had to carry very large stocks on their shelves because of the difficulty in turning over their stocks. Now that we have this communication they can turn over their stocks a dozen times in the year and the result is that the man who buys the article gets the benefit of this. Judging from the general public attitude one would be led to suppose that the people are glad to pay these contributions to our revenue. They realize that the Government are merely the collectors of money for when a settlement wants a lighthouse, a fog alarm or a bridge then they ask the Government whc collect the money essential for that purpose and spend it as wisely and as judiciously as they can devise. Really reading the Opposition reports of many of these things one would naturally be led to suppose that the Government were collecting money for themselves alone. To-day we had a long list, a regular litany, of the past Government expenses on arbitrations read out to us in full detail with many commentaries. We had paid exactly what other governments had paid for arbitrations and this notwithstanding the increased cost of things. These things cannot be done for nothing. We have done exactly what the hon. members opposite would have had to do had they been in power and building railways.

There are a number of other points referred to by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition last night, and although I do not propose dealing with them in detail, I should like to clear myself of some of the insinuations against the policy of the Government raised by them. He stated that he could not congratulate the Government on the work it has done the past five years. He stated nothing had been done to develop the fisheries or the mines of this Colony during a time when the revenues were almost abnormal. I say that we have done as much as the past administration. I am over and over again told of the connection of the late Sir Robert Bond with Grand Falls. He had no more to do with the installment of that industry than he had with the construction of saw mills in Timbuctoo. What actually did bring Mr. Beeton here is a matter of mystery and doubt. Mr. Crowe lays claim to the credit of this. Mr. Beeton first came to our shores as the guest of Sir Cavendish Boyle. They had been old university friends. He told me personally that he came to look over our possibilities in the pulp industry. He had been in Canada and other countries with a similar view. We had never heard of him before. He came and arranged for the instalment of the Grand Falls industry. He came as came the Bell Island Company. They floated in her one day because they owned certain land here, which seemed to them to possess possibilities. The Whiteway government had nothing to do with the advent of these people. My learned friend went on to state that we did little to develop the natural resources of this Colony. Well, what did the late administration do to develop them? We did our very best. No pains were spared. The hon. member conveniently omited the fact that we did our very best all the time we were in power to induce companies to come here and develop the various industries we thought this country capable of producing. The hon. member, Mr. Clift, has worked overtime again and again trying to bring to a satisfactory conclusion our various prospects in connection with peat industries. So far our inducements have failed. Beyond getting a report nothing has been done. Of course these companies realized the immense responsibilities of these contracts. Cold storage, bait, fresh fish, all were subjects of immense labour that up to now has borne no fruit. A horse may be brought to water but he cannot be made to drink. So had it been with our efforts to induce capitalists into this country. And for this we are blamed, for this we receive the censure of our opponents. We have spared no pains to develop the natural mineral resources of the Colony. Everything possible was said to depreciate and lessen the value of our efforts at attempting to develop the mineral resources. As far as the 1909 contract is concerned I feel confident that when it will have passed into history the judgment will be that it is a good one and compared favourably with the 1901 contract. I must apologize to the Committee for having taken up so much of its time, but the matter under discussion is so important that I could not allow it to pass without expresing my views at some length.

HON MR. CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a few remarks in reference to the matter now before the chair. I shall not unduly delay the House for the Hon. the Premier has already dealt in detail with it from every point of view. I should, however, like to refer to one or two remarks made by the hon. member Mr. Coaker, in connection with the contracts made between the Government and the Newfoundland Produce Company. The contracts giv-

en to that Company by the Government were tendered for in the usual way and were open to any man or company to apply for, but, I have been subject to the grossest abuse and vilification at the hands of the hon. member because I happen to be manager for that Company. During the debate here yesterday afternoon I heard insinuations made against members of this Government for receiving patronage from the different departments. One would imagine that this was some new scheme inaugurated by the present Government and that the friends and supporters of the Bond administration received nothing in the way of patronage. If the hon. member will refer to the public accounts he will find that hon. members of this Government got very little public patronage as compared to that given out to the friends of the Bond administration. We have heard a great deal from the hon. member for Bonavista about increasing the widow's dole in this country. I have very sympathy with the widows and would help to do anything possible for them but there is another class of women in this community who should also be provided for and that is the wife who is deserted by her husband. I would like this Committee to consider this class of women who notwithstanding the solemn marriage vow made before the altar is deserted by her husband. I was told some time ago in this House that certain hon. members were going to keep up its decorum and dignity but the slanders which have since been heaped on men who happen to sell coal to or carry freight for the Government, are anything but dignified. There has been nothing said about the contract in connection with Bowring Bros. but the Newfoundland Produce Company is singled out as a target for the venomous shafts of the hon. member. I was told some time ago by the hon. member that I was not fit to be an Executive member and that I should be dismissed by the Hon. Premier; such a course would no doubt suit some people but I shall be here when they have passed into political oblivion. The very man who asks for my dismissal will be buried some day by the votes of the people. I have been sitting at the Executive Board for five years and I do not think that the Hon. Premier ever had a more loyal supporter. I have never been in gaol during my time nor have I ever been before the Supreme Court of this country charged with a serious offence, nor have I ever been out on bail in connection with the expenditure of the public funds of the Colony.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman. What the hon. member is saying is not relevant to this subject before the Chair

THE CHAIRMAN—The matter before the Committee has a very wide range.

MR. KENT—I ask that the question be put to the Committee.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—I am discussing the subject.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I ask you to put the question to the Committee. Do you rule that the remarks of the hon. member are relevant?

HON. MR. CROSBIE—I am quite in accord with the taxation of the Morris Government.

DR. LLOYD—I call on the Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN—I am doing my best to keep order in the House.

MR. KENT—I say the remarks of the hon. member are not relevant.

MR. MORRIS—Will the hon. member point out how they are not relevant? We are supposed to be bound by the ruling of the Chairman. The greater number of the members here are not acquainted with the nature of the hon. member's objection. How

then can the Committee vote on them?

MR. KENT—I have explained them. I appeal to the Committee that the remarks of the hon. member have nothing to do with the question of Ways and Means. I ask you Mr. Chairman to put it to the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN—The question before the Chair is whether the hon. member is speaking to the subject matter before the Chair.

MR. KENT—I ask for a division.

THE CHAIRMAN—Those who wish to sustain my ruling will go to the left of the Chair, those against it to the right.

(The division sustained the Chairman's ruling.)

HON. MR. CROSBIE—There is a time in every man's history when he must put up a defence. This is my only opportunity to talk about what I am charged with because I am a member of the Government. I am not accusing any member of this House. I am mentioning something that I have known done.

MR. COAKER—You are afraid to state what you are hinting at you contemptible clown.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—I ask that those words be taken down by the Clerk.

Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that a disorder had arisen and that the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker, had used towards the hon. member for Bay de Verde, Hon. Mr. Crosbie, the words "You contemptible clown."

HON. MR. SPEAKER—I have to ask the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Coaker for an explanation of these words.

MR. COAKER—If the hon. member does not like those words he can make it what he likes.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—I demand an apology.

HON. MR. SPEAKER—The expression is unparliamentary. I must request the hon. member for Bonavista to withdraw the expression and express his regrets to the House for having used it.

MR. COAKER—The hon. member for Bay de Verde has insulted me deliberately as he would not do elsewhere except on the floors of this House. He has done what no man ever did on the floors of this House and I have good reason to say what I have said. If he thinks it offensive I am satisfied for him to call it what he likes. I will not say that he did not deserve what I did say.

MR. SPEAKER—What did he say?

MR. COAKER—He deliberately referred to me with reference to women whom their husbands did not support. And he said he was never in jail, never before the Supreme Court and never out on bail. If he will take it back I will take it back.

HON. MR. SPEAKER—Did the hon member for Bay de Verde use these expressions?

HON. MR. CROSBIE—I did not use the hon member's name.

DR. LLOYD—The expressions were used by the hon. member Mr. Crosbie and everybody knows that they were meant to apply to the hon. member for Bonavista.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—I have not used the name of the hon. member for Bonavista.

HON. MR. SPEAKER—Since we have the assurance that the words were not used towards him, I must ask the hon. member for Bonavista to withdraw his words.

MR. COAKER—I withdraw them.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons resumed the Chair of Committee

HON. MR. CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman it seems to me that no one can use words in this House except the Opposition. If a Government member gets up to address the House he is accused of all kinds of things. I want the Committee to understand that papers in this country have no right to paint me as a rascal, but I have no opportunity to grapple with them except here in this House. Is it nothing for me to be called a rascal, scoundrel and graball and abused in the columns of the "Advocate" in every shape and form? I must defend myself sooner or later and I will not stand it any longer. It is only a little while since a paper called the "Advocate" accused every member of the Executive Council of land grabbing, of selling timber areas. What did we find? It had to make the most abject apology that ever a paper made.

MR. COAKER—Is that matter relevant?

HON. MR. CROSBIE—I am dealing with the matter before the Chair. I have a right to discuss what I like. I have never feared Mr. Coaker or any other man. I was told only a few days ago that I ought to be turned off the Executive Council and Mr. Coaker refused to support the fishery resolutions because I was not turned out of the Cabinet. And to-day I must not defend myself. I will not stand it any longer. I have done nothing I am ashamed of. I do not think that the action of the hon. member Mr. Coaker in relation to the fishery resolutions is anything he should congratulate himself on. I do not think it would altogether meet with the approval of the Angel Gabriel to whom he recently referred in this House. The Angel would say that he has not done well for the fishermen, to allow a private grudge against an individual member of this House to blind his reason and so deprive the fishermen of the country of the services on that Commission of their great deliverer. Despite the hon member's wish for my destruction I shall continue to exist. In the past, like the hon member, I was "a religious man." I did a few good acts that gained the favour of the good Angel and he is the guardian of my safety as well as the hon. member's, and I think he would say to me now in relation to Mr. Coaker, Forgive him for he knows not what he does. If my hon. friend intends in the future to follow on in the "Advocate" or any other paper as he has done in the past I will have a few words to say to him that he will not forget for a long time. I have never accused him of anything half as bad as he has accused me of, but if he say more about me, I put it to him now that he will meet trouble. I want no more of it in the future.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bay de Verde seems very aggrieved and concerned because of some remarks he claims I made in this House and in the papers outside. For what the papers may say outside the House he has his remedy in the Courts; but what I say on the floors of this House I am responsible for here, and I am ready to take the medicine you administer. If I forget myself and do anything ungentlemanly I will not mind what hon. members may say in return. But I have not done this. Whatever I have said has been said in the papers and for that the hon. member could have had his remedy outside. But hon. members should not in this House descend to personal abuse; this is no place for it If we must fight out matters of this kind on the floors of the House of Assembly I think it would be better not to seek election. I for one will not do anything in this House, unless

I am wonderfully provoked, that is ungentlemanly, or personal. Sometimes a man in debate may say something that he will afterwards regret, but if he is a man he will afterwards make amends. I would be very sorry to be guilty of the things you have accused me of to-night, without reasons or proofs.

The hon. member is sitting here as a member of the Government; and he has contracts with the Government. Because he has a seat in the Executive we object to that. We do not object to the Bowrings, for example, getting Coastal contracts, because they do not hold seats in the Cabinet. They are not in positions of influence. But upon broad principles we object to members of the Government having contracts with the Government. Look at the case of Sir Stuart Samuel, who was fined an enormous sum because a firm in which he was interested had a contract with a Government department. Yet he did not sit in the councils or vote on the contract. But the hon. member knows how to look out for his own interests. We take the stand that in future we will not permit what has gone on in the past.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the honorable Mr. Coaker has got up and said that he has nothing personal against me. If that is so, let him put an end to unpleasant remarks in the "Advocate". He has made statements in the "Advocate" of which he is the editor. I am asking him to stop this and I will do the same. That is the position which I take in the matter. If he does that, he will have no better friend than I am. If he wants to say anything, he is at liberty to do so; but leave out the word "scoundrel". I am going to have the right of these floors to protect myself before my countrymen.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain resolutions, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect thereto.

It was ordered that this report be received.

Upon the motion for the adoption of the report the House divided, and there appeared for the adoption of the report:—Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, C. H. Emerson, J.C. Crosbie, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. F. J. Morris, Parsons, Devereux, LeFeuvre, Downey, Moulton, M. J. Kennedy, Moore, Walsh, George Kennedy, Currie, Higgins and Young (19); and against it: Messrs. Kent, Clift, Lloyd, Clapp, Hickman, Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Jennings Targett, Winsor, Abbott and Grimes (13); so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act further to amend 'The Revenue Act, 1905' was introduced and read a first time; and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I want to make an explanation with regard to my position as I was in Chair of Committee when the recent disorder arose. It will be admitted by both sides of the House that a great deal of liberty has been given to all members in debate, as to what they referred to. I have not been exact as regards keeping the members strictly to the matter before the Chair. A certain amount of latitude has been given to members and consequently I felt it my duty to accord the same freedom to one side as to the other. I say this, sir, to justify myself before the House.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the matter which

the hon. member has just spoken of. I think that the Committee should take the matter on its merits. I think that if the Chairman of Committees were to be strict in requiring relevancy in the Debates and were to control members more strictly when they wandered from the question under discussion, it would tend to save time and preserve decorum, and would be more in accordance with the customs of other parliaments.

And it now being past midnight

THURSDAY, March 5th.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs tabled Report of the Auditor General on the Accounts of the St. John's Municipal Council for year ending Dec. 31st, 1913.

SALARIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister Finance and Customs the Bill entitled: 'An Act to amend the Act 61 Vic. cap. 8, entitled: 'An Act respecting Salaries,' was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MARINE & FISHERIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the Act 61 Vic. cap. 3, entitled: 'An Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries'' was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

TRAIN FERRY SERVICE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Service" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Jennings gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Stone gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Targett gave Notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until this afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 5th.

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

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled Report of Inspector of Weights and Measures for 1913; and Report of Cashier Savings Bank, for 1913.

PETITIONS.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Upper Gullies. The people there request that a sum of money be granted for the repair of a wharf at that place. This petition is largely signed and I hope it will meet with a quick response. I have also a petition from the residents of the same locality asking that a piece of land there be reserved for a public bog. I trust that the Government will pay special attention to these requests. I now refer them to the Department to which they relate.

MR. KENNEDY, (Hr. Main.)—Mr Speaker, I beg leave to support the petition presented by my colleague Mr Woodford.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Long Island, bearing on the same subject as those presented to the House on a previous day. I ask that this petition be put with those which were presented on that day. I also beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Exploits, asking for a sum of money to complete a coastal wharf in that place. At present

steamers are unable to come alongside.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Brigus in relation to temperance legislation, also one from the inhabitants of Cupids on the same subjct.

MR. PARSONS—Mr Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of the south side of Harbor Grace on the subject of Temperance Legislation, also one from Harbor Grace on the same matter, both of which I am in full accord with.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister what steps the Government intend to take in reference to the Temperance petitions.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The petitions have been referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary and will be considered by the Government at the earliest possible moment.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the people of Portugal Cove on the subject of repairs to the public wharf at that place. The wharf, as this House is aware, has been carried away by storm, and unless it is immediately replaced the fishermen will be greatly inconvenienced for the want of shelter for their boats. The petitioners ask that a suitable wharf be erected which should extend to Anchor Rock, in which case it would serve the purpose of a breakwater as well as a wharf. The passenger traffic to and from Bell Island is very great, and it is almost impossible to maintain that traffic owing to the absence of a wharf at Portugal Cove. I trust that the Government will provide for a special grant, so that this work may be proceeded with at the earliest possible moment.

MR. DWYER—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. KENT—I also have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition. Attention has already been called to the condition of the wharf at the Cove, and I hope the Government will make some provision for its erection so that the fishermen may be able to carry on their work without risking the loss of their boats. I trust that when the work is being done that wharf will be extended to Anchor Rock so that it will serve the purpose of a breakwater for the fishermen.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Speaker, I beg to pesernt a petition from the inhabitants of a number of settlements along the Cape Shore praying that a line of railroad be built in that section of the country. I have on a previous occasion presented a petition to this House asking that a sum of six thousand dollars be allocated to repair the one and only road which runs from Placentia to Cape St. Mary's. This amount is required to put this road in repair as the main line Grant voted for it is altogether inadequate. I ask that the Government will consider the advisability of constructing this line of railway which would not be more than thirty miles in extent and it would give the people an opportunity of developing the rich agricultural lands which exist between the Cape and Placentia. Those parties, such as sportsmen, who have had the opportunity of seeing those lands have been very much impressed with the extent and richness of the soil in that locality and it is capable of great development from an agricultural standpoint. Even under the present conditions the people of St. Bride's, Branch, and other places, send hundreds of cattle year after year to St. John's and oth-

er parts of the country. The same conditions exist along that shore as are to be found in the District of Bay de Verde, for in neither section of the country is a safe harbour to be found. This was one of the chief reasons for building the Bay de Verde Branch Railway. I trust that within a reasonable time the Government will see its way clear to build this line, which will have the effect of fostering the agriculture to a large extent in that part of the country.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and am in full sympathy with the wishes of the petitioners. During the early part of the Session I took occasion to point out that the main line grant was wholly insufficient to repair the road from Placentia to the Cape a distance of something like twenty seven miles. The fishermen living along that shore are hard-working and industrious, and carry on their business under great difficulties owing to the lack of suitable harbours, and they can only convey provisions to their homes along the road, or by a small boat from Placentia. I fully endorse what my colleague, Mr. Devereaux, has said in relation to a line of railway and the possibilities of the development of agricultural pursuits in that section of the country. We have already asked the Government to give consideration to the extension of the Trepassey Branch to St. Mary's and when that is completed I trust that a contract will be entered into with a view to meeting the desire of the petitioners.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker, I also have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition. The development of the Cape Shore section of the country is fraught with vast agricultural possibilities. For the benefit of the Committee I may mention that the value of the agricultural products in that part of the country, amounted last year to seventy thousand dollars, while the value of the fishery products did not exceed eighty five thousand dollars. If we had a railway running through that section of the country a great impetus would be given to Agriculture as the land is somewhat similar to that of the Codroy Valley. This matter should be seriously considered more especially as the fishermen are so seriously handicapped owing to the want of a harbour along that stretch of coast. When the water would be too rough for fishing they could turn their attention to agriculture if they had the proper encouragement. I trust something will be done to meet the wishes of the petitioners.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Trinity asking for the sum of one hundred dollars to build a railway connecting road, also one from the same place asking for thirty dollars to repair some railing along the roadside. I ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. STONE—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayers of the petitions and trust that the matters referred to will receive attention.

MR. HICKMAN—I ask leave to present a petition from Grate's Cove asking for an elective road board for that place. The petition is signed by two thirds of the inhabitants of the settlement, and I trust that their wishes will be complied with.

QUESTIONS.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House (a) an itemized statement showing the amount of $6,000 paid the Reid-Newfoundland Company on account Cape Bonavista

Fog Alarm; (b) the amount paid the foreman; (c) the total cost of the Fog Alarm at Cape Bonavista.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I beg to table that information.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House returns of expenditure of all surplus and special grants allocated for Point Leamington wharf, and any other marine works in that locality.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg to table that information.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House the original bills for material and expenses for work in connection with line and cable repairing, which have been paid to Operator Hennebury, Beaverton, since 1900; also total amounts paid him for services shown in such bills, except his regular salary.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to that question, I may say that the Department is preparing copies of these bills and I hope to have them before the House closes this evening.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing the amount expended by his Department at Monroe, in the district of Trinity, for Post and Telegraph Office, and to whom paid, for the years 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It was impossible to get this information this afternoon, but it will be ready to-morrow.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing, in detail, all moneys expended at Monroe, in the District of Trinity, for the years 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1913, to date, and to whom paid.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—There was no amount allocated from the marine grants for Monroe during the years in question.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the amount of money spent at Aspen Brook in the District of Trinity,and to whom sent from 1910, 1911, and 1912, to date.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—This information will be ready to-morrow.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if the Marconi Pole at Fogo has blown down; if so, what steps, if any, have been taken to erect it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—On the 16th of January the Government were notified that the Marconi pole at Fogo had blown down. The Marconi Company at Montreal were notified by cable and they gave instructions to replace the mast with as little a delay as possible. Their officer came to St. John's and the mast was shipped by the Prospero. They were prevented by circumstances from landing it and then arrangements were made to get temporary spars. Temporary spars would serve all purposes except communication with Belle Isle. The permanent spars will be erected in the spring. I may say that the station is the property of the Company at Montreal and that they bear all expenss in connection with it.

PARTRIDGE BERRIES BILL.

Second reading of Council's amendments to Partridge Berry Protection Bill.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, the Council has made some amendments to this Bill and has added a section in relation to inspec-

tion. It provides that the Board of Trade should make Rules and Regulations regarding the inspection and exportation of Partridge Berries to be approved by the Governor in Council and published in the Royal Gazette. Since the Bill came down I have had some conferences with members of the Council and I think that they would favourably receive any amendments on this section to meet the views of this branch. It will be remembered that when the Bill was read a second time it was pointed out that inspection of a general character might be difficult to inaugurate immediately. It was thought that perhaps that inspection for exportation would be sufficient. In other words that in order to maintain the standard of our berries it was thought that no berries should be exported from the country without some brand or inspection. Well it was pointed out as it will be remembered, particularly by the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, that under the section as it then was it would be possible and might be intended that inspection would have to take place in all cases where berries were sold. I gathered that it was the opinion of the House that that would not be desirable at the present moment. There are very large quantities of these berries sold in many parts of the country without any intention of their being exported and again a certain amount are brought on here for local sale. It seems to me that all we have to do is to make a beginning and do things gradually and after finding out what will meet the views of the people. I would suggest to the House the following amendment: That it shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to make Rules and Regulations and provide penalties for regulating the inspection of partridge berries. Such rules and regulations when published in the Royal Gazette shall have the force and effect of law. Before the rules are made, information could be obtained from those who represent the districts where these berries are gathered, from the Board of Trade, who would know something about the industry,and from the Company that is exporting these berries out of the country.

MR.. MOULTON.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words with regard to the inspection of our berries. I would take it that that would almost mean that any man in the outports who wanted to export berries would have to bring them to St. John's and get them inspected. Now, I do not think that would be fair. Another thing that strikes me is this, that if a shipper is careful with his berries and wants to establish a reputation he need not have his berries inspected because he can sell them on his own brand. I would not agree with any law that will compel any man from the outports who wanted to export berries to bring them to St. John's for inspection.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Burgeo, Mr. Moulton, with reference to this inspection. I do not think that it would be right for an outport shipper to have to bring his berries to St. John's. However, I have no doubt that the Governor-in Council in making regulations will make provisions for the inspection at some important outports.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I think that the amendment suggested by the Prime Minister is a great improvement on the original position. It places the power in the hands of the Governor in Council instead of the Board of Trade and gives him power to regulate this industry. How far they can exercise that power and where it should be necessary to exercise that power can only be found out after ascertaining what are the

needs of the industry. Instead of it being necessary for berries being brought to St. John's for inspection, provision could be made to hold this inspection at the part of the country from where they are exported, whether it be Bonavista, Catalina, Placentia or Port aux Basques. I think this suggestion of the Prime Minister's is better than the original proposition.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the suggestion made by the Hon. the Prime Minister. I think it is better that the power to make these rules and regulations should be in the Governor in Council than in the Board of Trade. I do not think there would be necessity for an outport exporter of berries to come to St. John's. This matter is under the Department of Agriculture and Mines and it would be a very simple matter to appoint inspectors in the outports to inspect any berries that are to be exported direct. I think that the alterations introduced will meet the requirements of the people who are interested in this industry.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker I may say I have read over this section and it seems to me to cover the objection I raised the other day. I am quite satisfied with it as it stands.

The Legislative Council's amendments in and upon the Bill sent up entitled 'An Act for the protection of the growth of Partridge Berries" were thereupon further amended, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting the concurrence of that body in the said amendments.

WAYS and MEANS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of 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. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I want to make some reference to the matter of the awards to Ryan Bros. Trinity. Information that I asked for was tabled yesterday and I want to take this matter up now. For lot No. 1 they claimed $11,261.50. They asked $5 a foot for the waterside property and $2.50 a foot for land inside. For loss of docking at the Cove they asked $400. For land from the flake to the road crossing they asked $750. For the land the flake stood on they asked $250 and for being deprived of the flake itself they asked $4,000. For estimated loss by reason of interference with access to stores and wharves they charged $2,000. For estimated additional fire insurance they asked $2,000 and they asked 10 per cent on the value of the land taken as compensation for compulsory taking. That makes a total of $11,261, for land taken from the waterside premises. Then a piece of land that they had further in from the waterside premises they divided into 25 building lots, and asked 5 cents per square foot and they charged for four building lots depreciated at 50 per cent each. These two items amount to $3,750. That is what they charged for a small meadow. Then lot No. 3 is another meadow which they similarly divided up and for which they asked $4,200. We have the award of the arbitrators giving them $6,000 as against a claim of amount $19,000. The most peculiar part of this transaction is the evidence taken before the arbitrators which will be edifying indeed to the people of Trinity Bay when they come to see what it contains. We have also in connection with this award $2,000 additional for expenses. Mr. J. T. McCarthy received as expenses to and from Bonavista $93.80. Mr. McCarthy, Mr.

Goodison and Mr. Miller received as arbitrators fees $750. Mr. Gibbs was paid $762.76 and Mr. Howley was paid $484.75 a total of $2,091.31 for expenses In other words this property which Ryan Bros. purchased a few years ago for $5,900 cost the Government $8,000. Is it any wonder, Sir, that we on this side of the House get up and protest against expenditures for railways, arbitration awards, and fees. Now, we can look at these papers here and find how the solicitors for the Government. Mr. Gibbs, charged a great deal more than was awarded to him. He charged $972.76 and $210 was cut off his bill by Mr. Browning the Registrar of the Court. The people will have this information published later, and then they will know where we stand in connection with this Ryan property.

I will now come to the evidence of Mr. Daniel Ryan given before the arbitrators. He goes on to show that they were damaged because the Government made him remove his flake. He has any amount of property in that vicinity to which he could remove his flake material and build another flake. He demands $4,000. He says that the flake is very valuable to him because they could spread a hundred quintals of fish. He makes a claim too for the store because the passage is going to be interrupted and it will be a little more labour to go out one door than another. 'The year before last' he says, 'we stored in these stores to the best of my knowledge about 13,000 quintals of fish. Some of that shore fish would be put in at $5.00, and it went up in the fall of the year to $6.50 and $6.80. Some of it may have been put in as low as $4.00.' Now, this excellent man, this supplying merchant, this philanthropist who is supplying the poor men states in his evidence that fish that he paid $4.00 for was sold in the fall of the year for $6.50 and $6.80. I am very sorry that I did not have this information placed in my hands earlier. There is a lot of it and I have not yet been able to go through it all. I am sure that the country and particularly the people of Trinity will want to hear more of this evidence. There are several foolscap pages of it. He says further down in his evidence when asked what he paid for it. 'I paid for that place so very cheap I am afraid to tell you, $5,900. I can't say if that place was long in the market before I bought it. It never belonged to Bremner, he was a tenant; it belonged, I believe in England. Bremner had it hired and paid 105 pounds a year for it.' For lot No. 3 which had been rented for $10.00 a year he claimed from the Colony $4,200. Again he says: 'We might have bought that land at Trinity, and buying it at that price, do you think I would turn around and sell it at the same price? I did not want the premises badly.' Probably he knew the railway was going through that way and he would make a good haul. But he found out that this land was very good and when the arbitrators came along and he managed to get $6,000 for it. He says again, "If it had been offered to me for $5,000 I would say I will only give $4,000. The man who would not take the value of that premises at $5,900 I think would be fit for the Asylum. I said I would give the first sum because I was trying to get it as cheap as I could.'

He asked $2,750 for a part of a meadow that he used for grazing purposes and which he let out at ten dollars a year. I do not know on what he based this tremendous sum but I do know that it was not worth anything like it. There is another meadow that he asked $4,200 for, and yet all that he used to get from it before that time was an annual crop of

about five tons of hay. This is the philanthropist that we are told has done so much for the fishermen. This is the man that the poor toilers have been told to look up to and respect How does he treat them? Let me quote his own words:

'We have men and boys employed 'and we pay them from sixty cents 'to a dollar. Sixty cents to the boys 'and a dollar to the men. Sixty cents 'is the lowest we pay and a dollar is 'the highest. Sixty, seventy, eighty and 'ninety cents is the average. I think 'there is one man we have shipped 'whose wages are more than that, 'but we will say the wages are from 'sixty cents to a dollar.'

There we have him. There we have this friend of the fishermen paying them eighty and sixty cents a day, while a little distance away from them are men at similar work who are receiving $1.50. Is it any wonder that the fishermen have determined not to be down-trodden in this manner by men who have made great riches by taking from the toilers their fair wages? This is the type of man who buys a property for $5,900 and a few years afterwards wants to sell a very small part of it to the Government for $19,000. What a noble type of man he must be! These are the men, we are told, who have built up the country, these men with the big bank accounts. Is it any wonder that they are so wealthy when they do this kind of thing, when out of the taxes paid by the people they seek to make thousands of dollars that they are not entitled to.

There was another piece of land for which he received twenty-five cents a year rent for and he wanted another big pile of money for this, but it appears that the arbitrators were alive in this matter, particularly Mr. Goodison, who seems to have taken a great interest in what was going on. In most of the hearing, however, the other arbitrators were like the rt. hon. Prime Minister wished me to be, with their ears open and their mouths closed. In connection with this part of the arbitration we have another example of the kind of men the Ryans are and what kind of a bargain they make when they get the chance. In Mr. Daniel Ryan's evidence he says: 'I was asked what I wanted for that piece of land and I thought that the person who asked me had no intention of buying it, and I said about $450.00. After a little talk the person who was treating with me left the office and went out of doors. He came in about ten or fifteen minutes after and asked me right off then would I accept $450.00 and I said that I was not prepared to do so just then.' You see there were no flies on Ryan. I wonder did he have any suspicion that the Government intended to build a railway down there, for it seems a funny thing that he should refuse $450 for that part of the property, seeing that it brought him in only twenty five cents a year.

This the man who pays so little to those employed with him that he finds it very difficult to get men to work for him at all. Is it any wonder that they do not want to work for him? He may make a lot of money by cheating the toilers out of their fair wage but no matter how much he may make nobody will envy him, and when he comes at last to the Judgment Seat he will be sorry himself that he did not do his duty to his men. We shall publish the whole thing and I know that some of the toilers will be amazed when they learn the facts of the matter. The whole country will be surprised to learn that the Ryans were paid $6,000 and that the expenses amounting to $2,000 or $8,000 in all

for a small portion of a lot of land, for the whole of which the Ryans paid $5,900 not long ago. Not one single store or building will be damaged by the railway going through it, and on the whole property will actually be increased in value. Is it not enough to make the fishermen of that place indignant at the way in which the people's money is thrown away? Yet we are told that the Union members only argue against the Government because we are expected to do so. We have plenty to argue about, but nothing more barefaced than this reckless expenditure of money. What next will come to light it is hard to say in view of what has been disclosed during this Session, but whatever position the F. P. U. take on it, I feel certain that position will be justified as all our arguments have been justified since we have taken part in the debates in this House.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, befor the vote goes through I wish to make a reference to a matter referred to in the speech of the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister last evening, a matter that to me has a personal bearing. I wish to refer to it this afternoon so that when I speak on the Budget I shall deal with it from an impersonal standpoint.

In the course of his remarks on the Budget, he stated with reference to the arbitration fees paid by the Government that when the late administration had any arbitrations the hon. member for Trinity, referring to myself, was never passed over. I wish to thank my rt. hon. friend, who was the Attorney General of that time, for his asurance that he never did pass me over, but at the same time I wish to make my position clear, for it might be understood by those who heard the rt. hon. gentleman's statement that I was at that time in receipt of fees from the then administration of a kind similar to those that have been referred to by my hon. friend, Mr. Coaker. The class of fees to which I refer are those which have been given to certain members and supporters of the present Government in connection with the railway arbitrations. In one of these cases the arbitrator received $4,700, in another $2,113, in another $6,300, in another $7,100, in another $2,300, in another $3,600 in another $3,900.

It might be inferred from my rt. hon. friend that such a system was in force under the Bond Administration. I wish to disabuse their minds of that idea, if it does exist. It is true that the arbitrations under the late Government were not of the extent and nature of those to which I have just referred and it is true that during the several years that the late Government was in power I was appointed by the Government on several arbitrations. It might be inferred that I received from two to six thousand dollars as arbitration fees during the time that I was a member of this House before.

I would have allowed the rt. hon. gentleman's remarks to pass in silence as I have done on previous occasions, were it not for the fact that he has also declared in public that during that time I lived largely out of the Government, and that I was receiving fat fees and that owing to the defeat of the late Government I was now forced to work for my living. Had the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister not made that remark I would have made no reference to what he said last evening. What he has said during the present debate, however, would tend to give more currency to his former remarks and that is why I ask to make this personal statement.

What are the facts of the matter?

I was a member of the late Government for four years and during the whole of that time I received in all $232, an average of $58 a year. That is what I received from the Government that 'never passed me by' and I am told, when I lost this I had to go out and work for my living. Before I was a member of the Government I received $300 for work done by me, and after my defeat in the District of Port de Grave, I received a further $200 for other work. These are the only amounts that I ever received.. Surely it will be admitted that there is a distinct and big difference between the arbitration fees that I received and those to which I have referred.

As I already said, Mr. Chairman, this is a personal matter, and I would not have referred to it, but for the fact that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister stated that I received fat fees while I was a member, and that, when defeated, I was forced to earn my living.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry if anything I said last night injured the feelings of my hon. friend, for I can assure him that nothing was further from my mind. When I referred to the matter last night it was in reply to statements made a number of times in relation to the arbitration fees worked for and received by hon. members on this side of the House. There was a general charge made that hon. members should not receive any work or emolument from the Government. My only reference to my hon. friend was to point out that he and others, including myself, received large fees from the former Government, and that it has been going on under all Governments. I am sorry that the fees of my hon. friend were not assessed higher, but I cannot help it, as they were not assessed by myself. I should like to say, however, that I feel sure that any amounts paid to him by the Government or by order of the Court were fairly earned, and that the Colony received from him value for his remuneration. My hon. friend was selected on a number of arbitrations on my own recommendation, because I knew his capacity, and probably his fees were not as large as some of those that have been before us lately because of the fact that the matters in dispute were not very large.

As regards the statement made by me at Bonne Bay, I may say that I had no reports before me, and I was speaking from memory at the time. The papers were hitting me hard and I retorted that the editor was fighting hard to get back into power, and that he would probably obtain more fees as he had done before. If I used the word 'fat' I am very sorry, for if I had had an opportunity of looking up the figures, I would have found that the amount he received was as a matter of fact, lean. My hon. friend will admit that in the heat of a campaign there is not a man in politics who is not at times somewhat astray in his assertions. I should like to say in conclusion, that I was familiar with the arbitrations on which my hon. friend was engaged and I can certainly testify to the valuable services that he rendered and his fitness to act in that capacity.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, with reference to the remarks of the rt hon. Prime Minister, I may say that I do not wish to discuss any further what was merely a personal matter. I had no idea, however, that the rt. hon. gentleman had such a flattering opinion of my capacity. As he pointed out the fees under the former Government were quite lean compared with those under the present Government, but, whether the fees were fat or lean

they would have no influence in making me alter my views or in not sticking to my principles.

While speaking I should like to refer to a matter that happened in Bonavista on the night before polling day. I addressed a very large meeting of twelve hundred persons on that occasion and during my remarks I made a reference to the 'Daily News, which had a scare headline: 'Shall it be Morris and Prosperity or Coaker and Chaos?' I told the people that was not a bad way of putting it, and I asked them which they would prefer to have: Morris's brand of prosperity or Coaker's brand of chaos? That was the way I put it to them and I heard a reply of 'Morris's Prosperity.' It was from a single individual and I afterwards discovered he was a Ryan.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, as this is the last opportunity we shall have of discussing the matter, I would like to ask the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister when he expects to lay before us the result of the investigation of the Hospital affairs.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I expect to do so to-morrow. If not then, on Saturday.

MR. COAKER—I found at the Hospital that several doctors of the city were not permitted to attend patients at the Hospital. The doctors who attended them at their homes were not permitted to attend them when they went to the Hospital. I refer to the doctors who are not on the Hospital staff. Lately we have had a visit from an expert, who came specially to perform an operation on a lady here and that gentleman was afforded every facility at the Hospital, where his patient was taken. I have no objection to this being done, but I cannot see why one doctor is allowed to treat his patient in the Hospital, when doctors practising here are not permitted to do so. I have been told by doctors that sometimes it is not easy to get a patient in the Hospital, and in that case the doctors on the staff naturally have a better chance of having their patients sent there than those who are not on the staff. If that is the case, it is a serious matter, and it should be definitely settled that a doctor on the official staff should have no preference in this matter to the other doctors of the city.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I should like to explain to my hon. friend that there is no such practice as that to which he has referred. In the first place everybody is admitted to the General Hospital, who needs to go there, no matter what doctor may be in attendance. In the Hospital in addition to Dr. Keegan the Superintendent, there is Dr. Knight, the resident doctor. There are other visiting doctors but their patients are treated just like the patients of all other doctors The doctors on the Hospital staff have no more privileges than any other doctors. It is quite easy to understand that some of the visiting doctors of the Hospital go there, but when they go it is as visiting physicians and not as private doctors. There is no case where a patient is sent to the Hospital and the family doctor continues to attend the patient for once the patient enters the Hospital he is immediately under the care of Dr. Keegan and Dr. Knight. In cases of operation these doctors are assisted by Drs. Fraser, Anderson, and Cowperthwaite. There is no privilege granted to any of the doctors I have named and it would not be desirable that any practitioner should be allowed to follow his patient to the Hospital.

There must be somebody in control and it would follow that if every doctor was allowed to follow his patients

to the Hospital there would soon be chaos, and they would never know where they were.

There is quite a distinction in the case referred to by my hon. friend The lady in question obtained the services of an expert from abroad as she had to undergo a serious operation. After the specialist arrived he came to the conclusion that it would be inadvisable to perform the operation in her own house owing to the fact that naturally there was not a regular operating table or other utensils required in such cases as conveniently at hand as in the Hospital. The patient went there as an ordinary patient. but it was only reasonable that this specialist should be allowed to visit her a few times. If there was a specialist on the staff it would have been different. Surely nobody will object to this. I never knew of the services of a specialist being objected to in a case in which he was a specialist The only thing I am sorry for, is that we have no specialists, for our doctors here are practically compelled to carry on a general practice and have no time to specialize. It is the same with the doctor as it is with the lawyers, and other professional men. for the circumstances and conditions here are such that it is impossible to specialize, as they do in other countries. We have some specialists here in eye and ear cases, and I have no doubt that when these occur the other doctors are glad to have the advantage of their special experience.

In conclusion, I can assure my hon. friend that no rule exists whereby the doctors in attendance at the Hospital have the slightest advantage over other doctors in sending their private patients to the Hospital or in treating them there.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, what I object to is the discrimination against doctors that is made by people who wish to have the services of a doctor on the Hospital staff, because they believe that if they go to the Hospital they will have closer attention when they engage one of of the staff. The result is that often doctors find they are passed over and the services of a doctor connected with the Hospital are engaged.

As to the expert, I understand that he was asked to come here by the husband of the patient, who is himself a doctor. I understand the doctor met him in Canada and as he was a specialist in this kind of case he asked him to come here and treat his wife. He came here and he was allowed to go to the Hospital with his patient, which local doctors are not allowed to do. How do we know that we have not men in St. John's who could have performed the operation quite as effectively as he did, and as others have been performed? We do not give the men in town a chance to improve in this class of work when they are not permitted to go to the Hospital. These specialists make thousands of dollars a year and they should not have any preference over any other doctors. If it is permitted in one case it ought to be permitted in all cases, and that is why we object to a specialist or a member of the staff being allowed to follow his patient to the Hospital. It is not fair to the other doctors, and it gives these men a preference over all their competitors.

There is another point. The Hospital costs a lot of money and its chief object is to benefit the poor. Now that we have a first class Hospital men who could afford to pay a thousand dollars for medical services go there for nothing. I think that those who are able to pay for the facilities there ought to be compelled to

do so and thereby make a revenue for the place. The doctor would know if the patient could pay or not. There should be a scale of fees there and men should pay in accordance to the services rendered to them, and their ability to pay. It is only fair to those who can afford to pay to do so while the poor can obtain free service.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, over three months ago the Government gave Dr. Keegan permission to make enquiries as to the fees charged in Canada and the United States with a view to bringing them into force here. As a matter of fact, the number of patients who go to the Hospital and who can afford to pay any fees there is very small. I undertake to say that if my hon. friend will look the matter up he will find that not more than five per cent. of the patients are able to pay adequately for the services rendered them there. At times, however there are patients who can afford to pay fees and I quite agree that these should pay something at least for the services that are rendered them at the Hospital. The matter is being dealt with and I trust that, when we meet here again, we shall find that a proper scale of fees shall have been drawn up.

Coming to the question of Dr. Archibald, the specialist, I have already explained the situation in that case, and I think my statement fully answered the various points referred to by my hon. friend. When the specialist came here it was the intention that the operation be performed in the patient's own home but he thought it advisable owing to the very serious nature of the case to have the operation performed at the Hospital and he applied to the Colonial Secretary for permission to have it performed there. There was no unfair discrimination in this case nor has there been any discrimination whatever in favor of the doctors on the staff against other doctors of the city.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the following Resolutions:—

PUBLIC SERVICE 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, 1914, the sum of $244,719.17 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Colony.

RESOLVED:—That towards making good the Supply granted on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending June 30th, 1915, the sum of $2,376,069.-91 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 neighbourhoods having local Boards or Councils, to authorize the payment at any time after the 30th day of June 1914, to such Local Boards or Councils of all the moneys voted in respect of such districts or neighbourhoods for public charities and for roads, bridges and ferries in Schedule B., and all such moneys when paid them as aforesaid may be expended by such Boards or Councils for such local needs and requirements as the Boards or Council may determine.

RESOLVED:—The moneys hereby appropriated shall be paid by the 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 be introduced to give effect to these resolutions.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that leave be granted for the introduction of the said Bill.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT.

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 financial years ending respectively, the 30th day of June, 1914, and the 30th day of June 1915, 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 tomorrow.

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 for raising a sum of money by loan for the extension of the Railway System of the Colony;' 'An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances;' 'An Act for raising by the sale of debenture bonds a loan for the public service of the Colony;' and 'An Act to amend Chapter V. of 8 Edward VII. entitled: 'An Act with rspect to Compensation to Workmen for injuries suffered in course of their employment;' 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 amend 55 Victoria Cap. 2, entitled: 'An Act to regulate the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery'' with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the Council's amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

MUNICIPAL ACT.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: 'An Act respecting Municipal Affairs.'

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, this Bill is introduced for the purpose of giving effect to the petitions that were presented to the House a few days ago. These petitions were signed by three thousand voters of the city and they were received in this House with the unanimous approval of the members. Since then a number of other petitions have been presented. The prayer of these petitions was that the Municipal elections, which in the ordinary course of events would be held in July, be postponed for a year in order that a Committee of citizens might be able to enquire into the whole question of Municipal affairs At the end of the year a report would be presented by the committee.

The last election took place in 1910 on the 27th of June. The first meeting of the Council was held in July 1910, and the Council will go out of office on the 27th of June 1914. This Bill provides that, notwithstanding the provision of the Act of 1902, no election of a Mayor and members of the Council shall take place before the 1st of July 1915, or as near as possible to that date. The present Mayor and Council shall go out of office when their term is finished and the Governor in Council shall appoint a Board of twelve persons who shall take office at the end of June 1914 and continue for one year. The object of the Committee is to obtain a better Government in the city and to derive means whereby this may be

made permanent. They do not say that the present members of the Council have in anyway failed; but they think that a better inquiry can be held by a larger Board than at present, and by a Board that will be free from any obligations that might attach to men elected by a certain body and for a certain policy and platform. They think that a Board should be appointed which is thoroughly informed, so that suggestions may be evoked which may lead to civic reform along the lines indicated in the petitions. When I was speaking of the petition the other day, I pointed out that in my opinion a public meeting of the rate payers of the city should be held and that at that meeting there should be a selecting committee of say fifty nominated at the meeting and then that fifty would nominate the Board and submit the twelve names to the Governor-in-Council. That would practically mean an election, although it would not have the formality of an election. We want to get men who are interested in the welfare of the city and whose advice will be valuable in connection with the improvement of the city. Whatever service is not giving satisfaction must be amended. Take for instance our night-soil service. We know that these carts are emptied out at only a mile from here. Their contents are dumped out on the open soil and there it is to be seen to-day. There must be some way of dealing with that; but you must leave it to an expert who is acquainted with the way it is disposed of in other countries. I only mention this to show that all these questions will have to be dealt with and that we will have to get expert advice. It is only reasonable to assert that those who are in charge of things have done everything that they could. If the water supply is defective,if the supply fails, you want to know whether your system of distribution is alright, or whether your service to-day is alright. You want to know whether there is any defect which accounts for the lack of supply. There are thousands of homes in St. John's to-day without sewerage or a water supply. With these few facts, I move the adoption of the bill.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I am sure that every person must appreciate the zeal of the gentlemen who have originated the movement which has resulted in this Bill now before the Committee. I think that Mr. Gosling, the gentlemen originally associated with this movement in the first instance deserves the approbation of all our citizens. They have seen a need in the city and they have drawn the attention of the public to these needs and there is greater interest now in Municipal problems than in the past. I think, Mr. Chairman, that, if we would solve the problem of reform of Municipal Government, we would do away with many of the present evils in the city. Since the present system was inaugurated in 1888. we have had some of the best men for this work in the city. There are some present in this House who have done sincere work in this connection. There are for instance, Hon. Mr. Bennett and Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Shea who was a member of the last Legislature. These men are all capable and able. Our late Mayor, Mr. Gibbs and the present Mayor, Mr. Ellis, are both experienced and competent men and able to do the work; but they were hindered by the system under which they were working. The present members of the Municipal Council are all men who are earnest in their endeavours for the welfare of the city. We have to come back to the question of the system of Govern-

ment under which the city is ruled to-day; that is the chief problem for the city. When we were talking about the petition, I did not think that the best results would be accomplised towards reforming the system of Government, by bringing the two works —the working of the actual Government and the devising of a new system of Government—under the control of the same body at the same time. I have given the subject some thought since then and I have come to the conclusion that it would be much better for the interests of the city to appoint a body that will take up the question of Municipal Government and act as a separate body. I think that by this arrangement much better results would be obtained, than if you had only one body for the two purposes. I believe it would be a good idea to obtain the services of as many of the present members of the Council as is possible. No doubt, they will be only too delighted to tender their services. I think that the devising of a suitable system of Municipal Government would be sufficient work for one body of men. This is a serious problem and demands the best knowledge that we can afford to bring upon it. Such problems as the lighting of the streets, the obtaining of a good water supply and a good system of sanitation—are all problems that will occupy the attention of the Committee.

I was only able to attend one of the meetings of the Citizens' Committee; but during that one meeting, I learnt more about the Municipal problems than I had learnt in years from the outside. One great question is that of guidance. I think the time has come for our citizens to wake up and I think that in the future we will obtain an all round better system of Municipal Government. I would like to give my support, Mr. Chairman, to the Committee. I think that more satisfactory results will be obtained by having the two questions distinct. I think that this debate should have taken place at the second reading of the bill.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, the work of the citizens' committee and these petitions have been so much discussed when the petitions were before us that it would be rather unreasonable to occupy the time of the Committee much further. The main objection raised by the Leader of the Opposition is to the combination of the two functions in one commission. He maintains that it would be preferable to continue the Council in its present form for another twelve months, while another independent commission would enquire into the reform of Municipal Government. The petition asks the Government to pass an Act deferring the Municipal election for one year and authorizes the Governor-in-Council to nominate a Committee of twelve citizens to undertake the Government, when the present Council goes out of office. That is the purpose of the petitions which state the wishes of some 3,000 people.

With all respect, Mr. Chairman, to what has been said, by what process can anyone imagine that anything hurtful can come by giving these men the limited powers which have been referred to as already possessed by the present Municipal Council? All that they do is to carry on the work of the city as at present carried on for twelve months, and in addition to that, devise some proposal to be submitted next year. Well, as to the carrying on of the work of the city for the next twelve months, surely it is no reflection upon the present Council to say that, under the method of nomination suggested by the Rt

Hon. Premier, which will mean the election of the best available, we are likely to get twelve men who will be able to do the work as well as the present Council. Surely, that it is not too much to hope for. Surely the members of the present Council themselves will admit that. I do not think that there is any man serving on that Board but will admit that a body of citizens nominating fifty as a Selecting Committee and that fifty picking out twelve from their number will result in the selection of twelve men who will, on the whole, discharge the duties of the Council as capably and as efficiently and as honestly as any body that might be elected under the present system. As to the possibility of the scheme suggested that a separate commission should be appointed and that that commission should work with the Council, I do not think that is feasible. There would not be the best relations between the two bodies, and we would really be appointing a commission that would be dealing more or less with a hostile body. I do not say that now in an unfriendly spirit to either section interested but if one is to judge from newspaper comment and letters, the two elements appear to be not working in the same groove, and that being the case we would not get from a Commission so appointed the good results that we have in mind and that the citizens generaly have in mind. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I do think that this bill is the only practical form of giving a trial to the wishes of the petitioners. We are all aware that the only idea behind the petition is that an effort should be made to do something. No one professes that this is going to make our city a land of Utopia, but at least the Legislature will be in this position: That they will be able to say that when the citizens of St. John's in such a tremendous number have risen to an occasion and have formulated public opinion to such a degree that they come and ask a trial which costs the country nothing, which can in no way add to any burden which the tax-payers have at present to bear, which can in no way impose upon the taxpayers of St. John's any new obligation, and which can at the end of twelve months be cancelled, then surely the proper course for us to take—and particularly, I respectfully submit, from the standpoint of those who are more directly concerned with conditions in the city—is to give the measure a trial. I regret that on this occasion I have to differ from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a matter in which we both have the same interest. I recognize, of course, that his viewpoint is just as honest and just as earnest and just as well-intentioned as mine but with all respect to what he has said it appears to me that in the light of the form in which the petition has come to us, in the light of the peculiar conditions surrounding the present relationships between the Citizen's Committee and the Council,this appears to me to be the only practical form of giving the citizens' request a trial. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the bill in its present form.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman. Since this matter was before the House last in the form of a petition from the Citizens' Committee I have given it some consideration and I am in entire accord with the step which the citizens of this town are asking us to take in passing legislation whereby the Municipal election which would ordinarily be held in June, 1914, will be suspended for one year and that in the meantime a Board of Commissioners be appointed to enquire generally into the municipal affairs of the city. I have list-

ened to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in criticism of the intentions of the present bill and in support of the alternative that he suggests, and I want to say here from practical experience that I don't think that the solution of the present difficulties which the people generally are desirous of, and which is contemplated in this bill, can be attained in the manner referred to by him. I cannot conceive how it is possible for the present Municipal Council and a Board of Commissioners appointed by the citizens or by the Government to work side by side. I fear that it would mean continuous clash and friction and altogether divergent opinions as to what would be the best way to proceed. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the condition of things which exists in St. John's to-day and the action which the citizens have taken in the matter must convince this Committee that public opinion has been for a long time dissatisfied and irritated, and that it is not content to remain silent any longer as regards municipal affairs. We all know from experience the shortcomings and the deficiencies of our municipal system and I feel sure we are all desirous of seeing it improved; and any movement that tends towards the improvement of present conditions (although I don't agree with the gentlemen who compose the Committee in calling them deplorable—I think that a very strong word and that it would be better if it were left out) will have my hearty support. I feel that to-day we are awakening to the fact that the system under which we are working needs improvement and are facing the question as to how to bring about the desired improvement. Now I am not going to admit that there has not been improvement in our municipal affairs. I think that all of us who have lived in the city all our lives and who can go back 25 or 30 years, will admit that the city is very much better to-day than it was then. I can go back to the first municipal election—when the gentlemen who were the first representatives of the city under the ward system were elected. We have had many able men connected with our Municipal Councils, men who did good work towards the improvement of the town. I remember that during the term when I served on the Municipal Council a great deal of work was done, a great deal of time was put in and a good many improvements made. We installed during that term the present new water system, which meant the expenditure of $120,000. When that system was installed we were told by the expert engineers that came here in connection with it that it would settle the water question of this town for the next fifty years; that no matter how the town grew or expanded during that period we would have sufficient water to meet all our requirements and that we would never have such a thing as a shortage of water in one end of the town or the other. It was explained to us that the system was to be a kind of co-operative system—that is, the new system was to be separate from the one then in existence. One system was to come out to the top of the town and the other was the old one coming out Rennie's Mill Road. One system was supposed to supply one end of the town and the other the other end. The two were to be linked together, and when a great force of water was required in any particular portion of the town, the valves were to be opened and both systems worked together. That has not transpired. There is no question about the fact that we have coming into this town an ample supply of water, but the trouble is that there are pipes right through the town that have become corroded and

obsolete and useless, and it is necessary to replace these old and worn-out pipes and have the water porperly distributed. That is the only improvement that is necessary to complete as good a water system as it is possible for this town to have, in my opinion; and that is one of the problems that the Council is up against Now, as to the possibility of this Committee carrying out all that they claim they can do and achieving long steps towards municipal improvement As I said the other night when the petition dealing with this matter was before the House, I think the Committee have a big contract before them, and they will have all they can do within the next twelve months to satisfactorily carry out their programme. I hope, Mr. Chairman, and I have no doubt, knowing the class of man whom I hope will be on that Committee, that they will go a long way and in some measure at least relieve the vexed and unsatisfactory feeling that exists—this continual worrying and harping on and criticism of our present municipal system. Why, you cannot go into a club, you cannot go to a meeting of the Board of Trade, you cannot go to any place where an interest is taken in public matters, but you hear all kinds of complaints about dust, the water supply, protection on the harbor front, and a dozen other things. I feel sure that if any attempt is made to settle all or any of these vexed questions, the present Municipal Council will do all they can to assist. I have no doubt that every member of the present Council is doing his duty conscientiously and to the best of his ability, but the trouble is with the system; they are the victims of that system, and it is very difficult for them, as I know from experience, to get away from old traditions. You may do better with new blood—new men, untrammelled and uninfluenced—and I believe that they will do much to benefit this town. Some parties take the position that we are disfranchising the people by appointing a body of men to go in and do the work that they should have a voice in. Well, the answer to that is that it is the taxpayers of the town who are asking for this. We are merely suspending the election of the Council for one year. We do not want to disfranchise the people. What we want to do, if possible, is to make the franchise of the people more effective, and try and arrange things so that they will get the greatest possible return for the taxes which they pay. If the suggestion of my hon. friend Mr. Kent were carried out,and the present Council remained in for another year, would not that be a suspension of the franchise?

MR. KENT—I did not make that suggestion.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—You said that the Council might remain in.

MR. KENT—Yes, but I did not say that the present Council should go on as at present.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I thought you said that the Council might go on.

MR. KENT—Yes, I said that the Council might go on, but I did not say who should constitute that Council.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I misunderstood you. I thought you suggested that the Council should go on for another year and that a Commission be appointed as well. But, Mr. Chairman I don't think the matter of the franchise is a very serious one, and I don't think the present Council will be sorry if they are relieved of their duties for a year. I believe they are all patriotic enough to give those

who are talking so much about what they would do if they had an opportunity, a chance to see what they can do. If these people claim that they can do certain things, and if the citizens of St. John's say: Give them a chance and see what they can do. Well, I believe it is the duty of this Legislature to fall in line with that suggestion; and I only hope that when we come down here next year and have the report of this Commission before us, that it will be something which will mean the dawn of a new era for St. John's, while not calling for increased taxation on the working classes. I hope that they will do something of a tangible nature. I think, for instance, that arrangements should be made to have our middle streets paved, and I think the people who own property on those streets and who do business on those streets and who will derive a revenue from that property and business are the ones that should pay for it. You will never have a clean Water Street while you have a dirty Duckworth Street. It is apparent to every person who comes into this town that the pavement on Water Street is all right, and yet we find that after every rainfall the mud on Water Street is ankle-deep, especially near the intersecting streets, proving conclusively that what we need is to clean out upper streets. Until we pave Duckworth Street from the East End to the West End firehall, and all the intersecting streets between that and Water Street, we cannot have a clean city. [illegible] your water system into working [illegible], then arrange the matter of sewerage and the diposal of your night-soil, then pave Duckworth Street and the intersecting streets to Water Street, and you will have the groundwork for a clean and model city. The other streets will be matters of detail. I gladly welcome this movement, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that when the selection is made, that they will appoint the very best men irrespective of party politics, irrespective of religious differences, and irrespective of social standing—men who are big enough and patriotic enough to take up a work that it is necessary to deal with, and complete it to the best of their ability. Because, after all, our city is the same as our home. Every one of us wants to keep our homes clean and attractive and bright, and the same desire should apply to the city in which we have to live our lives. If we don't take any interest in our own surroundings, if we allow them to become neglected and dirty, then we will become a byword to everyone visiting us. I trust that my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, will see the force of the contention that I have tried to put up, that it is not desirable to have dual representation in this matter. I think we should put the responsibility entirely on those who wish to have a chance to take the matter in hand, and for one year, at least, give them an opportunity to see what they can do.

It being now half past six, the Chairman of Committees left the Chair until eight o'clock.

The Chairman resumed the Chair at eight o'clock.

MR. KENNEDY.—While we have before us the bill relating to Municipal Reform, I deem it not inopportune to make a few remarks in my capacity as member for St. John's West. The petition itself, which will result in a radical change, is signed by some three thousand men, and is a call to us to help the citizens of St. John's by our support in this fundamental amelioration of existing conditions. It is a topic of thought that as a wave has swept over the whole world of late, and the minds of the greatest men are occupied as to the way in

which these much-needed reforms are to be accomplished. We can take it as a sign of the times when we see the leading men of our city occupying themselves with it. Up to twenty-five years ago the affairs of this town had been managed by the Board of Works Department, and about that time there was a change in the form of government, which continued until the fire of 1892. In 1898 there was another change of government, and commissioners were appointed, who, when we consider the small revenue they had, accomplished a great deal, for the water service was inaugurated and the city partly lit. In 1902 the present Premier brought in a bill to give the city further advantages, and ever since then it has been the Prime Minister's chief thought to advocate to the fullest degree the amelioration of the existing circumstances in this city. In 1902 six councillors and a mayor were elected, of whom I happened to be one, and although the citizens now state this city to be in a deplorable condition, considering the lack of money on which we could work, we accomplished, I think, a very great deal indeed. Our first thought was to inaugurate the present water system. We got an expert to come down and do the work in the most thorough way possible. We can congratulate ourselves on our water system. The percentage of water here used is highly in advance of most of the cities of the world. Now, I listened with a great deal of attention to the address of the learned Leader of the Opposition this evening, and although he had part of it very well thought out, I cannot agree with him in regard to the dual capacity. I know that if you had a Council there and a Commission, each would be jealous of its privileges, and neither would allow the other to dominate over it. I know some of these men, and I am sure nothing would come of such a system. Now that these citizens have come forward and suggested a plan, I think, Mr. Chairman, we ought to assist them in every way in our power. I do not see that we are disfranchising people, because, as I said before, it is not the first time that we have tried to alter the system of government in St. John's. It is only an experiment for twelve months. We have given them no greater powers, and the people need not fear that they are going to increase taxation. They cannot do this without getting additional power, and are not allowed to remain more than twelve months, One thing I am certain, and that is that they will not put any increased taxation on our working classes. Let them devise means to get after the absentee landlords, and tax land not built on. You cannot put any further taxes on the workingmen who are putting up their own little homes. I think for this reason that we are safe in letting this Bill pass. I do not think any harm can come from it. If they attempt to do anything wrong, we can deal with them when this matter comes up again twelve months from now. I know that the time has come when we should get our streets paved. I know that we will have to get a large amount of money to do that. We can never get it out of the present revenue. We will have to borrow money, and then we will have to devise the means to pay the interest. Then again we will have to devise means to secure a proper sewerage system. I know it is pretty hard to keep some of our streets clean. If you go up through some of our back streets you will find that people have to throw out offal and dirty water on these streets, because they have no other way of disposing of these things. In many little houses there may be only two or three rooms, and they must put out their pails and

night soil on the street. I hope that these Commissioners when they take over the affairs of the city will devise a way of putting sewerage into every house. I know it is an awful problem in St. John's, in a climate like we have, to put in water and sewerage in these small houses. If these houses had water and sewerage last month, what would have been the result? Everything would have been frozen, or the water would have been allowed to run, and we know what a terrible waste of water that would mean. Every poor man would have to let the water run, as he could not afford to pay plumbers' bills if the pipes froze. I have had some little experience myself, and I know what plumbers' bills amount to after a hard winter. I know how hard will be the problems that will confront the Commissioners. We have had Municipal Government in St. John's for 26 years, and some are inclined to say that little has been done. I claim that a great deal has been done, and that St. John's of today and St. John's of twenty-five years ago are quite different cities. In 1892 we were visited by fire and our city wiped out, and shortly afterwards came the bank crash, and almost every house on Water Street had its shutters up. Now, in spite of these things, St. John's has made great strides and if this Commission is going to bring up further reforms, I think we ought to vote for this Bill. I may add that I think that this Commission should be composed of men who have had some experience, and who have not got their information second hand, but who have gone through the mill. Another problem that will have to be dealt with by the Citizens' Committee is the problem of water supply on the higher levels. On Water St. and the lower streets we have a good supply of water and a good sprinkling system; but the question of a water supply for LeMarchant Road and streets on the higher levels will have to be discussed. I think that we are doing right in giving the Commission twelve months to try and devise some system to deal with these problems. If they can make any satisfactory suggestions, I am sure this House will not stand in the way of reform. because every member of this House. whether he represents a St. John's or outport constituency, knows that we must have St. John's a clean city, because a great number of outport men come here, and if it is not a healthy city, they will bring disease to their homes. Now, Sir, the unfortunate part of it in the past has been that men who should have moved in civic affairs and helped towards civic betterment, have held themselves aloof. The only thing these men were doing here was making money, and what they spent for their own living expenses and their own pleasures. They spent nothing for the city. It is only latterly that anything has been done, and one firm—the firm of Bowrings—have given a public park to the city. It is to be hoped that the action of the Bowrings will awaken others to do something for the city. Many of these people have lots of money to spend on autos and other luxuries. We were told the other day that our people had spent $300,000 on automobiles That shows that these people have the money, and if we can only get at some of it we would be able to open parks and resting places where our working people can go to refresh themselves after their day's work. As I said before I will not attempt to delay the Committee, but I think I am safe in supporting this Bill I am a great believer in majority rule. Three thousand citizens have sent in their mandate asking that this Commission be given a trial. I am going to give this Bill my support, and I hope that when we meet here a year from now, these people will send in some good

recommendations, and we will support them.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman. there is a matter that was brought to the attention of the Council a short time ago in relation to the pay of the Firemen, and the Council have considered the matter and have agreed to an increase and they now ask the Legislature to amend the Act so as to authorize them to pay an increased wage to the city firemen out of their income. Section 158 of the Municipal Act authorizes the Council to pay twelve thousand dollars towards the expenses and maintenance of the Fire Department. The balance of the vote is paid by the General Government. It has been the custom for a great number of years for the Municipal Council to pay the Minister of Finance $12,000 a year on this account. They now ask to have the Act amended so that they can pay $13,000. No doubt after a little while they will be able to see their way to increase that. I would move the adoption of that amendment. Then it will be remembered that when we were dealing with the Act relating to the Protection of Animals there was a suggestion made that it was thought pertained more to the Municipal Act. It dealt with the age limit of persons driving horses for hire in the city and it was then suggested that the section was not germane to the Protection of Animals Act, and might find a place in the next amendment to the Municipal Act. That matter has also been brought before the Council and they now recommend that the following section should be placed in the Act:

It shall be unlawful for any person under the full age of eighteen years to drive, or use for payment, hire or reward, whether direct or indirect any carriage, cart, truck, express-waggon, sleigh, slide, catamaran, or other horse-drawn vehicle plying for hire or for any commercial purpose within the limits of the City of St. John's; and any person under eighteen contravening the provisions of this Section, or any person paying, hiring, employing, or rewarding such person, shall upon conviction thereof forfeit and pay for every offence a sum not exceeding ten dollars.

It will be remembered that this section was asked for by the Truckmen's Union, a very large body of men who are engaged entirely dealing with horses; and now that the request is made by the Municipal Council I do not think we will make any mistake in inserting it.

I may say also that there were two or three other sections recommended by the Council but as it is not contemplated at present to hold an election this year these matters can stand over until the next session when we shall probably be considering another election. These can then be considered and some of them it seems to me will be well worth the consideration of the House. The first section increases the number of Councillors from six to nine and the second divides the city into wards as under the first Municipal Act. The Mayor will be elected by the city and the Councillors by the wards. Then there is a provision to give a vote to taxpayers who reside outside the city but who pay taxes in the city. Then there is a section giving a vote to women over twenty-one years of age who own property in the city. Then there is a section amending Section 116 which will I think call for considerable debate. It deals with the valuation and appraisement of property. That I think requires a great deal of care and consideration, which I have no doubt will be given by the Council.

Then there is a tax not exceeding $100 on every Life Insurance Company doing business in the city and a tax not exceeding $50 on every Accident Insurance Company and Guaran-

tee Insurance Company. That is a matter that will have to be considered in connection with the tax at present paid by that class of Company. There are others that can be dealt with before the next municipal election; it is hardly necessary to consider them now.

MR. KENT—Mr Chairman, I am glad to see that my suggestion in reference to the firemen was acted upon to some extent. As to the suggestion about youths under 18 not driving horses, if the truckmen and the City Council recommend it, we have nothing to do but to further the movement.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, allow me to offer my congratulations that the City Council is going to add one thousand dollars to the firemen's vote. Now, my joy would be complete if you would add another thousand to it .There is not much need of altering the estimates, because last year you spent a great deal without Legislative authority, and it would be more justifiable now if you took a thousand dollars for the firemen.

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 adopted and the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

PARTRIDGE BERRIES BILL.

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 amendments made by the House of Assembly in and upon the amendments by the Council in and upon the Bill sent up from the House of Assembly entitled: 'An Act for the protection of the Growth of Partridge Berries' without amendment.

SALARIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: 'An Act to amend the Act 61 Vic. Cap. 8, entitled: 'An Act respecting Salaries.''

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 without amendment.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

MARINE AND FISHERIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: 'An Act to amend the Act 61, Vic., cap. 3., entitled: 'An Act respecting the Department of Marine & Fisheries.'

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I have, in the place of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who is unable to be here tonight, to explain to the Committee the provisions of this Bill. I have been asked by him to do so and I would like to point out that the Bill is to enable the Department of Marine and Fisheries to make rules and regulations in connection with the standardization, inspection and export of pickled fish; and also to authorize the reservation of areas for the propagation of lobsters. The time has now come for us to preserve the seed lobsters and to take measures for their protection. In the State of Maine, U. S. A., and in other places, they actually pay the fishermen 25

cents, over the market value of the lobster, for each seed lobster. It has been made illegal to can female lobsters, but we can understand the temptation when lobsters fetch such a high price—$22 a case. The importance of protecting the female lobster is apparent from the fact that one female lobster contains hundreds of thousands of eggs. Many of them do not come to maturity, but a great many of them do. It is necessary that after buying the seed lobsters, we should have some place in which to put them, and where they will not be immediately caught again.

I think it was in 1899 that we exported something like 76,000 cases of lobsters; but that did not include the lobsters caught on the Treaty Shore. I think it is safe to say we exported 80,000 cases. Then, lobsters were only about $6 a case; now, they are $22.50, and this year I suppose they will be $25 a case. Last year we dropped down to 16,000 cases. This fish is becoming more popular every year. The provisions respecting pickled fish apply chiefly to herring. What we want is a reliable brand. We must export nothing but the best quality, and those of a certain size. There is nothing like a good, reliable brand for increasing the sale of such an article.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I have asked for this Legislation partly at the request of the people in my district. A certain number of packers used to pack bad herring, and as a result spoiled the market for those who packed well. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Bill will go through in its present form.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my pleasure at the provisions of the present Bill. In my district of Twillingate,the herring fishery is largely prosecuted, and I believe that it is capable of still greater development. I know, myself, that much harm has been done to this trade ,through the practices of dishonest packers. There was a system in vogue of making the men put their names on the barrels and this had a good effect. Very often the trader had to do his own coopering and packing. I am in thorough accord with anything that will improve the market and therefore welcome these provisions. One calm night, I had the experience of sailing through a school of herring in our Bay that extended for 38 or 40 miles. There were millions of barrels of herring in that school, and I think that the herring industry is capable of very large expansion. As I said before, I shall welcome anything that can be done to improve the industry.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, this matter is rather a serious one—I refer to the reservation of the lobster areas. I hold that you are going a little too far when you give any man the power to proclaim any area as a reservation. You will find that men have a certain interest in certain places and that they will clash with any man whom the Department sends there, and invests with power to reserve this area. I think that more notice should be given of reservations. They should be advertised in the daily and weekly papers. I would suggest to the hon. the introducer, that due notice be published in at least one of the daily or weekly papers for at least two weeks. If the Prime Minister would accept that suggestion, I think we would get over a deal of difficulty in connection with the reservations. The next thing is—why not give a price that you are going to pay for the seed lobsters? We do not expect 50 cents. The Green Bay lobster is worth 10 or 12 cents, and I would suggest that we make the price 15 cents. Then you will get all the seed lobsters

and then you will find 35 per cent of the lobsters are seed lobsters.

In the year 1912-13 there were 134,000 barrels of herring taken in Green Bay. These were valued at $322,000. There is not the slightest doubt that the herring fishery in Green Bay could be developed to the value of half a million dollars. The Green Bay herring are superior to any other herring in Newfoundland. The fisheries of Newfoundland would be developed at least 50 per cent. in five years, if we went the right way about it. 134,000 barrels of herring are not enough. Last year 300,000 pounds of fresh salmon were exported, valued at $25,000. We could just as easily find a market for 1,000,000 pounds as for 300,000 pounds The market is there. The amount of salt herring exported last year was 4,500 tierces at 6 cents a pound. Last year's catch of salmon was 2,000,000 pounds altogether. If there was a ready market and good transport could be obtained, we might send almost any quantity. The Union will do all it can to further the lobster industry, but good prices must be obtained. The growth of the lobster is only an inch a year, and it is therefore easily exterminated.

If only the time that we take up in petty matters in this House was given in the interests of the fisheries, and we sat down as a Fisheries Committee, a very great deal might be accomplished for the country in four or five years. The future of this country has got to come from its fisheries. Don't depend too much on your other resources. The fisheries must be our chief dependence, and we have to get the men started and open up markets for the fish that they catch. I hope that the Premier will accept the suggestion which I made with regard to lobsters. If he does, a certain amount of good will be accomplished, but you will never do any good without giving the men a fair value for the lobsters that you want to take from them.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr. Chairman I would just like to say a word. I have listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Bonavista in connection with the statement made here the other evening by the Minister of Finance that the value of our fisheries could be increased at least fifty per cent. and it struck me that the fishery that required immediate attention was the Labrador fishery. Every hon. member sitting on the back row of the other side is familiar with that fishery. I spent four months on the Labrador coast in 1909, and I was struck with the fact that while the fish there is as good for eating purposes, and I think in some cases much better than Shore fish, yet it was sold for nearly $2 less a quintal than Shore fish. Now, whilst listening, Mr. Chairman, I just looked over a few figures that I had here, and I notice that in 1901 there were 456,307 quintals of fish exported from the Labrador. In 1911 the catch was very much smaller—285,968 quintals. Well, an increase of $2 a qtl. I understand, over the price paid on Coast, is easily obtained by the floaters who go down early in the year and bring home their fish and make it in Twillingate and Fogo and along the French Shore, and came here to St. John's and get the shore price for it. The bankers from the West Coast go down there and fish in September and go home and make the fish and they are able to secure six and seven dollars a quintal for it. Now, surely there is room for improvement here. Surely now that we have a free market in the United States this ought to be the fish that should be put up in the proper way and shipped into that market. I think that this is a matter which should claim our immediate attention. Now,

this is a serious matter and I think it ought be thoroughly investigated. Cannot we find better markets for this fish? This phase of our fishery matters just struck me in listening to the remarks of the hon. member for Bonavista.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Chairman, I may say that no member in this House more keenly appreciates the remarks made by the hon. member for Bonavista than I do. I should have a pretty keen realization of the advantages of the fresh fish business. As a matter of fact I have figures down here at the present time that I purpose giving to the House when the fishery resolutions come up for discussion and which I think will be not alone a surprise but a revelation to this Committee and I bespeak for them the most earnest consideration. I do not want to speak prematurely,but believe the circumstances warrant my stating that a very serious menace to our staple industry is at the present moment pending, and as to be forewarned is to be forearmed, I intend, when the Fishery Resolutions come before the Committee to speak more fully, so that hon. members may have a full realization of the position. I consider it incumbent upon this House, the Legislature and the country generally to take every conceivable precaution to forestall what may any day present itself to us in a very serious aspect.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, just one word in reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Placentia & St. Mary's. Of course, he is a lawyer and cannot be expected to be intimate with the conditions affecting the Labrador fishery. If Labrador fish is sold $2.00 cheaper per quintal than dry Shore fish, it means that the Labrador man gets as good value as the man who sells dry, because the man who sells dry loses ninety pounds on a quintal, so that $5.00 a quintal for fish as it is sold on the Labrador is equal to $7.00 a quintal dry. The Labrador man is always prepared to sell fish in the condition which we call "slob." Probably in that way they sell 250,000 lbs. If all that were dried it would cause a slump upon dry fish, and instead of getting $7.00 a quintal the price would probably drop to $6. As the fish is sold on the Labrador now, there is a ready market for it, provided the catch is not excessive.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in reference to section one, although I have not been able to give it the attention I would like to. The section states: "In addition to the powers granted to the Governor in Council by Act 61 Vic., Cap. 3, entitled "An Act specting the Department of Marine and Fisheries," the Governor in Council may, from time to time, make regulations for the exportation, inspecting, culling, classing, weighing, packing, branding or stencilling of all pickled fish, and for the granting of licenses to packers of such pickled fish, for the making of provisions for the issue of labels to packers of the same, and may provide that all or any of such rules shall apply to the whole Island, or otherwise whatsoever."

I do not think that is in the interests of the industry. I think that the fish should be classified. Fifty years ago, perhaps before that time, there were certain grades of fish introduced. Take salmon, for instance. The grades were numbered 1, 2 and 3 at that time. We had certain markets for salmon, but we have since lost those markets, and the salmon wanted by our markets now might not be the same class. The same thing applies to herring. Herring was graded into No. 1, 2, 3 and 4 and went to certain markets. We have different markets for both our salmon and our herring

now from what we had years ago and we have to understand the requirements of these markets and send them the fish that they want. Therefore, if the trade were compelled to have this kind of fish classified as it was clasified years ago, I am sure it would be detrimental. I would suggest that the words "all pickled fish" be stricken out of that section.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, the point is well taken by the hon. member for Bay de Verde if it were the intention to make rules and regulations for the purpose of inspecting and clasifying all pickled fish. The intention here is that fish may be clasified and inspected as occasion may require. It is desirable that the bill should be so worded that it will give power to inspect all fish, but it does not follow that that will be done. For instance, all the rules and regulations made under this legislation may only apply to herring. A full enquiry will be made by the Fisheries Commission and by the Department in reference to the trade, in reference to the people interested over on the West Coast—in reference to those who catch and ship this fish. A full enquiry, we must presume, will be made before any rules or regulations will be brought into force. It would be the merest nonsense to make rules and regulations without having regard to the principles laid down by the hon. member. He is quite correct and I am in entire harmony with his suggestion. As regards the classification and as regards the inspection it will be necessary to first ascertain what are the requirements. That matter is well answered by the observations of the hon. member for Bonavista in pointing out the way in which ordinary Labrador fish is dealt with, and the advantages of handling it in that particular way. Now, in taking power here to make rules and regulations in relation to all pickled fish, the Department will be enabled from time to time as occasion requires to deal with every class of pickled fish. We must asume that at present they will only deal with the herring industry, so that I don't think it is necessary to make any limitation in the bill. I think that is a matter for the Fisheries Commission, for the Department, for the Trade and for everyone concerned. No rules and regulations will be made under that section until the fullest enquiry has been made. Now, as regards the remarks of the hon. member for Bonavista in relation to lobsters: I should like to say that I am in entire sympathy with the principles laid down by him. I am very glad to hear that he is in harmony with this policy and that he approves of it as far as it has gone in relation to the propagation and protection of lobsters. Now the reason why the Select Committee recommended that the Inspector or whoever is appointed by the Minister should have the power to make this reservation without sending in for an authority was in order that the matter might be dealt with promptly. It is not as if he would be reserving a large area, or grounds upon which the fishermen have been using as fishing grounds, because it is not areas like that in which the fish is being put. The reservations will be small coves or ponds. If it were a case of reserving a marine farm where the fishermen were accustomed to fish, then it would be a different matter, but that is not the intention. That is the reason why I don't think it would be wise to make the changes suggested—that after the Inspector had decided on the place of reservation he should communicate with St. John's by letter,because that would mean the loss of a lot of time, and the opportunity of making this re-

servation might have passed. When the reservation is made, the Inspector will simply put a notice on the window of the post office of the settlement near which the reservation is, and all the fishermen around there will know all about it. Now, the other point referred to by my friend was in relation to the price to be paid. The Commission dealing with this matter have recommended that we should pay 10c. for lobsters instead of the amount paid last year, which was only 5c. Of course, we are not doing anything as extensive as was suggested by the hon. member for Bonavista. His idea would be to collect something like 2,000,000 lobsters and pay 15c. for each of them. Well, seeing that we contemplate spending about $10,000 a year and his proposal would involve $30,000, it will be seen how far short of his idea we will fall. He also took the point that we were giving too much authority to the Inspector going around. Well, in these matters you have got to give a certain amount of authority, otherwise it would be very difficult to make your scheme a successful one. I have seen a great deal of the men in charge of this matter and I think the Committee may rely on it they will be very careful in carrying out their instructions.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, the first section of the bill gives the Governor-in-Council power to make regulations. Now, the Governor-in-Council have to get their information from someone, and it might be information that would suit those who gave it and the law brought into force as a result of it might not suit the trade. I beg to move that the word "exportation" be cut out of that section.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the point made by the hon. member for Bay de Verde, I may say that I am not going to quarrel with any regulations which may be made dealing exportation. One quarrel, if we have one, will be with the lobster matter. As to what is done with regard to exportation is a matter for the trade, but if we have any objection at all it will be on behalf of the Fishermen's Union and not on behalf of the exporters. I am prepared to take the section as it stands, because if, when the regulations are made and they don't suit us, they won't be carried out. Now, one word with regard to those areas. I anticipated when reading the bill that what was intended was to reserve an area of say three or four or five miles. If it is only a matter of taking in a cove, that may be alright, but if you put the lobsters in a cove you will find that they won't stay there very long. They will crawl out. Lobsters are said to crawl three miles a year. I don't know who measured the distance.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—They have been known to travel 15 miles a day.

MR. COAKER.—I doubt that.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well I never saw it myself, but that is the fact as stated by those who have studied them. They close their claws and shoot through the water. That is how they travel.

MR. COAKER.—Well, if you are going to put lobsters down in a certain area reserved in a cove, you are going to have the fishermen selling lobsters and then catching them again and selling, but apart from that you are not going to get the female lobsters from the fishermen if you don't give more than 10c. each for them. You have got to pay 15c. for them, because I will tell the men to hold back the lobsters until you give 15c.

MR. DOWNEY.—On the West coast of the Island the individual packer is the exporter, and the necessity in the exportation for regulations of the

pack is quite apparent. The herring are badly packed, and they are in a worse state when they reach the Halifax market.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, I do not see why we should be governed by what happens on the West Coast. We pack a different herring; we go to a different market.

MR. DOWNEY.—It is better to give the power to the Governor-in-Council to make these regulations applicable to any part of the Island.

MR. HICKMAN.—But the Governor-in Council will be able to make it apply to St. John's. As I said before, the packers of St. John's do not send to the same markets as the West Coast. We understand the requirements of those markets, and if we want a hundred barrels for a certain market I would have to confine myself to what is required in that market. What is required there might not fulfil what the different rules call for. The same thing applies to salmon. We had certain markets 25 years ago. To-day we do not know what to do with the salmon that we catch. If these regulations are made they are very likely to work an injury to us, as they would not be workable at the same time and applicable to all parts of the Island.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of contrary ideas as to the manner in which herring should be packed. A few years ago the rule was that when they were packed in barrels they should be so packed that there would be no vacancy between the herring and the head of the barrel, and some firms introduced the idea of rigging up long beams to use them to obtain strong leverage on the head of the barrel, thus packing the herring very tight. A few of the local firms differed from this idea, because they thought it injured the fish. If there is not a certain amount of pickel in the barrel it would injure the fish. It was a change from the position taken by the old-time packers. These firms do not press the herring into the barrel. There are a number that need to be regulated by these regulations. Out of all the regulations that we have, I have never heard yet of any regulations that told the quantity of salt that ought to be put in a barrel of herring. We have been told not to use too little and that we must not use too much, but there has never been any regulation to say how much shall be used. I daresay that when the regulations are made as to the inspection of packing, that something upon these lines will be included. I hope the inspector will be able to carry out all the regulations. They may be confined to St. John's, or they may be also intended for the small packer in the outports, but it will be a very large affair to inspect all the packers, and I hardly think that it will be possible to carry that out to the full. There have been lots of complaints from small packers who claim that they have not been treated right. We do not know anything about that. I have never had to complain myself. I always got the quantity of my pack, but perhaps those who complained did not come up to the requirements themselves, but certainly I think Mr. Hickman will agree that one of the chief things to be considerd in the packing of herring is that it should be done under inspection, and that stringent regulations should be passed, and that they should be brought into effect before we can possibly reach that perfection in pack which is so much required.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Chairman, in regard to the herring, I quite understand Mr. Downey's contention and why he asks for inspection for Bay St. George. I have been in Halifax very often, and I have seen very much of the Bay St. George herring condemn-

ed. They put into the barrel but little salt and then fill up the barrel; it is never strong enough. That always tends to lessen the price for the St. George's and Bay of Islands herring; and the people around those parts have decided that there should be inspection and that they should not be allowed to ship without inspection. It that is brought about I believe that they will get from fifty to seventy-five cents more for herring than they are getting to-day, and that the packer will be able to get full value, which he does not get now. I quite agree with the hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Hickman, that we ought, if possible, to have some inspection for the different markets to which we are sending them. I know the different markets where they are shipped,and it is impossible to get a man competent to know the qualities of herring for the different markets. In the United States they want herring packed in a different package and somewhat different to what we do now, and I have no doubt that the value of the herring would increase if we will do that. Then there are the Scotch herring that are put up in a different way, and we want a man competent to inspect that herring, and as I said before, it would be a difficult matter to get a man to inspect herring from all over the country. There are men who understand the inspection, but we must not forget that in dealing with the outports it will be a difficult matter except as regards Bay St. George, where it will possibly be all right. In regard to salmon, we export a very small quantity, and it would be useless to have herring or salmon inspected except for the different markets. It would be useless to have salmon inspection for the United States; in other markets it might be different. I have gone in Nova Scotia and seen plenty of our salmon condemned. In regard to the catch of lobsters I quite agree with the honourable member. The Select Committee decided the question, I think, that we should have a reservation of breeding lobsters and pay ten cents for each lobster. I think that ten cents would be as much as we are able to afford this year; that is, ten cents all round. Some lobsters will be small, others will be large, and I think that ten cents would be a fair all round price sufficient to induce the fishermen to give up the lobsters; but I think that it would be better for the Government, as far as the matter of herring inspection is concerned, to let it stand as it is for the present, and make a trial for next year.

MR. HICKMAN.—I think that the matter of the first section could be left to the Select Committee for investigation.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, this Bill is the result of a very strong request from the people of Bay St. George and other parts of the country, and this section was specially formed so that regulations could be made quite apart from packing,and I think I can assure the hon. member that no regulations in relation to other parts of the country than Bay St. George will be made for the present. Over there they want this done as soon as possible. They want us to do with the herring as has been done with the lobster so that they can trace every tin or every package. With lobsters we have now reached the point where it is possible to trace every tin. We can locate the packer of every tin in every case, and that is what is intended here. On the labels will be the marks of the places where it has been packed and sold. Not only will we have inspection, but we will also use a brand. All the people interested over there have asked for that. That is really why it has been brought in here at this late hour of

the session. As regards the general provisions of the regulations, that matter will, of course, come before the Select Committee, and I feel certain that if the hon. member raises any question before that Committee it will be fully considered.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, if this Bill is brought in simply to satisfy the people of that part of the country round Bay St. George, I can't see why it should not be made to apply to that part only. We could have another special bill.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, it is desirable for the Governor-in-Council to have this power so that they can make regulations to apply to other parts of the country, if these parts desire it. We are not going to make any regulations without a petition from the people or some such representation. As a matter of fact I do not know of any such rules or regulations in relation to the fishery that have not been asked for by the people or by their representatives, and I can assure the hon. member that there is nothing that he need fear will be done without proper representation having been made. There would be no object in that, but it is desirable in general that the Governor-in-Council should be enabled to make rules and regulations when they are satisfied as to their necessity. I may assure the honourable member that I am trying to meet him in every posible way.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, these rules and regulations are not always carried out after they are made. The Prime Minister stated that he could trace every tin of lobsters that go out of the country. I have reason to believe that exporters tear off the labels and ship 200 or 300 tins without any labels on them at all.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, if we strike out the word "exportation" that would destroy the whole value of the Bill. What is the good of the section if we cannot do something to the man who exports; what is the good of regulations if we cannot deal with the exporter of the article. What we want to do is to be able to send a man down on the wharf and inspect evrything before it is shipped. At the present time a man can sell any catch as number one. Should there not be a law on the Statute Book to have the article standardised and properly inspected before exported? There would be no sense if we struck out the word "exportation;" it is in the export that we want the goods to be standardized. We must make the exporter classify his goods. It is no use making rules and regulations in regard to the cull of fish if we cannot get after the man who exports them. It is for the purpose of exportation that we want standards. We have to watch the fish when it is going abroad, and if the Government has no power over the exporters it is only nonsense to discuss the question at all.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I think I quite understand Mr. Hickman's objection because he knows a little about the working of things in St. John's. He is a large exporter of herring and a large exporter of salmon. There are only three or four men in the business who take salmon for export. He is not going to give his reasons. He has serious objections to the proposition and probably the Board of Trade will make some rules. He and the Board of Trade do not agree. The Board of Trade has little use for him and less for me. It is a case of "you scratch my back and I scratch yours." He knows a little of the troubles that there are in this business; then he wants herring to be inspected, not according to a fixed standard, but for a particular market.

There may be some markets to which certain standards cannot apply. I think, however, that Mr. Hickman could do well to trust to the Prime Minister in this matter, and that he will not be placed in an inconvenient position by any rules and regulations that are imposed if they are not imposed without the proper representation being made. I think he can trust the Government to do their duty and keep up to its promise.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to give a few remarks on this lobster law that is now before the Committee. I am very much in favour of the protection of lobsters. One of the reasons is that I want to see the lobster fishery as large as possible. We want to increase this industry. Looking over the fourth section of the Bill I do not see anything to make provisions for the fishermen. I have had a number of letters from different parties and several of these letters are asking about the rules of the lobster fishery regarding the setting of traps. There is quite a little trouble in the manner of setting lobster traps. Some of the fishermen get too near others. I have not seen in the public print, in fact I do not trouble very much about the rules myself with regard to this matter, because so far as I am concerned it does not affect me, but I find from the letters that I have received that some fishermen had quite a lot of trouble in regard to the setting of traps for lobsters. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if there is any provision in the law in regard to the distance in setting of traps.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member I may say that there are a considerable number of rules and regulations with regard to the distance of which lobster pots are set but there is nothing as to the time for setting of pots or as to the setting of traps. I do not know the exact rules or regulations, but the lobster fishery is somewhat different from the others. I would be very glad to get the hon. member a copy of the rules.

MR. TARGETT.—I do not want the rules and regulations, but I think there should be a rule as to the distance that they are set.

MR. COAKER.—There is now no rule with regard to distance, and I think the time has come when we should make some regulations in this respect, as now quite a lot of trouble is caused because of it. You will have to give the man who puts his trap down first certain ground. The man who puts his trap in the water first ought to have a claim to a certain area.

MR. TARGETT.—I may say, with regard to setting lobster traps that I don't think it makes very much difference how near they are set to one another. The trouble is in putting traps down between others.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, in reference to section 4, the hon. member for Bonavista drew the attention of the Prime Minister to that matter. He pointed out that the powers that are given in that section to the inspectors are rather large, and I am inclined to agree with him in that respect. The section as it reads, I think, goes far beyond the intention. The intention, I think, is to reserve small coves or ponds in which female lobsters would be placed for the purposes of propagation, but the section as it reads now gives the inspectors power to reserve any portion of water. Under this section the inspector could reserve, for instance, a district like Placentia Bay. But, of course, such a reservation as that was never contemplated. Then, the authority ought to come, as he said, from the

Department of Marine & Fisheries, and not from the inspector. At the present time the section reads:—

"It shall be lawful for any person who shall have an appointment in writing signed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries lawfully authorizing him thereto at any time by public notice to set apart and reserve with definite boundaries and limtations for the purpose of the propagation of the fishes that are in such waters, any portion of the water of this Colony; within which it shall be unlawful for any person to fish for lobsters or other shell-fish which may be named under a penalty for each offence of $100 to be recovered in a summary manner before a Stipendiary Magistrate or Justice of the Peace by any person who shall sue for the same." If it is the intention to empower the inspectors to reserve small areas on or near the fishing grounds, then I think the power ought to be limited to that; but if, for instance, the Government should, this year or next year, decide upon reserving as large an area as I have mentioned, then I think the power ought to be vested in the Department, as Mr. Coaker, the hon. member for Bonavista has pointed out.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, the intention of the section is quite clear. As I have already explained, it is merely for the purpose of the propagation of the fishes. It is not intended in the section that a reservation would be made which would be practically a close season for a portion of the Colony or for any particular district. I don't think that the section can be construed to cover such an intention. Of course, one can place any construction he likes upon it. "It shall be lawful for any person who shall have an appointment in writing signed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries lawfully authorizing him thereto at any time by public notice to set apart and reserve with definite boundaries and limitations for the purpose of the propagation of the fishes that are in such waters, any portion of the waters of the Colony." Well, now, that has a distinct meaning. You might probably say that if we were to put on a close season that that would be for the the purpose of propagation, but that is not the meaning that would be placed upon that section if interpreted by a judicial tribunal. This is for the purpose of propagation by reserving certain waters in order to put in berry or seed lobsters. "It shall be unlawful for any person to fish for lobsters in that area." I think that is very clear.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, I simply think that the power given here is rather extensive. As regards the construction of the section, if a person, say from Placentia Bay, or Fortune Bay, came to the Prime Minister as a lawyer, told him that the inspector has reserved a large section of either of these bays, and asked him for advice as to whether he had the power to do so or not, I think that the Prime Minister would have to advise that person that the inspector had the power to do so under this section. And while the intention, I think, is clear, as expressed by the Premier, still the wording of the section goes beyond the intention. That is what I pointed out, and I think if it remains as it is, that the power ought be given to the Department, and not to an inspector going around the country.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the meaning of the section is to give power to the Inspector to go down to the several bays where this fishing is carried on and reserve certain portions of the ground. Last year, Mr. Dee states in his report, he set apart a certain portion of a fish-

ing ground, say a quarter or an eighth of a mile; motor boats went around and collected lobsters and paid for them, and they were put in this reservation. There were no rules or regulations in force last year, and it took him in some cases eight or ten days before he could get the machinery to work and get in touch with the Department to get the necessary authority and by the time the authority reached him he found that men who were not satisfied had gone down and tried to take the lobsters off the reservation. I can quite see what the Leader of the Opposition refers to, but I think it can be easily got over by the addition of a couple of words limiting the reservation to a half mile or a quarter of a mile.

MR. KENT.—That would be all right.

MR. COAKER.—That would be too small. Why not make it a mile?

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the first section, I would like to bring to the notice of the Premier a statement made by the Minister of Finance and Customs. He said, if any regulations were brought in in reference to inspection of fish they should apply to exportation. At the present time there is a special committee sitting to decide that.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, we are here to legislate not for a class, but for the whole country. There is no reason to my mind, if you strike out that word "exportation" in the first section, why you should not wipe off the whole section. If the Government have not power to inspect the article intended for exportation, I fail to see any common-sense in that section. If we cannot deal with the man who exports fish from this country, then why make rules and regulations for the man who goes out to catch it and bring it here to St. John's?

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, the Minister made a statement as to what was going to happen concerning a matter that a special committee is sitting to decide.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, it was a broad statement. I did not make any statement on behalf of the Government, but I think it is about time that we woke up and found out where we are in this matter.

MR. COAKER.—Is the Premier going to alter that distance to a mile?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I am going to draft a section which I hope will meet with the approval of everyone.

MR. HALFYARD.—In defining the limits of the area to be reserved for lobsters, can anyone tell us how far a lobster would travel during a season?

MR. COAKER.—The Premier says 15 miles a day.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—You will find it in any ordinary textbook.

MR. HALFYARD.—Well, it will be necessary to set apart a very considerable area.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—They will be fenced in.

MR. HALFYARD—So that they cannot go outside the limits?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Precisely. I would suggest this: "Provided that no such reservation in any one case shall exceed more than a half mile on each side of such reservation."

MR. COAKER.—That will be all right.

MR. TARGETT.—There is another question that I should like to ask. There is a lot of misunderstanding with regard to how lobster pots should be made. I think the law says that the two undermost laths on each side

of every lobster trap shall be placed not less than 1 1-2 inches apart. Some people don't understand just what laths are meant. Some say it is the bottom lath and the next one on top on the side. Others say it is the two under side laths. I would like to have it explained which is right.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I think the latter.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—You will find it in the rules and regulations.

MR. TARGETT.—I don't think you will. The rule says the two undermost laths.

MR. COAKER.—I think it is the two side ones.

MR. TARGETT.—I think it would be well if this could be explained. I would suggest that when the rules and regulations come out in the spring this be put in such a way that everybody will understand it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have taken a note of that, and I will be very glad to suggest it to the Department.

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 an amendment.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

TRAIN-FERRY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train-Ferry Service."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Chairman, I desire to say, with regard to the resolutions now before this Committee, that I recognize in them one of the most important matters for discussion that has been submitted to this Parliament since the date of the introduction of the original Railway Resolutions some thirty years or more ago.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, the lateness of the hour, and that I may not now treat the subject matter or the Resolutions so exhaustively as I would like to, yet I feel it devolves upon me to endeavour to have honorable members of this House see an aspect of our great fishery industry upon which the project embraced by the Resolutions will exercise an important influence, that may most advantageously affect the country; whereas, our indifference to the provision of this, or some similar scheme to enable us to grasp and appropriate to ourselves the altered conditions that are about obtruding themselves into the prosecution of the fishery industry on this side of the Atlantic, will possibly have most unfortunate results.

At the risk of taking up more of the Committee's time than I should at the present moment, and in order that the Committee may have a comprehensive view of the entire project before their mind's eye, I am compelled to repeat certain statements made in this House on previous occasions

A brief review of what has been done in the matter of cold storage for fish, not in England, nor in the United States, nor in Newfoundland —for, unfortunately, we have done practically nothing—but in our immediate neighbourhood, pertains directly to this discussion, and will serve as an example of the danger that I apprehend to our fishery interests if we fail to be actively alive to the golden opportunities that we have neglected in the past, but that are still open to us.

So far back as the year 1885, I realised what cold storage had done for Australia and New Zealand in the matter of the transportation of their meats in a fresh condition to foreign markets. This led me to the conclusion that there was nothing to prevent our disposing, of a certain quantity at least, of our annual catch of fish, in a fresh condition, through the agency of the same medium. As an initial proceeding I, for some years, wrote the matter up in the press, and talked it to those whom I thought might be likely to become interested, but I ultimately found it was a futile effort.

On the completion, however, of our railway system to Port aux Basques, and the placing of our bay steamers on their respective routes I recognised that the time had ripened for a practical effort in this direction, and that it should of necessity be a personal one.

I accordingly visited, and made myself familiar with the requirements of the fresh fish trade in certain American cities, and returned to Port aux Basques where I established a Fresh Fish Company by the aid of one of our business firms, whose ideas seemed to be, in this direction, in advance of those of our commercial community generally.

The codfishery in the neighborhood of Port aux Basques was conducted in a manner that gave the suppliers absolute control of the product, and these, of course, did not look kindly upon a new industry that they naturally thought might be the means of lessening the volume of business done by themselves, consequently this condition of things was remedied by the Company's acquisition of a number of the local fishing raft, but with their acquisition, unfortunately, another difficulty presented itself—that of continuity of transportation facilities.

From the start the Fresh Fish Company was flooded with orders, at prices that enabled them to pay 50 per cent. more to the fishermen than they could realise for their product as sold to be salted. These orders came from every direction in which such had been sought. In the five years of its existence the Company that I refer to sold codfish, haddock, halibut and fresh salmon in every city between North Sydney and Montreal, in Canada, and in the United States in both Boston and New York, and we were never in a position to make an attempt at filling these orders, more than in small part.

In those days, 1889 to 1894, the fishermen were receiving but $4.00 and $4.50 per quintal for their fish. It takes 308 lbs. of split fish to make a dry quintal of 112 lbs. but as neither the head nor bone is taken from fish, bought for exportation fresh, the quantity that would be the equivalent of a dry quintal weighs 500 lbs., and when the fishermen are paid a cent and a quarter for fresh fish—as this was the price we usually paid, though in certain cases we paid a little more—we were paying them the equivalent of at least $6.25, and this return was a net one to the fishermen as there was no deduction for salt and making, the usual cost of which was fifty cents per quintal, consequently the actual price realised by the fishermen for their fish was equivalent to $6.75 when the selling price of dry fish was $4.00.

The demand for fresh fish in those days was nothing like so great as it is at the present moment, and in the light of my experience I have no hesitation whatever in stating that no difficulty would be found in disposing of the entire West Coast winter catch, in a fresh condition, at prices that would readily enable the payment to

the fishermen of the equivalent of nine or ten dollars per quintal for their fish, and the leaving of a much larger margin of profit to the exporter than he can possibly obtain for the salt product at the best of times, but unless there be an assured certainty of continuity of transportation facilities I would not recommend the enterprising of a business in fresh fish from Port aux Basques, for the reason that though there is no difficulty whatever in acquiring a market, and most satisfactory prices, for fresh fish, it is requisite that a more or less constant supply should be kept up, otherwise purchasers will be forced to continue to get their supplies from the source from which those are acquired at present, and at a figure very much in advance of what we could supply them for.

Singular though it may appear, large Canadian cities are to-day dependent, in very great measure, for their supply of fish from Boston firms, because despite the increased cost, and the handicap of the duty upon fish shipped from Boston into Canada, the supply is certain.

When the Fresh Fish Company at Port aux Basques had been fairly equipped with facilities to fill orders to an appreciable extent, they were handicapped and their efforts nullified, by the fact that owing to the blocking of the railway and other untoward accidents, cross country traffic was interrupted, and the requirements of the mail service nearly every winter compelled the transfer of the Bruce from Port aux Basques to Placentia, as a terminus.

Such occurrence recurring yearly was a source of great loss to us; disorganized our business; paralysed us by failure to fill contracts, and frequently left us with large quantities of fish on hand that we had no means of shipping to destination and which, on certain occasions, we had to defrost and split and salt, with the result that its value was very materially lessened as dry fish.

In the handling of fresh salmon which of course, occurs from about the 20th May until the middle of July—this Fresh Fish Company was more fortunate. When we opened business in Port aux Basques, salt salmon was realizing to the fishermen from ten to eleven dollars a barrel, and as the cost of the labour barrel, salt and other charges totalled about $1.50 per barrel, the net return to the fishermen was not more than from nine to ten dollars per barrel. As it requires very nearly 300 lbs. of Salmon, as it comes from the net to make a 200 lb. barrel salted, it follows that the fishermen in selling their Salmon fresh to our Company, and as it was taken from them "round," with neither the head nor entrails removed, and as they were not paid less than 6 and 6½ cents per lb. according to the distance from which it had to be brought—they received for their Salmon, sold fresh, the equivalent of from $18.50 to $21.00 per barrel, and this business has continued up to the present time. We, at times, shipped as much as 12 to 14 thousand lbs. of salmon in a single day. The maximum quantity exported in any one season did not exceed 200 tons. That this limit was not exceeded was owing to the want of facilities in collecting at a greater distance than about 150 miles on either side of Port aux Basques as a centre Had the facilities been available for the expansion of the business to the extent that I was desirous of seeing it reach it was my intention to have extended the collecting of Salmon so as to embrace the Eastern and Northern Coasts, from which a vastly larger supply could have been procured.

Our Fresh Fish Company also dealt in Live Lobsters, and I may say that there is no other means of disposing so profitably of Lobsters as by the sale of them alive in the American markets, and with the proper conservation of our Lobster industry in short time a very considerable percentage of our fish could be got of the requisite size to meet the requirements of the United States Fishery Laws.

All in all I am warranted in unreservedly stating that for both merchant and fishermen there is no other means of disposing of our fish that is in any way so highly profitable and generally advantageous to both merchant and fishermen as by its sale in a fresh condition. Apart from the higher prices obtained, there is the great advantage of prompt realizations. Fresh fish is always sold F.O.B. Port aux Basques, and returns are procurable by sight draft.

In or about the time that this Fresh Fish Company was organized in Port aux Basques a similar enterprise was started in Nova Scotia, but from some difficulties that it had to contend with at the start, it failed, but the Canadian Government, being keenly alive to the advantages that it offered, extended to it a very considerable measure of aid. The Company was re-organized and is to-day doing a large, profitable and rapidly expanding business, and since then another similar Company has been organized in Nova Scotia. In the past year one of these Companies, in order to procure a supply of fish for winter export, and to avoid the necessity of accumulating such through the summer season, as they have not the advantage of a winter supply as we have, engaged the services of two English Trawlers to come to Nova Scotia in November and fish for hem at an agreed-upon price. These steam Trawlers arrived early in November; they fished in North Bay and in 17 days they procured and delivered $62,000.00 worth of Cod and Haddock. This value in fish was equal to 3,542,-857 lbs. and if dried would only have weighed 7,085 quintals, and at the price that the Trawlers were paid for it it realized to them the equivalent of $8.75 per quintal. This quantity of 3½ million lbs. when re-sold, as it was, at in or about four cents per pound, netted the Company $141,714.00, or the equivalent of $20.00 per quintal.

Our winter catch of fish on the West Coast averages at least 40,000 quintals, and at the best price of $6.50 per quintal only realizes for the fishermen $260,000.00. These 40,000 quintals are the equivalent of twenty million pounds, and if sold fresh would realize, at 1¾ cents per pound, $350,000.00, and when re-sold in the Canadian or United States markets at four cents per pound would realize $800,000.00.

The realization of these prices presents an aspect to me of the fishery proposition at the present moment that may develop—and I very much fear will develop, unless we take prompt steps to avert it—a most serious menace to, in a large extent, even not alone to participation in our fisheries but proprietorship thereof. Such an untoward result can come about in the following way. These trawlers, realizing as they must have done in the past season, the highly profitable character of the business that they were engaged in, and as British fishery methods are away and ahead of those adopted in any other country—will be keen to see the advantage of them of appropriating this business to themselves in the future, and they may come in considerable numbers, not alone to Nova Scotia, but to our own Coasts, accompanied by the speedy and capacious fish carriers

that are employed in the British fishery operations, and then the operation will consist merely of these trawlers sweeping our grounds, taking our fish, dumping from their trawls into the refrigerated holds of the fish carriers, and these latter will convey it direct to American or Canadian cities equipped with Cold Storage facilities for its preservation, and these facilities are at the present time being very greatly extended. In New York today there is a new Cold Storage being erected covering an area of 16 acres, and this is destined to handle fresh fish and Argentine beef exclusively.

I know of no greater misfortune that could befall our country than to have such a condition of things come into operation, and our safety therefrom lies in our equipping ourselves with such facilities as will enable us to grasp the supplying of fresh fish to the American markets, as we have it in our power to send to such markets a grade of fish very much superior to any that could be supplied by steam trawlers.

In-shore, or boat-caught fish is very much more desirable for the fresh fish trade than is vessel-caught, because boat-caught fish can be placed under ice or subjected to mechanical freezing on the same day on which it is taken from the water but in the case of vessel-caught fish their catch is generally from two to five days before it can be similarly treated, and the quality of the fish is seriously affected by the length of time that intervenes between its being caught and chilled, or frozen.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I consider the Resolutions before the Committee as being pregnant with possibilities for this country and its people, that would warrant our extending to them any reasonable concession that would ensure their realization for us, as they would immediately place us in a commanding position with regard to the supply of the great market that all the large American cities would offer us, where a supply of absolutely fresh fish is so eagerly sought and so difficult to procure.

I have no desire, Mr. Chairman, to paint an alarming picture, but I do seriously entertain the fear of most unfortunate results accruing to our great staple industry if we do not make every effort to grasp the opportunity that is offering to us at the present moment of doing our best to secure the installing of the needed facilities that would enable us to capture the great business that is now offering to us.

The first healthy sign of reformation in an individual, or even in a community, that had not previously lived up to the ideal, is an expression of regret or shame of the past. My contention is that we, as a people, have not in the past done anything like our best in the matter of the exploitation of our fisheries, and I trust that what I have now said, in a humble way, may effect an awakening of our business consciences that will prompt us to enquire very closely into our disregarded opportunities and I think the result will be the acquisition for the country of a very much larger measure of successful results than have attended our operations in the past.

Not alone have we been remiss in our efforts to develop a fresh fish business, but I fear I am justified in thinking that we have not done all that we could have done in expanding our market for our salt-cured fish. At the present time our markets for dry fish are only sufficient to absorb a normal catch. We live in almost constant dread of having an unusually large codfishery, which

would result in our being compelled to surfeit our present markets and, consequently, suffer a material falling in prices. Yet in Central America there must be fully twenty millions of people prepared to accept our fish ,if we will make it available to them, and though in the past there has been something to condone our neglect of all the possible markets in South America, with the exception of that of Brazil, there is no longer anything to debar our undertaking to reach these. With the opening of the Panama Canal in the present year we will be enabled to reach the countries on the West Coast of South America with the same readiness that we have in the past reached the markets of Brazil, and if we were as keen in the enterprising of our fishery industry as are our rivals, the Norwegians, we would retain a special agent, whose duty it would be to ascertain the conditions and requirements of the countries where there is a reasonable prospect of a market for our fish products being secured, and there are other places than South America where the making of such an effort would abundantly repay us.

As far back as the year 1902 I realized that other facilities than those existing at Port aux Basques were requisite to the building up of a large fresh fish business, and I submitted to the Government of that day a proposition covering very nearly in its entirety the scheme now submitted to the House in the Resolutions that we are at present discussing.

The following extract from the proposition that I then submitted to the Government will show that in those days— 12 years ago—the time, in my opinion, was ripe for the introduction of the facilities that are now contemplated.

I said, in part, in that communication:—

'To transit frozen fish and herring to Western Canadian or United States points, via Sydney, means a steamer freight of 250 miles from Bay of Islands to Sydney, and a railway car freight of 1,000 miles from Sydney to Montreal—a total mileage by this route of in or about 1,250 miles.

'An alternative, and far more advantageous and economical route would be by steamer from Bay of Islands to Paspebiac, near Gaspe—to which port there is a branch of the Intercolonial Railway—a distance of less than 400 miles. From Paspebiac to Montreal the railway freight would be over a distance of about 470 miles, making a total mileage of slightly in excess of 800 miles, and a saving in distance of over 400 miles.

In the case of the Sydney route four-fifths of the distance is by railway freight, which is far more expensive than water borne freight. That via Paspebiac is 400 miles less, and is only half railway freight. The Paspebiac route has other most important advantages which it is not necessary to refer to here.'

The scheme here outlined, Mr. Chairman, failed to evoke any interest on the part of the Government, and was lost sight of, but I am abundantly pleased to see it resurrected, and, I hope, developed into actual operation through the scheme embodied in these Resolutions.

As the hour is late, Mr. Chairman, I may not trespass longer on the time of the Committee, as no doubt, before the measure is finally through another opportunity will be presented to me of referring to other features of our great fishery industry that are wrapped up in the Resolutions that are now being considered.

MR. HICKMAN.—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if there is a duly registered company called the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate, Limited.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I tabled the incorporation papers to-day.

MR. HICKMAN.—Have they realized the capital to carry on the building of the railway or have they yet to raise it?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—They have only raised £1,000 for preliminary exploration and investigation.

MR. HICKMAN.—Are the Government giving any guarantee?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Nothing, except the right of way and terminal facility for putting up their buildings providing there are Crown Lands there. These are only given in the event of the building of the railway and not until after the building of the railway.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, as regards the third section of this Bill I have a strong objection to granting this Company five square miles in extent with a sea frontage of one mile. I found out in Grand Falls, and Bishop Falls what this kind of a grant amounts to. You should go out to Grand Falls, you will find that every man's house, home and garden belongs to the Company. You can hardly keep a pig or a goat without the permission of the company. These people complain that they have found trouble in keeping men. The trouble is that men are not encouraged to settle down. The same kind of trouble is going to occur with this Company if we give these five square miles with one mile frontage. What do they want with a mile of frontage. They only want to monopolise the land surrounding their terminals so that they can compel the people who work with them to pay rent and can make money out of them. These lands belong to the Crown and they should not be given to any Company. Give them sufficient for their smoke houses, factories and whatever they require but only give them sufficient. There is no need of giving them five miles and instead of giving them one mile in extent only give them a half mile.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—There is a provision in the section to make all necessary reservations for public use so that in giving these blocks we can make any reservations whatever.

MR. COAKER.—Was not the same reservation made in connection with Harmsworth?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—No. There the reservations were specific and the Government were given the right to reserve for public buildings for schools and churches but beyond that there were no reservations. They asked in that contract for this exclusive control because they wanted to control the land around them in the event of forest fires. They said, "if we are going to come in here and spend $8,000,000 we want a certain amount of control." Of course, I am afraid this present project is too good to be true and that we will never have to give these blocks of land. We have been been giving away blocks of land every day, we have been doing so for years and I suppose we will continue to do so. Now this Company comes in and asks for a hundred feet right of way through the woods and for these blocks of land for terminal facilities at Bay of Islands and at Green Bay. These blocks are unoccupied to-day. They are not going to get those blocks unless they build this railway because it is provided that not one acre of land is to be provided until these railways are built.

Now if Mr. Thompson can find the money to build these railways across from Notre Dame Bay to Bay of Islands and if there are unoccupied Crown Lands there we will give them this block at each end of the railway. These lands will be of no value to them unless they make them valuable and settle them and if they settle them they will be as interested in having workingmen living around them as we are to-day.

Now. Sir, you must give a large Company like this some inducement in order to get them to come in. It is possible, as I said before, that this project will never get beyond the introduction of this measure. Of course I hope that that is not so, but we cannot get them to come in here unless we give them concessions in some way. The same thing applies in connection with the settlement of our public land. I wonder how many of us have heard what has been done in this regard by Canada, our next door neighbour. There they give two or three hundred acres of land build a house, put in a stock of cattle and make the place all ready for an emigrant to go to work. Twenty years is allowed to pay for this. Emigrants leaving the Old Country or somewhere else on the other side look to see what inducements are offered to them. They ask what is Newfoundland giving and what is Canada giving, what are the C.P.R. and the Great Northern and these other large railroads giving. These railroads spend millions every year in settling people along their lines. These railroads have large lots of land given to them by the Canadian Government but there lands can only become valuable by opening up the country and by settlement. Now the same thing applies to these five mile blocks of unsettled land because it is provided that we can only give unoccupied lands; if the land is settled we cannot give it. We only give them land for terminal facilities for their docks, and walls, smoke houses, etc. and unless the railway is built we give them nothing. It is not as though we were giving valuable land around the City of New York or the City of London. We are only giving them this vacant land which can be of no value unless they make it valuable. Now I am in entire sympathy with the principles of my friend the hon. member for Bonavista not to give the corporation any lands not likely to be settled nor not likely to be productive of any good. But I remember similar objections to this being made to other concessions that we were granting too much, but unfortunately the concessions never amounted to enough to induce anybody to come in. These people are not asking any subsidy or any land except this right of way and these blocks for terminal facilities. I do not think there is any objection to giving them these things. They could go to the Crown Lands office to-morrow and get this land in fee simple for 30 cents an acre.

MR. COAKER.—The point I make is that if they build these railways these lands may turn out to be very valuable and the man who goes to work there will have to go to work under many disadvantages. One-half this land ought to be sufficient for the purpose of the Company. I must say that I have very serious objections to this section going through as it stands.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—May I point out to the hon. member that it is provided that all desirable reservations can be made from these grants. Suppose all the hon. member contends is true, suppose these people could put up a concrete wall around these lands and never allow any one in, are we still prepared to give those blocks of land to induce those people to come

in and build that railway and establish that industry. They are not coming in to build that railway for pure philanthropy. They are bound to open up a big industry if they open up at all. If they do this, what do these blocks amount to? Nothing. They believe that this project is sound and that they can accomplish this work. They only ask us for this land which has been there since the world was made and which is likely to remain useless for centuries if something is not done. I do not see any objection to this but I would be glad to insert any reasonable amendments the hon. member would suggest.

MR. COAKER.—How would it do to put in a section that reservations would be made in the said grants for workmen's cottages.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have no objection to that.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman, just a few words with regard to the bill before the Committee at the present time. I think that if the expectations of this bill are realized that the fishing industries of this country will be up against competition from outside sources. I think that one of the expectations of the Company, and possibly one of the inducements held out for the purpose of getting people to take shares, is the possibility of a large fishing plant to be operated on the northeast coast of this country; and if this should become an actual fact, I think that the competition which it would mean would largely offset the advantages which we would get from the train-ferry service. I think that the Rt. Hon. Premier mentioned a few nights ago, when this matter was first under discussion here, that a Scotch gentleman, largely interested in the fishing industry of that country, was very much interested in this proposal. I think it is worth while taking these things into consideration. I don't know very much about what will happen should this thing be realized, but I think it would be alright to consider these matters while the bill is before the Committee.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Chairman, I might say that I do not anticipate any of the untoward consequences which the hon. member for Twillingate fears from this bill. It is an undoubted fact that the United States markets must have a supply of fresh fish of some sort. If we undertake to furnish that supply I think we will do a great deal towards keeping from entering into our fishery activities the British trawler; but assuredly if we do not do so by the introduction of this or some similar scheme. we must in the near future have to deal with this competition which we fear. I do not think that the realization of this scheme will be an inducement to the British trawler, but rather a deterrent to its coming. I see a two-fold effect, Mr. Chairman, in the realization of this scheme. Not alone will it enable us to realise a very large price for the fish that we dispose of in this direction, but it will directly react upon our salt fish markets. At the present time our great fear is that we may have a large catch. Our present markets can only consume a normal catch, and any year we may have an abnormal catch, which would have the effect of decreasing the value in the limited markets to which we are now confined. The fact that our markets for salt fish are so limited is one of the sins of omission that I charge against our governments. I believe they have not been sufficiently active in seeking new markets. Time and again it has been pointed out that very great possibilities were awaiting us in Central America. This is not hearsay. I have been in two or three Central American countries and proved the possibilities that were there for us, but we are making no

effort whatever to secure an entry into them. Our competitiors, the Norwegians, are very much more active than we. They have trade agents in all Central American and European markets and in every Mediterranean port of consequence, whilst we are doing nothing in this direction. I think that a more up to date and progressive policy would result in a very large measure of profit for the country.

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.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

CONCEPTION BAY ELECTRIC CO. BILL.

Second reading of Bill 'An Act to amend the Act 3, George V., Cap. 4, entitled: 'An Act to incorporate the Conception Bay Electric Company, and for other purposes.''

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, I may say, in relation to this and the following bill, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who is unavoidably absent by illness, has charge of them, but in his absence I would ask the Committee's leave to explain the nature of the amendments. It will be noted that the United Towns Electrical Co. are purchasing certain rights from the Conception Bay Electrical Co. A charter was granted to the Conception Bay Co. last year. That Company was formed for the purpose of lighting the principal settlements in Conception Bay from Harbor Main down towards Harbour Grace. Estimates have been made and it was found that to supply light tc that whole area would require a very large amount of capital. The Conception Bay Electrical Company, without any recompense, have subscribed $20,000, and paid up 20 per cent. of this amount, according to the terms of the charter, and they have made an arrangement with the United Towns Electrical Co. for the latter Company to do the work of supplying light and power to the area covered by the charter. In other words, the Conception Bay Electrical Company have agreed to lease their charter to the United Towns Electrical Co. on receiving guarantees that the undertaking of the Conception Bay Co. will be carried out In accordance with that arrangement, the United Towns Co have already got to work. They have erected poles in and wired Bay Roberts, and have agreed to supply the Cable Companies with the necessary light and power, and are doing everything in their power to carry out the charter of the Conception Bay Co. The Legislature is now asked to amend the charters of both companies to meet the altered circumstances. The arrangement between the Companies has not yet been executed pending the application for the proposed amendment.

The Conception Bay Electric Co. propose to sell their rights to the other Company, who are prepared to carry out the objects for which they were incorporated. Then, on the other hand, the United Towns Electrical Co. ask for permission to do this, as under their Charter they don't appear to have the power to purchase, and it is proposed to add the necessary words to section 10 of their charter. In other words, one wants to buy and the other to sell, and they were advised by their solicitors that under their acts as at present constructed they have not the power to do that. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that we will be all glad tc know that these settlements are within reasonable

distance of being supplied with electrical light and power. It will be a great advantage to the people up there and it will be an advantage that they will appreciate more after they have had it for a while, and I think we will be glad to do anything we can to facilitate these settlements, and indeed the whole island in this connection. It will be remembered that as far back as 1908 we passed a Bill to establish an Electric Light Co. down in Twillingate. We were all hoping at the time that that would become an accomplished fact and that the people down there would have the advantages of electric light before now. Unfortunately, the thing never materialized owing to the difficulty of getting capital and the uncertainty of returns that would pay the company. With this explanation, I beg to move the second reading of these two bills. Tomorrow when we are in Committee on the bills, any further discussion may be gone into very fully, and if it is desirable to suggest any amendment, we can consider it then.

MR. COAKER—Might I ask whether the Premier would find it convenient to let us have the original bills when we go into Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, I will have copies printed.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled: 'An Act to amend the Act 3, George V. Cap. 4, entitled: 'An Act to incorporate the Conception Bay Electric Company and for other purposes'' was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

UNITED TOWNS ELECTRICAL BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled: 'An Act to amend the Act 2, Edward VII., cap. 8, entitled: 'An Act to incorporate the United Towns Electrical Company, and for other purposes'' was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

PILOT'S BILL.

Second reading of a Bill An Act to Amend Act 1, George V., Cap. 24, entitled "An Act respecting Pilots and Pilotage for the port of St. John's."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, this is in relation to an arrangement made between the pilots and the Commissioners. The bill is not yet printed. but it will be before we go into Committee.

MR. KENT—What is the nature of the arrangement?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It refers to a sort of insurance scheme they have.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled: 'An Act to amend the Act 1 George V., Cap. 24, 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 a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

REVENUE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of 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 a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the report of the Tuberculosis Public Service for 1913.

And it being now past midnight

FRIDAY, March 6th, 1914.

Mr. Kent gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Stone gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Abbott gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Winsor gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Halfyard gave Notice of Question.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I should like to say for the benefit of the House that early in the week I was in hopes that we might be able to close on Saturday, but I find now that that cannot be done without rushing the work before the House, and it not desirable that we should do that. I now hope that we may be able to close on Wednesday next. We may possibly find it necessary, in order to advance the bills now before the House, to sit on Saturday. In the meanwhile I am not aware of anything further to come before the House.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until this afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 6th, 1914.

The House met at three of the lock in the afternoon pursuant to adournment.

PETITIONS.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Mr. Speaker, I eg leave to present a petition from he inhabitants of Haystack, P. B., on he subject of temperance. This petition is the same as those presented before. I trust that the Government will give this petition the greatest consideration.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the residents of Collier's, complaining of the codtraps being too near the shore. These traps are placed a certain distance from the land, and one trap takes up the same room as two hundred boats. The petitioners ask that a law be made, prohibiting traps being situated within a certain distance of the shore. This petition is largely signed and is of great interest to the people of that settlement, who request that a new fishing regulation be made. I trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give this matter his special attention.

MR. J. KENNEDY.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of the petition from Harbor Main. I trust that the Fisheries Department will enquire into the matter and see if anything can be done to meet the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. ABBOTT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bonavista against the use of cod traps on fishing grounds resorted to by hook and line men. It is signed by over four hundred fishermen belonging to Bonavista town. The petitioners are not averse to the legitimate use of cod traps but they protest against their use on the grounds and ledges to the detriment of the hook and line men. They do not want them used on Dancing Point Rock, Western Ledge and other places named in the petition. Being a fishermen myself and having had experience in hand line fishing at the town of Bonavista I think I am safe in saying that cod traps are detrimental to hook and line men if placed on these grounds I have named. I would ask that this matter be placed before the Fisheries Board in order that the prayer of the petition may be granted. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Catalina asking for a sum of money to cover in a brook there that overflows. The petition is signed by a number of the inhabitants. I am acquainted with the place and I know the need of the allocation asked for. I wish to give the petition my hearty support. I have also some other petitions dealing with various public matters in the District of Trinity and I ask that they be

referred to the proper departments.

MR. TARGETT.—I rise to support the petitions presented by my colleague, Mr. Stone.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Speaker,on your behalf I beg to present two petitions from the town of Victoria in the District of Carbonear. One relates to temperance matters and the other asks for a sum of money to construct a road. The people, who are nearly all of one denomination are constructing a parsonage and they are anxious that the Government grant them a sum of money to construct a road to facilitate the work of that building. I have very much pleasure in asking that these petitions be referred to the Departments to which they relate.

I have also two petitions from my own district. The first is from Lamaline and is of a more than ordinary importance. The people point out that Lamaline is entirely formed by land washed up by the sea, that it is difficult to get a water supply and they are anxious for the Government to help them in this matter. At present they have to go some distance to get water, and unless something is done there is always the possibility of an outbreak of disease. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition.

I have also a petition from Allan's Island asking for a sum of money to construct a breakwater at that place. Petitioners say that at present there is only about eight feet of beach to protect the harbor. If this breakwater is constructed it will not only be a benefit to the inhabitants of Allan's Island but also to a number of people from other places who make use of this harbor.

I have much pleasure in supporting the two petitions and ask that they be referred to the proper Department.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I beg to table a statement of expenditure asked for by Mr. Jennings, and also a statement asked for by the Leader of the Opposition.

QUESTIONS.

MR. KENT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to state whether any application has been made by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and the Nova Scotia Steel Company, or either of them, operating on Bell Island, for refund of duties on coal imported for domestic purposes during the past twelve months; if so, state the amount claimed and lay on the table a copy of all correspondence, accounts, and other papers in relation thereto; also, whether any refunds have been made in previous years; if so, state the amount of same for each of the past four years.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In reply to the hon. nember I may say that I hope to have this before the House rises.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colonal Secretary to lay upon the table of the House all correspondence in connection with the Spur Line at Trinity, why the work was suspended, and when it is likely to be resumed again.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I shall have that information to-morrow.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement, in detail, of all monies expended by his department at Grand Bank for the years 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERES.—I beg to table the information.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House (a) a statement showing for what purpose the sum of $200 was issued by his Department to Nathan Brown, Bonavista; (b) a copy of returns of the above named amount.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I hall have that statement to-morrow.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a copy of all returns for monies allocated by his department to J. S. Rowsell, of Bonavista, for the years 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—That is being prepared.

MR. WINSOR asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a copy of returns for all moneys allocated by his department to J. S. Rowsell, of Bonavista for the years 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I shall have that statement prepared as soon as possible.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement showing (1) the names of those receiving Old Age Pensions; (2) the amount received by each in the District of Harbor Main.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This will be here shortly.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines if the prizes won at the Harbor Main gricultural Exhibition have been given to the winners yet; if not, when shall the same be distributed.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I beg to table the information.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Justice to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the amounts granted annually for the heating and cleaning of the Court House at Holyrood and Hr. Main and the accounts showing the expenditure of ame during the years 1912 and 1913.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That matter is in the Department of Public Works and I have asked them to prepare a statement so that I can table it.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all moneys spent on wharves f Hr. Main during the years of 1912 and 1913.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—(In the absence of Minister Marine and Fisheries). The answer to that question is being prepared.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to a question I asked on the opening day of the session, for a statement of expenditure in St. John's East and copies of returns. I received a statement of expenditures but not the returns.

MR. JENNINGS.—I would call the attention of the Colonial Secretary to a question I asked quite a while ago. I regret I cannot find the Order Paper in which it was placed. It relates to cable repairs at Exploits in the summer of 1912.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I shall have that matter attended to and have the information at the next sitting.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon the Prime Minister the Bill ntitled "An Act respecting Municipal Affairs" was read a third time and passed; and it was ordered to 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.

SALARIES BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 61 Vic. Cap. 8, entitled 'An Act respecting Salaries," was read a third time and passed; and it was ordered to 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.

MARINE & FISHERIES BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 61 Vic. Cap. 3, entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries" was read a third time and passed; and it was ordered to 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.

TRAIN-FERRY BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Pime Minister, the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train-Ferry Service" was read a third time and passed; and it was ordered to be engossed, 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.

CONCEPTION BAY BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 3, George V., Cap. 4., entitled, "An Act to incorporate the Conception Bay Electric Company and for other purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

MR. KENT.—Just one word, Mr Chairman. I understand that the intention is to unite both companies; their operations will be carried on as one company. I question whether that is a good policy and in the interests of the people. I think that it would virtually constitute a monoply for this company. Of course it will be said that it is not a monoply, in as far as other companies are allowed to come in and compete with them. But were these companies united into one, it would give that company the heating and lighting of the whole of Conception Bay, as far as these two Acts extend. It would not be practicable for any other company to compete with them.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. hairman, as a general proposition, I agree with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. But this is just a case of one Company not being able to carry out its charter and wishing to lease its charter to another company. That is all; it is not a case of selling to another concern. The United Towns Electric Co. were purchasing the rights of the Conception Bay Electric Co. which was incorporated last year. I do not agree with monopolies; but I must tell the hon. member that it is only by offering every facility that such companies can be induced to establish at all.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Company has an exclusive right for 30 years. I think, therefore, that there should be some provisions to prevent such a monopoly from being used injuriously to the people.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that there is a right provided to buy out after 30 years. Unless we gave these companies some extent of monopoly, they would not proceed to work. We must consider the question in all its bearings, and must endeavour to induce these companies to come and establish here. There is another thing too, which will keep the price of electric light from going too high. I refer to the comparatively cheap price of oil. When it is at all necessary, the people can return to the use of oil, and this must prevent the price of electricity from being raised too high.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I

have heard the opinions of many of the people around Conception Bay and I know that it is the wish of these people to have no monopoly. The people want to be in a position to buy them out, whenever they are able. I would like to see this exclusive right taken away as a condition of granting this privilege. The people of Conception Bay should not be bound down by the company and have no way of getting clear of the contract. Some years ago a contract was made by the overnment of that time with the Anglo American Telegraph Company whereby they were granted a monopoly of the telegraph business of the Colony. We all know how that monopoly failed to be an advantage to the Colony and it will be remembered ow anxiously the people waited for the contract to expire. It was not until the monopoly was at an end that it was possible for the people to send a message for less than fifty cents whereas now they can do so for twenty cents. We have had this experience and we should profit by it. I have no doubt that this company will make a profit out of this contract and they should not object to giving the people power to buy them out, when it is convenient for them to do so. We do not grant them to come in and claim for prospective profits, as we had enough of that in the case of the Ryan arbitration, to which I referred yesterday. There can be no objection to this for if the Government unites these two bills, it will be no trouble to get all the capital that is required. It is a money making affair and I believe that no company between Twillingate and St. John's will make more money than they will. There are wonderful possibilities for Conception Bay, for Carbonear, Bay Roberts and Harbour Grace are growing towns, that will some day have street cars and that will help this company to make money. I ask, therefore, that some arrangement be made with the company on behalf of the people of Conception Bay whereby the company will give up its rights to a fifty years' monopoly.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, I have had no opportunity of reading the Bill and I would like to have an opportunity of making myself acquainted with its provisions. The District of Port de Grave, which I have the honor to represent, is one of the districts concerned, and I trust the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister will have no objection to deferring the discussion till tomorrow.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to a postponement, if any hon. gentleman desires it. As I have pointed out, the Bill is not a Government measure and it is only because the member in charge of the Bill is away that I have taken charge of it today. On general principles I do not favor monopolies but it cannot be denied that on occasions you have to give companies what may seem to be large concessions in order to encourage them to inaugurate large industries. I do not think the hon. member for Bonavista was quite happy, in his reference to the Anglo American Telegraph Company for, as a matter of fact, there was a clause in their charter giving the Colony the right to purchase their enterprise, which was never availed of. The matter came up here at one time and there was quite a lot of discussion on it but we decided not to avail of the purchase clause.

My hon. friend has stated that we have messages sent now at a cheaper rate but, if he will look into the receipts and expenditures of the Postal Telegraphs Department, he will find that we do not get our messages for twenty cents. As a matter of fact

they cost us much more. I undertake to say that half of the 150 offices of the Department do not pay and there are even offices that cost us about $300 a year that do not earn more than $20. Under the charter of the nglo Company the Government had the right to erect telegraph lines where the Anglo Company would not do so. The result was that two systems came into existence, the Anglo lines going to the places where the ervice paid best and the Government lines going to the other places. In other words, the Anglo Company had a monopoly against the world but not against the Government.

Last year the ordinary revenue of the department was $93,000 and the expenditure was $124,000, from which it will be seen that if the people are getting their messages for 20 cents they are really paying more for them but the Government, of course, receives value indirectly in the way of increased benefits to the public.

In 1898 there was quite a furore because we gave the Reid Newfoundland Company a monopoly of the street car service of St. John's. Nearly twenty years have passed away and the receipts of the company are at a standstill, not a dollar more than they were five years ago. We know this because they have to pay a percentage on their earnings to the Municipal Council.

MR. KENT.—They would earn more if they extended their system.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is a debatable question for it is argued that if there was money in it for the company they would make the extension. However, I am not prepared to argue one way or the other at the present moment and I shall be glad to accede to the request to have the debate postponed till to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

UNITED TOWNS ELECTRICAL BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 2, Edward VII., Cap. 8, entitled "An Act to incorporate the United Towns Electrical Company, 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 had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted, and that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

PILOTS' BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 1, George V., Cap. 24, 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.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, this Bill now before us is for the purpose of adding a clause to

section 18 and also to section 24 of the Bill passed in 1910. This amendment is made to carry out an agreement made between the Commissioners and the Pilots. The fund known as the Pilot's Fund, goes to them as a pension and in some cases to their widows. From the fund now two or three widows receive grants and also some superannuated pilots. They do not get pensions from the Civil Service but from this fund and, as I have said, this amendment is made with the consent of all concerned, namely the commissioners and the pilots themselves.

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 without amendment.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

REVENUE BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act further to amend "The Revenue Act 1905."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. LLOYD--Mr. Chairman, I purpose to make a few remarks on the Revenue Bill that I had not an opportunity to make on the Budget. The debate on the Budget ended somewhere about 1 a.m. and the hour was hardly suitable to continue the discussion of the tariff proposals, so I deferred my remarks and made no objection to the Resolutions going through at that time, intending to take up the discussion again at the Committee stage of the Revenue Bill.

It is not often, Sir, that I am in a position honestly to congratulate the Minister of Finance and the Leader of the Government. But I do congratulate the Minister, and I do congratulate the Leader of the Government upon the unexampled prosperity of which both the Minister and the Leader of the Government made so much during the debate. In the opening paragraph of his remarks he said that he was in a position of being able to congratulate the country on the remarkable prosperity which we were enjoying. And it is my privilege to extend that congratulation to them It however, is a most remarkable circumstance that at the time when the country has reached this height of prosperity we should have such a Revenue Bill before us. That is the most extraordinary feature of the situation, that with abounding exports, with extraordinary imports, and with a revenue the like of which the country has never seen before, the Minister has to come in here, and in these Resolutions ask us for $250,000 a year, more than was ever asked for before. And this in spite of the fact that he has received more revenues than any Finance Minister before him. In fact, he boasts that during the last four years the revenues have been such that, as he stated the other day, we are collecting $4,000,000, as against $3,000,000 collected before the Minister of Finance took office. We are collecting one third more than his predecessors did, and in spite of this the Minister comes forward to ask for additional taxation to the extent of $250,000 more than he took off last year. I was rather surprised that the Minister had the effrontery and that the Leader of the Government supported him in telling this country of its remarkable trade, and at the same time asking this House for such

an increase in the Revenue. But it is illuminating commentary on the financial exploits of the Government. This was not realised last fall but everyone knows now what it means.

We have heard a lot this session about mandates. For every increase in expenditure we are told as an excuse that the Government is giving to the people what was asked for. They are giving it because they have a mandate. The people asked for these facilities and we are getting what they asked for. That is a very sorry excuse for it adds what is really the gravamen of the offence. It is perfectly true that the Leader of the Government had a mandate and that he obtained that mandate in 1909. Under what conditions was it given? Were you to come to the country in five years and ask the people to pay $250,000 more revenue than ever paid before? Was that a term of the mandate? You promised extensive public works; you promised to carry out the policy of building branch railways, of extending the lighthouses, etc. Under what conditions? If the Leader of the Government will refer to his Manifesto he will find that he promised all these facilities without one cent of additional taxation. You are asking every man, woman and child in the Island $1.00 a year more than they ever paid before for a mandate which you promised to fulfill for nothing. Go back one year. What do we find? You were promising something for less than nothing. Last year you came before this House and said: 'All these things we give to you and actually for a less tariff than you were paying under before. We are taking off $380,000 of taxation. That did not surprise us at the time. It would have been more honest and fair if the position set up the other night had been set up last year, and you had told the people in plain terms that you could not give them something for nothing, but that they would have to pay extra for extras. Nothing was said about that before the election. The election was over before we heard that these facilities meant extra taxation. You told the people in this House last year that after taking off $380,000 of taxation you would have a surplus this year of $150,000 at least. How has it turned out? We are in truth $300,000 to the bad. On one year's reckoning you are $450,000 out. And all this in the years of prosperity. All this at a time when the trade of the country was never so good, and all at a time when the revenues were never so large. Comment has been made on what is termed the adverse balance of trade. For my part I attach little importance to the question which side the balance is on, whether we have more imports than exports, or vice versa. Because in some countries where the greatest prosperity exists there are more imports than exports, whereas in others great prosperity exists where there is an excess of exports. Other factors have to be considered before we can give judgment as to the meaning of the excess. In England great prosperity exists side by side with a large excess of imports over exports. The same thing applies to Canada. But the cause of prosperity is not the same in both countries. In the case of England her excess of imports is due to two great factors. England is the greatest money lending power in the whole world, and secondly England is the greatest transporting power in the world. Owing to the enormous investments made by England abroad, there is a very large income going into that country every year. Then, again, British shipping is at least one-half the shipping of the world. What is made in this

shipping is carried to England. How is it carried? It is not carried in bullion. It is more up-to-date than to be transporting bullion to and fro. No, it is taken in values. This large income from investments abroad, this income from shipping, creates an extraordinary purchasing power abroad, which goes back to England in a large excess of imports. Take Canada. Canada is not a money-lending power. But Canada is a large borrowing power. During the past two years the average amount of money borrowed from London for Canadian Governments, Dominion and Provincial, for civic corporations, and industrial bodies, has been $1,200,000,000 a year. Of course a large amount of interest is sent back, but it means that for every $4 sent to England in the last four years there has been a clear $96 of extra purchasing power in Canada. In other words the excess of loan over interest has given Canada an extraordinary purchasing power. She has been purchasing on loans. She has to develop, and she has been borrowing largely and living largely on her loans. Now, what is the case with Newfoundland? We have not been an extraordinary borrowing power until lately. As a matter of fact the position of Newfoundland in the past has been that the exports exceed the imports because, after all, the Government sends out some considerable sums every year in interest. That does not go in bullion, but really in our own produce. We also send outside large credits in connection with premiums of insurance and profits in banks. It is quite easy to account for the apparent difference. But that has nothing to do with the question of our prosperity. It would be the same whether we were prosperous or not. Because we would still have to send out these sums of money in interest, whether we were prosperous or not. That is the explanation of the excess of imports over exports when there was such an excess. But when the exports exceed the imports we are still sending out large exports. When the imports exceed the exports, we are balancing our exports to meet loan interests, insurance premiums, and bank profits, and gaining the excess of imports by taking in the credit of our loans in the form of imports. I do not assert that this is bad finance. I do not claim that it shows the existence of financial peril, as the Premier tried to put into the mouth of the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Kent, who did not contend that it showed unsound finance, but that when we come here to consider the Budget we ought to have a reliable statement of exports and imports, a clear statement of what is otherwise going out and what is coming into this country, and we would then be in a position to discuss the matter intelligently. I have already remarked that the most astonishing fact of the situation is that although we are on a wave of prosperity that has never before been attained, despite the fact that during the past 10 years and more particularly during the last five, since the present Minister has been in charge of the Customs, we have had abundant revenues, in spite of the fact that the new 1913 tariff was to give us a surplus, we are asked to add considerably to the tariff to raise a greater revenue than the old 1912 tariff would give. There was a time when an extra 10 per cent. was put on before. It was dubbed the iniquitous ten per cent. That was in the days of adversity. Now a 10 per cent. is to be enacted to meet a deficit in days of unexampled prosperity. I have in my hand a report of the Trade and Commerce of Newfoundland made by Governor MacGregor. And in that report he sets out vari-

ous tables and charts. In one table relating to imports you will find that for the year 1897-8, 18 months before the putting on of the former 10 p.c., the imports were down to a low level. They had been low once before in 1893, but if you will examine that table you will find that the imports went up in 1903, and since then it has kept on going up, and still we have to-day to put on the iniquitous 10 per cent. again. Again, I have another table before me which shows the state of the exports, and just a year before the 10 per cent. period the exports had reached the lowest level for many years. Another table shows that the price of fish was extremely low, the lowest point being reached in 1896, and it was not much higher in 1897. The point I wish to make in this connection is that while in 1899 a surtax of 10 p.c. was put on, it was put on at a time when there was a most extraordinary depression in trade. To-day we are on the highest wave of prosperity ever known in the Colony, and we have to re-impose a similar tax. The Government have been presuming on your good fortune, and instead of being careful they have been as extravagant as possible, and with all the good things coming in they have been a spendthrift Government.

The Leader of the Government smiles and well he might, because it was only last year that he said of the budget then introduced that it was the best on record. Perhaps it was politically. It certainly did the trick and put the rt. hon. gentleman back again. But it did so by fooling the people and if they appealed to-day to the people they would find a much more adverse answer than they received last fall.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I think they would have returned us in any case if you deducted the amount of fooling that was done by the other side.

DR. LLOYD.—Perhaps they would put it in their pipes and smoke it with the extra 10 p.c. duty.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is not a satisfactory answer.

DR. LLOYD.—It would be more satisfactory to the people than to be told to pay 1½ cents more for a five-cent stick of tobacco, after they had been told that they were not pay any extra duties. It may be remembered that the other day attention was called to the question of champagne. It is perfectly true that the Minister of Finance stated in his budget the other day that he was going to tax champagne. But he did not do it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—That was a printer's error. You should know all about that.

DR. LLOYD.—Yes, I know all about that, and that is why I am going to explain it. I say that the Minister mentioned champagne in his Budget speech. He intended to tax champagne, but he forgot to do it. He brought down his resolutions typed, but there was no champagne mentioned. That was on Wednesday. The following day he brought down the resolutions printed, and he had still forgotten to do it. It was not until to-day, after it had been pointed out to him, that he had it inserted in the tariff. That is characteristic of the Government, and of the way in which the whole finances of the country are handled—everything is done without due care. A railway estimate was made, and the country was given to understand that the railways would cost $4,000,000, but when we come down to-day we don't know yet whether we will get out of it for $8,000,000. All for want of the same due care. Then "the best Budget on record" is brought before the House, and the Government claims a surplus of $150,000. Twelve months afterwards the Minister comes in and admits that he

is $130,000 to the bad, and we know that he is another $100,000 to the bad in bank loans. All because no care is taken. Then we were told that it was the Champagne Classes that were going to pay this $250,000 a year. The Premier assured us, if my memory serves me right, that 120 automobiles have been imported into the country, costing from two to three thousand dollars a year each to run, and he said, Why should not these people pay these extra taxes? That is good enough as a sentiment, but it is not true. He does not call upon these folk to pay. I was naturally interested, when this matter came up, as to what the Minister of Finance and his leader were asking from the motor people, that were going to pay it all, and turned to the Customs returns, tabled by the Minister of Finance, and I found, taking locomotives, automobiles and everything of that class imported into the country for the year ending June 30, 1913, and putting on the extra surtax (which is actually all that we were going to get out of these folk that spend hundreds of thousands of dollars a year and that, we were told, are well able to foot this bill of $650,000 a year), if they import into the country as many automobiles as were imported last year, the revenue will actually get $1,900 more. And yet these were the folk who were going to pay the $650,000 a year. Now, what about Champagne? The fishermen, we know, have a scoff occasionally, and probably there is a drop of rum in connection with it. I have just been wondering if we were to compare this scoff of the fishermen with the champagne suppers that are held by this wealthy and well-to-do class that we heard so much about, who will pay more, proportionately, into the revenue. I think we would find that it is not the Champagne Charlies—that was what we used to call them when I was a boy. Let us take a look at one of those champagne suppers. Commencing, they will take a glass of sherry, perhaps. There is no specific duty on that. No dollar a gallon on sherry. Oh, no. That is forgotten. There is nothing extra on sherry except the 10 per cent. Next they take a glass of hock. Anything extra on that? Anything extra on port or any kind of wine, except champagne? He pays nothing on his wines except the 10 per cent., but what about the specific duty on champagne? How much is he paying towards this $650,000 a year? The Premier and his Minister are actually asking him to pay $427, while the men who take a drink of rum are asked to pay, not $427, but $84,000. And yet we have the Leader of the Government standing up in the House and trying to make us believe and to make the people believe that it is not the ordinary fishermen and the ordinary laborer that will have to pay this extra taxation, but the wealthy and the well-to-do. Now, what about tobacco? Is it the rich man's cigar that has got to pay heavily? Oh, no. The best brand of cigars only pays the same duty as the worst, but there is no specific duty at all on cigars, merely an extra 10 per cent. On cigarettes, however, he expects to get next year $126,000.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—More than that.

DR. LLOYD.—Perhaps more than that. I accept the correction. But that is how I figure it out on the basis of last year's returns. But that is not all by any means. He is going to get $50,000 more from cigarettes locally made. And yet we are told that the Champagne Charlies are going to pay for it all. I hope that the duties to be realized will come up to the Minister's expectations, but I don't believe they will, because folks have had

their eyes open for a long while. They did not accept the statements of the Leader of the Government and the Minister of Finance last year, and they believed there was going to be a big deficit and that the duties would have to be increased on some articles; and naturally enough they looked around to see what were the articles on which the Minister would cast his eye. Some of the merchants have told me what they have done, and it is common talk that puncheons of cigarettes were taken out of bond before the duties went on. I say this was natural enough. I am not at all surprised, because this increase was expected and, as I have said, folks looked around to see what articles could bear to pay extra taxation, and such articles as butterine, tobaccos and liquors suggested themselves.

Now, I was speaking of the manufacture of tobaccos. The Minister calculates to get into the revenue some $8,000 from imports, and I should imagine, another $51,000 in the way of excise duties on locally manufactured tobacco. Is it the Champagne Charlies who smoke it all?

I was very much interested the other night by the remarks of the hon. member for Port de Grave in connection with this matter. I think he very effectively disposed of the argument put forward that it was the well-to-do classes who were to be called upon to pay these extra duties. I was particularly interested because I had myself made out a list similar to the one which he had, and I have got it here. I followed him as he read over his list, and I find that outside of the articles specifically taxed—merely taking those articles that have been increased 10 per cent. —there are some sixty two articles which each brought into the revenue at least $5,000 or more. On all of these there is an extra ten per cent. But the point made by the hon. member for Port de Grave was this: That these are not articles which are consumed by the well to do classes exclusively, but are in common consumption by everybody. It is an absolute mis-statement of fact to say that any of this extra taxation is especially directed against the well to do. As a matter of fact, if there is any special direction at all it is against those who smoke tobacco and drink rum and whiskey. In going over these articles I was reminded of a statement which is frequently made in this House by the Leader of the Government and which he appears to think is a very good answer to anyhing said by the Opposition—I refer to his expression that 'it is like a dose of medicine.' The new Tariff is a dose of medicine. A dose of medicine is often a purge, and the Government intend to purge the country of a good deal of its savings.

Sir, when I rose it was with the intention of putting myself on record against this budget and to give the Government some reasons that weighed with me as to why I could not and would not support the resolutions before the Chair. I strongly sympathize with the Minister in his difficulties and with the Government in their difficulties. I know they are in trouble and that we are in trouble with them, and my regret is that they do not even yet appear to have seen the error of their ways. I have been told by the portion of the press that supports the Hon. the Premier, that I do not know my way about the city. Now, however, I know that it is the Government who are in that position. They are undoubtedly in a financial fog, and don't know how to get out of it; and it is absolutely clear from what has been happening during the

past few weeks that their hopes with regard to the revenue which they are expecting to receive between now and the end of June are going to be as delusive as the balance they expected last year, because the Minister of Finance has been forestalled. He is counting on getting the extra duties on spirits and tobacco between now and the 30th June, whereas it is a well known fact that recently heavy importations have taken place, the bond stores have been cleared out, and he is not only not going to get any extra revenue on those articles between now and the end of June, but he is going to get less than he ever got before during the same period

The serious part of the matter is that we have obligations to carry out. This House has been asked to authorize a large loan, and the Premier is intending to float 3½ per cent. bonds but such bonds are attracting no favorable attention at the present time. No colonial government during the past fourteen months has even attempted to float a 3½ bond. Since I spoke last on this matter and since this Budget was introduced into the House, the Dominion of Canada have authorized the flotation of a $25,000,000 loan, but it is not a 3½ per cent. loan, it is a 4 per cent. I would like to know why it is that the Premier came into this House and asked us to put through a bill, as he has done, in a form that is entirely unattractive to investors and that no other colonial government would think of. It is quite true that there was a slight recovery in Colonial investments last January, but there has been a slump since, and the market is nothing like so buoyant as it was when the Premier placed his last two million dollar loan. And what happened his last two million dollar loan? According to the Government's statement it only realized 89½ per cent. in the Treasury. Now, what are you going to do under worse conditions? As far as I can see Newfoundland bonds are as good as those of any other colony, but there is a depression in all investments, and the market is much worse than it was when the Premier last went to London, and then you only realized, as I have said, 89½ per cent. At that time 3½ per cent. bonds were in vogue. Now they are not in vogue.

MR. COAKER—Are you correct when you say that we gave away 10½ per cent. on every dollar that we borrowed?

DR. LLOYD—I don't say gave away but 89½ per cent. was about the amount that was realized. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister knew and has known all along— when I say all along, I mean for over twelve months— that the Government, whoever they should be, would have to go into the market to raise this loan, it is extraordinary that he should have permitted the extravagance of the past year. Even if he were convinced in his own mind this time twelve months ago that the Budget which was called 'The best Budget on record' would bring a surplus of $150,000, how was it when he found that his expectations were not being realized, that he still permitted extravagant expenditure? Surely he could have called a halt. The country, after all, was more important than that the Prime Minister should be returned to power. Now he is reaping the result of his folly. It is true that he is the Leader of the Government, but no one envies him his position, and no one envies the Minister of Finance his place. It would have been a sorry day for us if we had been called upon to deal with the situation If you had been relieved of the burden and we had been

made to bear it. Fortunately for us you have to deal with the burden that you have thrown upon the country. You have to answer for your own financial sins. We know what 'the best Budget on record' means. We know that it was a prodigal budget, a spendthrift budget, and the budget which we now have before us embodied in the financial resolutions proves that your sins have found you out.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to fall out with the hon. member for Trinity, even though he does call names, because there is an amount of innate honesty and fight about him that commends itself to some of us, and he would have to say very much harder and very much stronger things against the Government, and against us personally and officially, before we would fall out with him. I have always regarded the hon. member as one who fights fairly, and although he appears to hit hard and intends to hit hard, I believe it is from conviction. He has, however, in his remarks this evening adhered to the lawyer's practice that when you have a bad case call the other side names. A spendthrift government, he has called us, and he rolled that phrase in his mouth like a sweet morsel. Well, calling the Government a spendthrift Government does not make it one. He wants to know why, when I knew that I would have to go to England for a loan, I did not stop the extravagance that was going on? Because there was none going on. In the last year or the last five years, there was not one dollar spent that ought not have been spent, and that cannot be honestly justified in every way. That is the reason I did not stop the extravagance. But whilst the hon. member has been thinking in cents others have been thinking in millions. If the hon. member had his way he would run the affairs of the country and the public service as he would run his own affairs, but he has got to learn to think imperially. He has got to remember that the time has arrived when he must throw away the toys of a child and take up the duties of a man in word and in deed.

We must not forget that our people have been crying out for public improvements, such as roads and bridges —lighthouses and telegraph offices— and other matters, and the Government has only responded to the call of the people. I pointed out here the other evening, that owing to the needs of the hour we were spending one million dollars more than our predecessors in the direction of meeting the demands of the public service, because we have done all those things we are accused of extravagance. The present Government pays one hundred thousand dollars a year more for education, which means increased pay for the teachers and a better condition of things as far as the children are concerned. From a hygienic standpoint. We pay fifty or sixty thousand dollars a year more for lighthouses and aids to navigation, and another sixty thousand for old age pensions, and about thirty thousand dollars more for widows and orphans. When we meet only one-tenth of the demands for public improvements of hon. members on the other side of the House, we are accused of extravagance. This Government intends to go on with this policy of extending those improvements just as long as the country demands them and is able to pay for them. I am prepared to submit a statement of those increased expenditures to any impartial tribunal or court with the absolute certainty of obtaining a verdict in our favour. The

hon. member, Dr. Lloyd, stated that it was extraordinary that with such abounding prosperity we were now asking for two hundred and fifty thousand dollars more in the way of taxes. We are enjoying abounding prosperity in spite of what the hon. member says, for if indications were in evidence of the country going backward, we would be obliged to adopt a strict policy of retrenchment. Twenty years ago the fishermen were receiving about three dollars a quintal for their fish, as against six dollars at the present time, and the wages of the mechanics have also largely increased; the people are spending more to-day, because they are earning more, and in consequence are enjoying greater comfort and prosperity than formerly. Compare the conditions existing in the country to-day with those of twenty years ago, and what do we find? Look at our present steamer and train service, and the number of telegraph offices and lighthouses on our coasts; and the same thing is true of all other public improvements. The people are beginning to see they must have public facilities for conducting the business of everyday life. Within the last four years—to give an example—we built fifty telegraph offices in the country, although it took fifty years to construct one hundred of them before we came into power, and the end has not yet been reached. The people are clamouring today through their representatives for more public wharves roads, telegraph offices and all other public conveniences, and yet when we meet the exactions of our people we are at once accused of extravagance. These are some of the reasons why the estimates are increasing. The people are earning more, able to pay more and expect steady extension of public works. What would satisfy a man forty years ago, would not today. One has only to take up the newspapers to read the strong appeals made on behalf of the public servants for increased salaries; and yet when we respond to those appeals we are accused of unnecessary expenditure. Does the hon. member forget that the estimates of the Governments of all other countries are going up as well as ours, and in greater proportion, and at the same time we do not impose taxation as heavily as other countries? We have about two hundred and forty-three thousand people in this country, one quarter of the total population of New Zealand, and we collected last year about four millions of dollars in revenue. On the same basis New Zealand should have collected sixteen millions, but what do we find in regard to that country? We have ascertained that New Zealand last year collected sixty million dollars in the way of taxation. We do not hear any severe criticisms against the Government for borrowing money for the development of its public services, such as railways, lighthouses and telegraph offices, and yet they have twelve times our revenue and fifteen times our public debt. In this country it seems always to be fair game to criticise the Government for attempting to increase the public service or doing anything for the people under the authority of the Governor-in-Council. I want the hon. member to bear in mind that notwithstanding the increasing ot fhe custom's duties of a country, it can still be in enjoyment of abounding prosperity. The present conditions in this country do not warrant a finance minister adopting a policy of general retrenchment of public services. If we are to keep up with the times our motto must be "Onward" and we must progress within legitimate bounds; and as long as the country continues to advance by

reason of the people earning more and their purchasing power increasing, so long will they demand public utilities of every description all over the country. When the hon. member, Mr. Lloyd criticises the Government for giving the public increased facilities,he merely does so for the purpose of drawing a red herring across the track and also for the purpose of drawing public attention from the acts of the party with which he is associated. The hon. member informs us that owing to the financial bog in which we find ourselves to-day, he is glad that his party was not returned. If the statements and charges made by the hon. member in connection with the Budget are as sincere as this one, the public will be in a position to place a proper value upon them. I have no hesitation in saying that the hon. member would be only too glad to assume the responsibilities and burdens of office,and no doubt if he was in charge he would continue the good work performed by this Government in the way of giving to the people increased public utilities The hon. member in his criticisms here to-day has made the statement that if the Government had placed before the country six months ago a true position of its financial affairs we would not be in power to-day. Even if the statements made by the hon. member were true, there is nothing to show that the result of the election would have been different. We are now passing through a period when we are finishing our work. No man should be judged by his unfinished work, and our opponents should wait until that work has been accomplished before they attack us too severely. If the people during the last election were judging the Government on its policy and on its work, we would have had many more members sitting on this side of the House, but other issues crept in, which the hon. member has to thank for his seat in this Assembly. It is a very easy matter to raise cries before the country which will turn down any Government or any party. The result of last election was history merely repeating itself; no one can deny that a great many people in the country were not aware of and did not understand the policy of the Government during the last four years. These people were too far away from the centre of Government, but in places where we were able to reach the people and meet our opponents fairly on the public platforms, we won in nearly every case. Whenever we were judged by our acts and a comparison made between them and the policy of our predecessors, the verdict of the people was in our favour. I find no fault with those districts that voted against us, for they had a perfect right to exercise their own judgment. New issues were introduced last election. We went before the country as the servants of the people, who had employed us. We had signed a shipping paper, and we were tried on our merits and our work, but we were not tried fairly in some places where we lost. I think that the hon. member will hardly deny the fact that if the F.P.U. element had been eliminated, and it was a question of judging the Government on its merits, we would have had 32 or 33 men on this side of the House. The hon. member recognized that his chances would be hopeless if he had not attached himself to the leader of the Fishermen's Union, and his friends.

It being now half-past six, the Chairman of Committees left the Chair till eight o'clock.

The Chairman resumed the Chair at eight o'clock.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER (Cont.)—Mr. Chairman, before we adjourned for tea I was making a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, in relation to his criticisms of the Budget, in a speech which he made here this afternoon. The learned member had made statements that it was an extraordinary position for the Government to take that amidst such abounding prosperity we should be here with a Budget asking $250,000 a year more; that he was surprised that we had the audacity to make such a statement or to claim such a condition of things.

DR. LLOYD.—No.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—He said he was surprised that we had the audacity to come in and ask for further revenue, and at the same time claim that there was abounding prosperity in the country. He then went further and said that we had been claiming as a justification for what we had been doing, that we had a mandate from the people; and that if we had explained to the people and fairly put the case before them as to what we were going to do—that we were going to increase taxation—that no such mandate would have been given. I took issue with him on that point, for I contend that there is nothing whatever inconsistent in the position that I took that the country may be abounding with prosperity and yet it may be necessary to look for larger revenue to carry out the specific and implied mandates of the people. One would imagine from the speech of my hon. friend that we should never increase the public service and utilities and that we should do nothing but talk about what we have already done and compare our works with the work of those who went before us. I hope I have satisfied the committee that there is nothing inconsistent in claiming abundant prosperity for the country at the present time and at the same moment to ask for an increase of the revenue to increase and add to the public service.

My friend for over an hour made a strong attack on the Government and its policy before and since the last elections and particularly on the present Budget. He saw no good in anything that we have done or in anything we are doing. He contended that it was a government of extravagance in every sense of the word. We expect that. We do not look for any praise of our policy or our work from hon. gentlemen opposite. That is natural and the people the Colony realize it for they know what differences there are between us and they expect that the Opposition should come here and endeavour to the best of their ability to show that we have not done the best possible in the interests of the Colony. The wise men of old times loved to convey their ideas by means of the fable and no doubt my hon. friends are familiar with the works of Aesop, one of the great writers of those old days. He once told a story of a man, who had a great castle and who invited a lion to inspect the rooms. In those days beasts were able to talk. The man took the lion through all the rooms and showed him among other things a number of paintings of hunting scenes, struggles between the lion and the man. In all these paintings the man had the better of the lion. After they had seen all the paintings, the man asked the lion what he thought of them. "Well," said the lion, "if these pictures had been painted by a lion, he would have put the man underneath." That is how it is with the Government and the Opposition. They paint our do-

ings very much differently to what we paint them.

When we hear this story about over-taxing the people it is well to compare our country with others in this connection. Before we went to tea I pointed out that New Zealand with a population of one million, or four times ours, should have a revenue about four times ours. Our revenue is about four million dollars and consequently theirs should be about sixteen millions but as a matter of fact it is sixty million dollars. Instead of having a public debt about four times as large as our own they have a public debt very much larger. Our public debt is about thirty millions while theirs is four hundred and fifty millions. They have 2,800 miles of state owned railways and we have a thousand miles of railway.

Canada last year with twenty-eight times our population had a revenue of $170,000,000. Compared with our revenue it should have been only $112,000,000. The people of the different provinces of Canada, such as Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, have to pay not only the Dominion taxes but also the various provincial taxes and municipal taxes. In our Colony, however, with the exception of the municipal taxes in St. John's, all the taxes are paid to the Government. It will be seen from these figures that our people compare very favourably with the people of New Zealand and Canada so far as taxation is concerned.

Passing from that, my hon. friend referred to the question of the balance of trade and he departed entirely from the argument of the Leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman wished to show that the country was dashing towards bankruptcy.

MR. KENT.—I argued nothing to that effect.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—My hon. friend could have had no other object in referring to the matter. I do not wish to infer that he did this wilfully but everybody within sound of his voice must have understood from his argument that the trade of the Colony was not sound and that eventually this would mean that the trade would become insolvent. What other meaning could his words have?

Ever since the days of Sydney Smith, the author of "The Wealth of Nations," this question of the balance of trade has been discussed over and over again. As a matter of fact, the importation of more goods and merchandize than you export does not mean anything like that suggested by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The learned doctor has a final word on the matter for he says: "I give no attention to the question of the balance of trade for in some countries the excess of imports over exports signifies nothing."

DR. LLOYD.—My rt. hon. friend does not quote me correctly. What I stated was that in some cases the exports exceed the imports but that this fact in itself was not proof that the country in question was not prosperous I did not say that it did not matter if the exports were less than the imports but rather that it was matter for enquiry.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I accept my learned friend's statement and I submit that what he has said is practically the position that I have taken in the matter. I have stated that because the balance of trade is against a country it does not follow that the trade of that country is not prosperous. There may be a great difference between the imports and exports of the Colony (though this I am not prepared to admit)

and still the trade of the Colony may be flourishing. I referred also to the trade of Great Britain and Canada and showed that the balance of trade was against them but that it was admitted by all that these two countries were rich and prosperous. Coming to our own Colony, I showed how the value of our exports was incorrectly given owing to the fact that the exporters of fish undervalued it at the Custom House. Mr. LeMessurier had to write to the Board of Trade about the matter for the under-valuation was not a matter of a few dollars only but a matter of over a million dollars. As an actual fact, the fish exporters one year valued their fish at nearly two million dollars less than the amount which came back to the Colony for it, as they did not take into consideration the labour and other expenses in handling the fish after they had purchased it.

It is reasonable to assume that nearly every dollar of our exports returns to us in the shape of imports. Some of it comes back in gold and some may be invested in other countries but nearly every dollar comes back in imports. Let us suppose that there is a difference of a million dollars in our exports over our imports. That million dollars will have to be paid and where will the money come from to pay the bill? It is paid by the amounts received by our people as interest and dividends on monies invested in other countries. This amounts to quite a large sum of money in the course of a year. Then there is $25,000,000 invested in the Savings Banks and debentures and local industries. Of course, all the interest and dividends are not sent out of the country, for some people allow their interest on their deposits at the Savings Bank to accumulate. However, a large proportion of it is sent away for goods that are purchased. There are a hundred and one other ways in which the purchasing power of the people is added to but I do not consider it is necessary to go into the matter in detail this evening. I am not prepared to admit as I have said before, that the exports of the Colony are any less in value than the imports but even if they are, the difference can be accounted for very easily and there is not the slightest indication that the trade of the Colony is not on a sound basis or that the Colony is not prosperous.

The next point that was taken up by the hon member for Trinity was that the Colony was living on her borrowings. That is a serious statement to make and I would like to know how my hon. friend arrives at that conclusion If a thousand or two thousand men have been working for the past four years, during a portion of each year on railway construction what does it all amount to? They receive $1.50 a day while they are at work and if my hon. friend will figure it out he will see how very little it affects the revenue. During some of the time there were not five hundred men at work and never were there more than two thousand. How we have been living on our borrowings I do not know.

My hon. friend then went on to say: "It would have been more decent if the Leader of the Government had told the people four years ago what he told us on Wednesday. If he had done so he would have received a different mandate from them." I told the people nothing four years ago that was inconsistent with what I said on Wednesday and I challenge my hon. friend to prove otherwise.

DR. LLOYD.—I shall accept your challenge.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—What else would my hon. friend do? He will endeavour to prove he is right but he will not be able to convince anybody. Four years ago I told the people what I was prepared to do and I have carried out the main planks of that manifesto. If my hon. friend will examine that manifesto he will see that I have carried it out on the lines that I laid down and that all the main planks have been accomplished without an increase of taxation and that all the necessaries of life therein referred to have been placed on the free list. We have been told that the taking off of duties last year was a deathbed repentance and that if there had been no election we would not have taken them off No proof of this has been advanced beyond the idea in the minds of those who are opposed to us and this goes to show what they would have done if they had been in a similar situation.

I would like to know if there was anything wrong in taking off these taxes. My hon. friend's leader did the same thing in 1904. I object to the insinuations made that because it happened to be election year we took off these taxes. Everything here is looked upon as bribery and corruption, and no matter what measure is introduced by the Government for the benefit of the people it is looked upon as bribery and corruption. It is unfair and it is not done in other countries. For instance it was never set up that because Gladstone brought in the Home Rule Bill he was bribing the Irish vote or that because Lloyd George introduced his great Insurance Bill he was bribing the poorer people. He believes in that Bill and he has given it to the people. It is the same with us. We had a well defined policy and we carried it out. We do not expect the approval of the Opposition for it is not natural that they should praise us.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer to one or two of the Premier's remarks. Whenever a charge is made in England against any public man, he is immediately brought up and, if it is true, he is punished. We should have the same thing here. I maintain that the Opposition have a majority of the people on their side. I am delighted to be in the Opposition. I would not change places for anything. It would have been an unfortunate thing for the F.P.U. to have the Government in that case we would have to untangle the affairs of the country and make order out of the present confusion, and then very likely be blamed for the condition of affairs. Last year, some $71,000 was spent on telegraphs and not half the value has been obtained for it. Men who were supposed to be working along the line were paid their wages for days on which they were drunk. I do not blame the Government for this; but I do blame the Superintendents. The Agricultural grant was equally wasted. The Commissioners are intelligent and industrious, and I don't say that the salaries paid them were not earned. In fact, I think they were really worth more than they received. There is another matter to which I want to refer and that is the Logging Bill. That Bill passed this House unanimously, but was thrown out in the Upper House, because it was said that there was no need of it. There was not a man in the Upper House out of the twenty-two or twenty-three that had the courage to stand up and take charge of that Bill. Nothing was thought of the 3,000 loggers scattered over the country. But there will be a day of reckoning for

the useless Upper House. I shall in future do all I can both in speeches and in the papers, to work for the abolition of the Upper House. The A. N. D. Co. and Mr. Crowe approved of that Bill. Only the Albert Reed Co. opposed it, on the grounds that they were losing money. They had been losing money in other countries, too, but no complaints were made. While I have breath I will work for the destruction of this Upper House. Trade Unions have made New Zealand what it is to-day. Twenty-five years ago it was like Newfoundland, half the people did not know where to get a day's work. To-day, New Zealand has a population of a million, and is one of the best governed countries in the world. It is because the people have taken an interest in their Colony. The trade legislation of New Zealand is very advanced, and the late Premier, Mr. Seddon, was a workingman. During the late campaign the policy of the Government was properly placed before the people of the North; but they preferred the policy of the Union. In the course of some remarks the other day, the Premier referred to the fact that the rich men of the city pay a much larger share of the revenue than the fishermen. I do not doubt it; but after all the rich man obtains his money by means of the poor man. You cannot do without a laboring class in a country. If there was no one to bring in the fish or prepare it for market, how could they spend $20,000 a year? It is the men who haul the fish out of the water, who kill the seals, who work on Bell Island—who toil from morning till night at a dollar and a half a day—that enable these men to spend $20,000 a year. They could not do it if they did not have these men to toil for them. But that is the class of men that no country can do without; it is the class that makes every country great.

Now, as regards tobacco. I understand, according to the returns for last year, that $614,000 worth of cigarette tobacco was imported, and that $104,000 worth was imported free, paid no duty.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—It went into the factory duty free, but it paid excise coming out.

MR. COAKER.—That is the explanation. Now, I notice that foxes were exported valued at $30,000. The reason I remark that is because I want to show the Minister how he might bring thirty or forty thousand dollars more into the revenue. If you will alter the game laws and allow foxes to be exported—allow any man who catches a fox to sell to the highest bidder—and put an export tax of 20 per cent. upon foxes, then you will find that you will be able to get an extra thirty or forty thousand dollars a year. We have some fox farms here now. They buy their foxes very cheap and are able to sell them at a tremendous profit. The Government should see that the Colony gets some of that profit—that it does not all go to the man who owns the farms. The people who catch foxes here have to sell them at a big loss because they are not allowed to export them. If they were allowed to export, they could get from $1,000 to $1,500 more for them outside than they can get here in Newfoundland. That should not be. They should not be permited to sell to the man who would pay them the most money. A man came along the other day who had a splendid fox. A friend of his asked him what he was going to do with it. He said he was going to sell it in Grand Falls. His friend said: If you will hand this fox over to me I will get you a far higher price than

you can get at Grand Falls, because I will export it. The owner asked: How are you going to get it out of the country? Oh, said the other, I can get it out alright. I know the officials along the railway line; don't you trouble about that. As a matter of fact, the owner of the fox sold it at Grand Falls. Now, that is an eye-opener for the Minister. Keep your eyes open. I do not mean to say that the Minister should go out on the line, but he ought to keep his eyes on the men working in his Department.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer, in connection with the logging business. There was a number of men working at Ragged Brook for the A. E. Reed Co. These men had cut quite a lot of logs and had them piled, but there was no snow, so they could not work the horses. There were eight men in the camp, and they were told that they were not wanted any longer and had to be paid off because they could not handle any more logs. These men left the camp about the 20th January and came out to Gambo, and tried to get from Gambo home. They spent two days out in the storm, and they were two and a half days without any food. Some of the men are in town to-day, and they state that they were asked to go in there and work as long as they liked. They belong to St. Brendan's. Now, I am going to get the particulars of this matter and publish it. Talk about laws in relation to logging. You may be sure that when a body of 20,000 men ask for legislation, they know what they are talking about.

Now, there are a few questions that I want to ask and then I am going to close for the present. I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary to take these questions down, because I don't expect to get any information in answer to them this session, but he may find out something that may be worth while giving attention to.

How many telegraph poles have been paid for by the Government and how many have been delivered and how many condemned? What became of the poles that were condemned? Find out where were the construction bosses and see if they can give the necessary information or if they were off on sprees. There was no limit to the amount of whiskey that was consumed on that line last summer. I only mention this because I want to help you out in your effort to get good value for the money spent. We know thousands of things that never come under your notice, and I want to show these men that there is someone watching them and they will find that I will expose them from my place in this House if they do not look out. I don't care who they are, if I find that they are not giving value for the money that they receive I will expose them.

Now, as I wont have an opportunity to talk any further about the Budget business, I want to say that I hope the Minister, if he does get this Budget through, will, when he comes back here next year, be able to take the whole amount of this extra taxation off. I can assure him that no government ever did anything more obnoxious to the people. I can inform him that from one end of the country to the other to-day there is an universal cry against this act, and that nothing that any government has done since the Reid deal has aroused the people so much. North, South, East and West, the people are incensed against you, and I feel perfectly sure that if you had to appeal to the country within twelve months, one-half of the men at present sitting on the other side of the House would not be returned. I can only hope that you will take a lesson from what

has happened, and that you will keep a closer watch over the expenditure of public moneys and don't allow them to be squandered as they have been in the past. Keep a firm hand over them, and don't have us coming in here from year to year having to make up deficiencies.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I may say, in reference to the remarks of the hon. member regarding the whiskey that has been consumed and the drunkenness which has taken place in connection with the building of the telegraph line, that the first that I have heard of it was the statement which has been made here to-night. The Committee can understand that the Government in building these telegraph lines have been simply following the rules and the system which have been adopted for years. I don't know the line referred to by the hon. member.

MR. COAKER.—It was the main line, going right across the country.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Personally I have only knowledge of one line that was built—that constructed by Mr. Cunningham down through St. Barbe. I happened to be in the district when he was building it and I made special enquiries regarding it. From what I learned, no better man could have been chosen to do this work. What happened on the other lines during last summer and the summer before, I am not, of course, in a position to say. When the Legislature authorizes an expenditure, all we can do is to proceed with the work. The men who have had charge of the construction of these lines are men who have done similar work before, and they are supposed to be competent men. If any of them have been drinking, it must have been done in such a way as not to have come under the observation or notice of the Government. When you put men out in the woods, where you cannot observe them daily, of course abuses will arise. We shall have an investigation into the matter referred to by the hon. member, and deal with it.

MR. COAKER.—I may say that the statement which I have made has no reference whatever to the line built by Mr. Cunningham. I think Mr. Cunningham's line well built. The statement referred to the main line construction.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, there was one insinuation which the hon. member made in reference to which I would like to say a word, and that is that last year there were telegraph poles paid for and not delivered. That is a serious charge, and one that will have to be investigated, and, if possible, brought home to the parties who are responsible. I know there were a lot of poles cut last year and paid for, and there are some poles still in the neighbourhood of Gambo, I think. I was told by Mr. Stott about a week ago that he was going to take delivery of those poles now and do some repairs with them. I think they number somewhere in the vicinity of 5,000. I don't know of any others that were paid for last year and not taken delivery of.

As regards the information which the hon. member desires to get, if he will send me a note of the questions, I will endeavor to have them answered before the close of the session.

There was another matter that the hon. member referred to, and that was in connection with fox farms. That is a matter in which I have taken a good deal of interest since its introduction here, and I have been one of the strongest supporters of the policy of the non-exportation of foxes. My ideas in reference to that matter

are something on the lines that he has expressed to-night. Two years ago when the question of fox farms first came up I was one of those that strongly endorsed the policy of preventing the exportation of foxes, with the idea that we might establish a great industry in this country as it has been established in other countries. The free exportation of foxes would, in my opinion, at that time (and I have found no reason to alter it since) have meant the depletion of our forests. We would eventually destroy the goose that would lay the golden egg. Of course, every step in a matter of this kind will receive criticism. People will oppose it and be adverse to it. I am prepared to admit that there are cases where it is a hardship on individuals who might have a valuable animal and be unable to procure for it the high price that might be obtained elsewhere. I really believe that instances of that kind have happened. But like all laws of this kind, the few have in very many instances to suffer for the interests of the many. Now, Mr. Chairman, if it is possible to establish an industry of this kind in Prince Edward Island that is to-day worth millions of dollars, in a country that has not anything like the resources in this respect that we have here—why is it not possible for us in Newfoundland to establish an industry in this traffic? My idea was at the start that if we prohibited the exportation of foxes, so that those interested in the industry outside could not procure them, they would come in here and establish farms; and I think that is happening, and I believe we are on the verge of establishing a very large industry here; and I agree with my friend, the hon. member for Bonavista, that when that industry is put on a sound basis and we are exporting our hundreds of foxes annually, the Minister of Finance will be able to secure a very large revenue from them.

Now, while I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two in reference to the Budget. The subject has been so lengthily and so exhaustively reviewed that there is very little left for me to say. I am sure we all gladly accept the sympathy of our hon. opponents on the other side—which they expressed so fluently and sincerely—on the financial muddle or hole in which we find ourselves. I appreciate the fact that the increasing of taxes is always an unpopular move, no matter what the requirements that made the increase desirable may be; and that every government that ever revised the tariff with a view of raising taxes were subject to criticism similar to that which we have been receiving from the other side of the House during the last few days. As to the financial hole we are in, I don't think that that is half as serious as the hon. members would lead the outside public to believe. When Sir Edward Morris first appealed to this country and isued his Manifesto, people were frightened to death at the magnitude of the promises which he made. It was common talk to hear people saying that if Morris were returned the country would be into Confederation inside of two years, because if he attempted to carry out that policy the country would never stand it. And the people who said those things were sincere and believed exactly what they said. The country, or at least a portion of it, were frightened and afraid to run the risk of probably losing their independence. We all know the history of the election of 1908. The reason why we did not secure a majority in that election was because the people were afraid.

They did not know the leader of the present Government sufficiently well to trust him with such a herculean task. When the next election took place and people put on their thinking caps and saw that the districts that knew Sir Edward Morris best—his own district and those immeditely adjoining his own district—were not afraid to trust him, it inspired them with confidence and they concluded that the time had come when progressive steps should be taken in this Colony. For a number of years we had been only marking time—not advancing one step; no effort being made to open up any industries or to make any development. For part of that time I was a member of the Bond administration and I speak from my own practical experience. There were some measures introduced here that did not come into practical operation, and these and the Revenue Bill and the passing of the Estimates were practically all the legislation that was laid before the House during that period. I might say here to night, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those who are in sympathy with the fishermen and those who have the interests of the fishermen at heart, that the occasion upon which I left the Bond Government was one which concerned the fishermen—the sealers. I sat in my seat on this side of the House under the leadership of Sir Robert Bond, and I had a disagreement with him upon a question in which the sealers were interested. I had followed him faithfully and supported him loyally up to that time. Sir Edward Morris was then in Opposition. He had left the Government the previous year or the previous summer. His leaving had nothing whatever to do with me. I was not elected to follow Sir Edward Morris; I was elected to follow Sir Robert Bond. Sir Edward Morris and I were personal friends and colleagues in my district, but he did not say to me: If I leave will you follow me? Never by any act, word or deed did he attempt to influence me. But, Mr. Chairman, one day he came up here. He had noticed the previous year a lot of sealers around the streets of this town. They had been shipwrecked, and came back here homeless, and had been living in the railway station and in the fire halls, and wherever else they could get to lay down and take an hour's rest, and he rose in his place on the other side of the House and asked the Government if they would take into consideration such a condition of things happening again, and go down on Water Street and make arrangements with the merchants and steamer-owners, so that in the event of any shipwrecked crew coming here some obligation would be laid upon them to have these men sent home. It struck me as a most humane, reasonable and honorable position and one not involving the Government in any possible way—merely such a request as might come from my friend the member for Bonavista to-night. If the hon. member for Bonavista made that request to-night, I have no hesitation in saying that Sir Edward Morris would immediately agree and would see what he could do in the matter; but instead of that, the Government of that day denied that it was any of their business to do any such thing. Sir Edward Morris pushed the matter, and asked the Government, for the sake of humanity, to go down and make arrangements with Bowrings, Jobs, Baine Johnstone & Co., and the others, so that such a condition of things as existed the year before, and which was a disgrace to our country, should not happen again. When I saw the position the Government took in the mat-

ter, Mr. Chairman, without any other consideration, I said that I was going to vote for Sir Edward Morris's resolution. I did not know then but that it was going to cost me my seat, and I did not care. Under similar circumstances I would do the same thing to-morrow. If the hon. member for Bonavista made a motion of a similar kind to-morrow, and I could elp him in any way, I would do it if I had to forfeit my seat on this side of the House. So, Mr. Chairman, I think it will be admitted that there are at least some members on this side of the House in sympathy with the fishermen. My reason for mentioning this matter is this: that it might be thought and it might be believed that the Government in preparing the tariff did not give proper consideration to the claims of the fishermen. I think that five years ago the fishermen of Newfoundland were in a very different position from that in which they are to-night. I believe that the fishermen of this country tonight are in a better financial position than they ever were before. I was talking to one of the managers of our banks here the other day, a man who has been around the Island a good deal. His bank has several branches all round the Island. He is a man who is up to date, and he goes around frequently to visit these branches and to mix amongst the people and he knows whereof he speaks, and he told me that he has never been in a country where there is as much money amongst the people as there is in this country. He said: Fishermen come into my bank with cheques for two thousand and twenty-five hundred dollars and they take it away without any serious consideration; it is nothing new to them. He told me of cases where the men have told him of the money which they had stowed away in their homes—in trunks and other places. Now, I only mention this, Mr. Chairman, because I don't think it is proper to be all the time saying that the fishermen are poor, and that the fishermen are the only people in the country that should be considered. I believe that the fishermen are able and I believe that the fishermen are willing to bear their share of the burden of the taxes of this country. I believe they are intelligent enough to see that if they are to get their share of the advantages that they must bear their share of the taxes. The fishermen of this country and their concerns have received the very deepest consideration from this Government. Ever since the Government has been in power they have done nothing else but consider the needs and requirements of the fishermen. All round the Island you will see evidences of it. Much has been done in erecting lighthouses and fog alarms and equipping them, and in other ways. It was not done with the idea of getting votes; it was not done with the idea of making the Government popular; it was done because it was a public necessity and to safeguard the lives of our people, which should be the first concern of a Government. Also the wharves and bridges around the country never received the same amount of attention as was given them during the last four or five years. I remember my hon. friend the learned member for the District of Trinity, saying a few nights ago that he was agreeably surprised when he went to that district at the condition of the public works there. He saw good bridges, good roads, and he thought all the other public works that the district enjoyed were a credit to the Government. Thus, Mr. Chairman, at least we can say that all the money that we had to spend was not

wasted. And if that is true of Trin ity district, it must of necessity be true of every other district in the Island.

MR. LLOYD—No.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—If it is true of Trinity District, why is it not true of every other district?

MR. LLOYD—A question of fact.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I say that the other districts are in a very much better condition today than they were four years ago, and therefore. I say that all the money that we had to spend was not wasted. Was it waste of money to put a second steamer on the Labrador? Was it a waste of money to improve that service and bring it up to the standard in which it is today? Was it a waste of money to give Fogo a service and vote a subsidy for that service? I don't think the hon. member for Fogo will consider that a waste of money. Was it a waste of money to inaugurate a daily train service across the colony, and put another steamer on Cabot Strait? As everyone knows, there are two magnificent floating palaces doing service on that Strait today, that are a credit to the country and to the Company who have them there Fortune Bay has also received consideration at the hands of the Government. Then there is the money spent on education, Old Age Pensions, the increase in the Poor Commissioner's grant, and all the other things that have tended towards the benefit of the people. So that I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that it can be successfully contended that we wasted the money that came into our hands. It may be that some money was wasted. I don't know of any government that ever existed that did not waste some money, and I don't think that any government will ever exist that will not waste some money. People have peculiar ideas of public moneys. They think it belongs to them, whether they work for it or not. I am glad to know that the feeling is about that some changes in the spending of public moneys are about to take place. I agree with the idea of the people being permitted to spend the money themselves. I think it will be a good day for the members of this House when they are relieved of this responsibility. The members of this House have to look after all sorts of little matters that they should not be bothered with at all. A member today is not so much a representative as a servant of his district. I consider that he should be above that. This House should make the laws, and the people should obey them. If those laws are wrong, then the day of reckoning will come and we will have to give an account of our stewardship. At present we are called upon to do things which are not our duty at all. Every member of the Assembly has got his own work to do, either official or private, and he should not be asked to attend to the numerous details that are now looked upon as part of a member's duty.

As regards the railroads, I have not heard a single member of this House take the position that he would fight against branch railroads. I think the principle of branch railroads has been admitted both in this Assembly and in the previous one. It is a well known fact that in the days when the railroad was first being built a hue and cry was raised that the country would be ruined. At that time, in 1882, we had a revenue of $1,000,000, and with a revenue of $1,000,000 we undertook a contract that involved $10,000,000. It took far-sighted men to look into the future and see the necessity for the railroad, men who had hope and confidence in this country and in

its splendid natural resources. Well, the road was built. It was said at the time that would never pay for the axle grease, but I think that the builders of that road have been justified. That road has been the salvation of Newfoundland. I do not think that Newfoundland would have been able to retain its independence but for the building of that railroad. It is true that great harvests come to our shores; that the sea that surrounds our Island is and must ever be our greatest asset, and our greatest resource; but we had other resources, and these could never have been developed but for the building of the railroad. And that road has grown. It has doubled its capacity in a few years. The amounts of traffic, freight and passengers that are carried over the line have been increasing in leaps and bounds. If that is true of that road, are we justified in building branches? If the trunk is sound--if the trunk is full of sap, will not that sap go into the branches as well. It is only the completion of the tree that will blossom in the days to come and bring forth good fruit. The building of the branch railways is merely the completion of the principle that was laid down in 1882 by Sir William Whiteway, and it is a step that will still further prolong the independence of this country. The day in which the independence of this country will be in danger will be the day when we stand still and do nothing. Every country in the world today is doing the same as we are doing here. We must advance. We cannot afford to stand still. We must keep up with the pace that modern civilization is demanding of every country. I think those railroads, when they are in thorough operation (and, of course, that may take a few years), will be the greatest asset that we will have. I was proud today to hear my friend the Leader of the Fishermen's Union Party, when he was speaking in connection with the United Towns Electrical Co., make the statement that Newfoundland in the near future will go ahead twice as fast as ever before, and before twenty-five years are over she will be half as rich again as she is at the present time. Well, if that is to become true, we must follow up the policy that is at present being pursued. I think the hon. member knows well enough that this country must have a progressive policy, and although I regret the necessity for the increased taxation that is brought on our people to-night, still I believe that the earning power of our people will increase, and I believe that the small amount that this taxation will mean per head of the population will not be anything in comparison to the increase in the earning power of our people within the next twelve months or two years. I hope to see the wages of our laborers, of our mechanics and of every man that earns his bread by the sweat of his brow, increase this year. I believe that the adjustment of your tariff very often readjusts itself by the price that the people receive for their labor. Moreover, I believe that this increase is to a large extent only of a temporary nature. I have sufficient confidence in the recuperative powers of this country to believe that within a short time a good deal of it will be taken off and returned to the people. As far as the condition of the Colony is concerned, I believe that Newfoundland is just as prosperous to-day as ever she was. I do not think that she is half as helpless as the hon. members opposite would have us believe, and I have no doubt that when the Premier goes over to London to negotiate the loan for the completion of the railroad, that he will be as well received and

as successful as he has been in the past. The hon. member for Trinity was good enough to say this afternoon (which is an undoubted fact) that the past loans that Newfoundland has raised have been raised on as good terms as those raised by any other country.

DR. LLOYD.—I did not say that.

HOL. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—You said that Newfoundland stands as well as any other country.

DR. LLOYD.—What I said was that in the market to-day Newfoundland stands as well as any other country, but I made no reference whatever as to how the Premier raised his loans.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That is the same thing. It is absolutely true that Newfoundland stands as well as any other country. And, I might say, Mr. Chairman, that when these loans were raised, the people of London who advanced this money took good care to look and see where their money was going. They made careful enquiries as to the stability of the Colony, and as a result we were able to get the money as well as any other Colony in the British Empire. I don't think that that condition has changed very much, and I think that we are all patriotic enough to wish that when the Premier does go to London he will raise his loan on as good terms as he ever did before, although that is hardly to be expected when we take into consideration the money stringency all over the world during the past twelve or eighteen months. We can only hope that now that the clouds are breaking and there is the possibility of a bright future that he will be successful, and that when he does come out with his loan, and we go ahead with railway development and our other industries get working at full blast, that he will be able, when this House meets again, to remove at least the greater part of the duties that have been enforced to-night.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman, when we were in Committee on last Wednesday night, the hon. member for Bonavista came into the House and read from a list which he had copied, I presume, from the Public Accounts. In that list the Company of which I am a member was credited with having got $1,700 for a building at Harbour Grace. I do not wish this Committee to rise to-night without having an explanation in connection with that and also the matter of the General Hospital. I would not rise at all here to-night if the hon. member had not stated that I had bought a new house out of moneys received in this way. Now, Mr. Chairman, three years ago the Government asked for tenders for the public building at Harbor Grace. The firm of Moore and Co. applied to Mr. Churchill, the Superintendent of Public Buildings, for plans and specifications of that building, and we put in a tender, as did other firms in this town. We were awarded that contract because we were $100 lower than the next figure to us. The Chairman of the Board of Works is present here now, and he knows that what I am stating is correct. The General Hospital asked for figures for the installation of a plant down there. It was advertised for four weeks, in the ordinary course. The plans and specifications were prepared by the Government Engineer. We took the plans and specifications; we went down to the General Hospital and we spent a week there. The Angel Engineering Co.—Mr. Fred Angel and Mr. John Angel—were also down there going over the ground. They figured against us. We won that contract by $1,750. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't

for the life of me see the reason why the hon. member should say that if I were over in England I would be in gaol.

MR. COAKER.—Being a member of the House, you should not have any connection with matters of this sort.

MR. MOORE—Your late leader—.

MR. COAKER.—I am not concerned in what he did.

MR. MOORE—Your late leader,the gentleman whom you fought under at the polls at the last election, issued a notice to the Superintendent of Public Buildings that there was no firm in the country to get anything to do in connection with plumbing but one, and he was to have absolute control. That firm did it all for years. To-day, under Sir Edward Morris, every firm in town, no matter what their politics may be, can come in and figure.

MR. COAKER.—But they don't get the work.

MR. MOORE.—The Prime Minister here and my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Finance, will say if I ever asked them for support. I have never asked them to support me in connection with anything that has come before them. I think it most unfair for the hon. member to make that statement. Why, take the case of my hon. friend, Mr. Kennedy here, when he figured for the Nurses' Home at the General Hospital. He was a member of the Government, and yet Messrs. Thomas Brothers got that contract because they were under his figure. On a reconsideration of the contract they found, however, that there was a mistake in their figures, and he got the work? Was any favoritism shown there? I think the hon. member will find that he is astray. I make this statement, Mr. Chairman, before we go out of Committee in justice to the Government and in justice to the firm that I am a member of.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely indifferent as to the numbers of tenders issued. What I am insistent upon is the fact that Government members should have no connection with the Government chest. It is an idea by which I intend to stand resolutely. Let the departmental heads be well paid, as well paid as may be possible. I am in favour of their having ample remuneration for their work, but I think it ought to be legally enforced, that no member should be in any way connected with the Government expenditure. I rather wish to remedy,than find fault, with the conditions that hitherto have prevailed over this Colony. As for myself, I intend never to have a department, nor do I propose any connection with contracts issued from that side of the House. I am inclined to believe that I shall be once on that side of the House a good deal sooner than hon. members facing me realize, and when there I intend to fight for reasonable salaries for heads of the Departments.

MR. MOORE.—May we be led to infer from your concluding remarks that you would refuse subsidies for the 'Kintail.'

MR. COAKER.—I think the hon. member will be pleased to find that the 'Kintail' will have absolutely no connection with the Government. You will find in ten years' time that if living I shall have reaped no benefit from whatever power my seat in this House shall have given me. I shall die poor, and poor men die honest.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Chairman, I regret the fact that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is absent tonight, for while I do not intend to detain at length the House here tonight, I would wish in a few words to point out several things which have in my mind failed to come be-

fore his notice. A few days past, while perusing the public accounts, I was interested to note a few items in reference to my own district. As I have spent several years in the light-house service, I was more or less acquainted with the conditions existing there. One of the items was in reference to the supplying of coals to lighthouses and stations, with very little differences between them, as to position, isolation and so forth. I may state for the information of the Committee that the amount of coal usually supplied ranges from ten tons to twelve for one keeper. You will find considerable difference in cost of coals supplied to lighthouses. Of course there is to be taken into consideration the difficulty of conveying the coals to the lighthouses. Up at Black Island the light placed there for the benefit of the Anglo-Development Company is well sheltered and lighted from the 1st of May to the last of December, and this Island is well-wooded. Island Cove headlight is situated on the north-west side of Exploits Island. The coal for both those stations was supplied by Josiah Manuel, and cost $148. I notice that the coal for Herring Neck station cost $78. It appears to me that the difference is too great in the supplying of this article to those different stations, as they are all easy of access and present little difficulty in landing this article. The coal for Change Islands light cost one hundred dollars, and was supplied by Mr. Hodge, the coal for Cann Island cost $73, and I think the keeper is allowed that sum for heating purposes. I merely mention these few items to show how the money is expended. I think that a great deal of reckless expenditure was made in connection with the laying of the Exploits cable. I asked a question some time ago in the House in connection with this matter, which revealed the fact that too much money had been spent on it. The hon. member had referred to the treatment by the Upper House of his Logging Bill, which I am pleased to say passed through this chamber unanimously. The elimination from that bill of the section dealing with the minimum wage question satisfied every hon. member here, and it is a pity that the Upper House did not approve of it, for I can tell hon. members that the Bill is badly needed. There should be some law regulating the logging industry. It has been said that it is not very difficult to get a law passed to protect a dog or other animal, but logging men seem to be entirely disregarded in this respect. There are men sleeping under the sod to-day on account of the hardships which they were compelled to undergo in these camps. The conditions prevailing there are deplorable, and only those possessed of strong constitutions can stand them. I have heard dozens of men say that owing to lack of bed and bedding they very rarely get a night's rest in the camps. It may be said that these men, knowing the conditions, should provide themselves with necessary bedding, but it will be remembered that these men have to travel great distances, and in consequence can only carry a small amount of clothing. Stringent laws should be made for the protection of the loggers. They should not be placed in the position of being placed upon the generosity of the employers. We have been told that the fishermen are fairly well off, but I can assure this House that the larger number are saving little, and find it hard enough to make both ends meet. We have also been told that the people throughout the country are petitioning for public facilities, but I think that if these people are fairly told the facts connected with the ex-

penditure, and that if more moneys were granted for post offices and everything else they would have to pay for it, they would stop asking for them. If the people fully understood they would have to pay for those public improvements, they would cease to ask for anything but what was absolutely necessary and essential. My experience is that road boards try to do their very best and give good returns for the grants, but I am sorry to say that public moneys are in a large measure wasted when spent by individual and irresponsible people.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Chairman, these are the first Budget speeches I have ever listened to, and I feel certain that the House has profited from the discussion. The conclusion I have come to is, that the Budget of last year was a local one, while this Budget is an imported one. Of course the Prime Minister may think that full value is got for all the money spent but he is not in a position to know what happens to all the money that the Gov ernment sends out. In looking over the Public Accounts we discovered how a lot of money has been wasted. Now I am not going to run from Genesis to Revelations but I will give just a few instances of what I call waste money. The road from Badger's Quay to Cape Freels cost $20,000 in 1911. That much may have been charged for it but I am sure that amount never went into the road. In going over the returns I can only find $15,000 was the amount; but I do not dispute that there was $20,000 spent.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—I would like to make it clear that I was only quoting from memory when I said $20,000 but if the hon. gentleman says $15,000 I am prepared to accept that as the correct amount.

MR. WINSOR—I know that a lot of money was wasted on this road. A man came to survey the road and another man came to make another survey of the route, he went away and a man came to see if there was much rock to be cut, and finally another man came to see how they could get a rock crusher over the road. That was how the money was wasted on that road. I have been looking for a statement of this expenditure since the 5th of February and it was only to-day I have received it. The Government afterwards sent another man to construct the road and also a man to surpervise the work. One man received $318 in commission, another $362.25 and another $135.50. Now, I think that everybody in this House will consider that a lot of that money was money wasted.

MR. COAKER—What was the road like after the money was spent?

MR. WINSOR—In many places a man could not get over it but a bird could fly over it all right.

Then there has been a great deal of money wasted in connection with those Agricultural societies. Salaries to secretaries and expenses called for over $15,000. Then there are outside expenses and there is a cab hire amounting to over $164.00. That is what we call waste money. A lot of money is wasted by the Government in salaries paid to the Government officials. Of course, some officials and notably many outport post masters are not paid enough salary. I have already drawn the attention of the House to the case of the gaol keeper at Greenspond who only receives a salary of $84.00 a year. We find other Government officials getting $200 and $300 a year for the same class of work but this man cannot get enough to support his family during the year. The whole question of salaries ought

to be gone into by the Government. There is a lot of money wasted in this way and a lot of these salaries could be reduced and some dropped altogether. Of course in some cases it will be found necessary to increase some of the salaries paid to Government officials.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Chairman. I would like to say a word or two before this vote passes. I do not need to say much as my colleague from the district of Trinity, Dr. Lloyd, is able to speak for the district of Trinity and can deal with these matters much more ably than I can. I merely wish to say a few words from the standpoint of the fishermen and do not intend to delay the House. We have been here now since about the 12th of February and I have been away from home so long that I almost forget when I did leave. What I wish to speak on is with regard to the Premier's statement that every dollar of Government money was honestly spent. Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot very well agree with that. I have no doubt that the Premier was honest enough in giving out the money, but the trouble was that he gave out too much. That was where most of the trouble was, there was too much money given out this year. I know that thousands of dollars of that money was wasted. It would have been just as well to throw it over a bank as spend it in many places where it was spent. There have been many men pensioned since this Government came into power, with pensions of $400 and $450, who have been as well able to work as the men that have been put in their places. I consider that money wasted, I do not think Mr. Chairman that the poor toilers of this country can afford to pay such heavy taxes as they have to pay and then let somebody take so much money and throw it over the wharf so to speak. There is no doubt that the Premier is a man that has got a thorough education with regard to political matters. If he has not, he ought to because as far as I can understand he has been in politics for over thirty years, and any man that could not learn his business in that time must be awfully stunned. I think the Premier knows his business pretty well but the trouble is that he cannot please everybody and while trying to show favour here and there he has got into a lot of hot water, but I think that the best rule for him to follow would be to be honest and square with everybody and never mind whether he gains favour or not. I believe that the man who does that will come out best in the long run.

With regard to the pensions that have been given away, I know there are a lot of old men in this country poorer than those who have been pensioned. I know men over 75 and in fact over 85 that cannot get a pension. For that reason I think that things should be worked out in a little better manner.

I do not want to say much about agriculture. That has been talked about enough. I suppose some of the southern and western districts received some benefit from it but in the majority of northern districts that money was largely wasted. I suppose there has been a little good done. It does not matter how bad, a man is I suppose he has some good point and the same would be true about this agricultural policy. I do not want to make any wrong insinuations but we all know that a lot of money has been wasted on this agricultural policy and I trust that the remarks that have been made from this side of the House this session will teach the members on

the other side to do better in future. They may be perfectly honest and sincere in their work but they cannot be expected to know as much about the fishermen of this country as members of this side of the House. If they will take the advice tendered them from this side of the House I do not think there will be as much trouble when we come here another session. Some of us who may be spared to come another session will not find as much trouble as we have had this session. As I have said a lot of this money might as well be thrown overboard as spent in the way it was. I do not expect we will have as much trouble in this connection because I believe the Minister of Finance will be more careful in the future than he has been in the past. I know he has felt pretty bad during the present session, I know that many a time after he has gone home in the night he has turned over things in his mind and resolved that if he were spared for another session things would be done in a better manner.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman. I have no desire to say much but seeing that every hon. member on this side of the House has said something in connection with this Budget I am going to say a word or two also. We have been told in the past of the overflowing revenues that this Government were receiving but under the present Budget we find that the revenue is to be revised and additional taxes taken from the fishermen of the country who are after all the great producing class of this country. I understood that when this Government came to the country that they were going to reduce taxation but we find now that they have put additional taxation on a great many articles with a 10% surtax all round. If I understood the Colonial Secretary right he said these taxes will not bear heavily on the fishermen. Do not the fishermen of the country use a great deal of common tobacco and have they not got to pay 14 cents a pound on that. That is a great deal for a poor man to pay. The average fisherman uses about 20 pounds a year and 14 cents on each pound means a considerable amount. Now another thing on which they have put a tax is a little drop of foxey rum. Now it is all right to tax champagne and expensive liquors but I do not think the drink of the poor man should be taxed. If I understand the Premier right at the opening of the House he was going to put a tax on motor cars. We do not find any extra taxation put upon these.

With reference to the Premier's remark in relation to the railways that they had a mandate from the people, I may say that the mandate from the people was for five branch railways to be completed for $4,000,000. We find now that they have spent $6,000,000 and that this session they are asking for authority to go into the money market and float a loan of $2,000,000 extra which will mean $8,000,000 in all. I venture to say that $8,000,000 will not complete these five branches promised to the country for $4,000,000.

Now instead of an annual interest of $140,000 we are called upon to pay $280,000. Now we are a small country with a population of 240,000 people and we are not able to bear the burden of taxation that is now being imposed upon us. I trust that when this House meets again the Government will be able to take off this surtax and reduce some of the other taxes and alter the present condition of affairs.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, during the course of the remarks of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, he stated that he had carried out his mandate

of 1908, practically to the letter. I challenged that statement and I am on my feet now to justify the position which I took. I have his manifesto before me and in that manifesto I find that he promised that all the principal factors of that platform would be carried out without the increase of one cent in taxation. In his manifesto he justifies the increased expenditure that he intends to make by stating that he anticipates an increase of $300,000 over the revenue collected during the last year that Sir Robert Bond was in power. What has happened? I will admit that he has carried out his promises as to the building of railways, the erection of lighthouses, telegraph stations and other public works. That we recognize but what we dispute is that he has carried it out without making an increase in taxation. He expected an increase in the revenue of $300,000 within four years but he not only obtained this increase but there was an increase of over a million dollars. He said he could carry out his promises with an increase of $300,000 and he had an increase of over three times that amount. To-day the Hon. Colonial Secretary remarked that we must have a day of reckoning. We have it in this debate this evening. The reckoning is that the Government comes before the House to-day in spite of the fact that the revenue is more than a million dollars a year more to-day than it was at the time of the making of the manifesto of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and asks for a quarter of a million dollars more. That being so, I deny that the Prime Minister has carried out his promise to the people of the Colony. I simply rise to deny this and it is not my intention owing to the lateness of the hour to go into the whole matter. I might do so if it was not so late. I do rise, however, to say why I challenged the correctness of the statement of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister when he asserted that he carried out his manifesto under the conditions that he promised, namely that he expected a natural increase of revenue of $300,000. The increase has been over a million dollars and yet it has not been enough for he has not reduced taxation. Last year there was a reduction but this year the Government has added $200,000 more in taxation than was ever asked for by any Government under any tariff.

This Budget is unique for never in the history of Newfoundland has any Government asked at one time for an extra $650,000 in taxation. Yet this is done in the face of a pledge to the people that there would be no increase in taxation..

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word or two in reply to the hon. member for Trinity. I join issue with him and contend that what I stated in 1908 has been proved by subsequent events to have been absolutely and critically correct. What I promised to carry out has been carried out but it is the old story of "a man convinced against his will." My learned friend would continue to argue against what I say if I argued here till next year. He refuses to be convinced by my arguments and he will not look at the matter from my point of view nor do I expect him to do so.

The facts are true that for the past five years the Colony has had a great increase in revenue without the necessity for any additional taxation. The increase in revenue has been not only $300,000 but $1,000,000 and that is the strongest proof of the advance that the Colony has made under this Government. When I went to the country in 1908 I pointed out that in order to carry out the promises

contained in my manifesto I required an increase in the revenue of at least $300,000. We obtained that increase and $700,000 more. It was no easy matter to convince the people that we would obtain this increase without adding to the taxes but it is agreed that we did obtain it. It is only reasonable, therefore, that we should say what was done with the money. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall tell the House.

Take the district for which my hon. friend is one of the members. We increased the grants to that district and we made such improvements there that when my hon. friend went there after an absence of some years conditions were so much better there that he did not recognize the district. That is my hon. friend's own testimony. He found all the public works there in the very best order and condition, far superior to what they were when we came into office. What is true of Trinity Bay is true of all the other districts throughout the Island. Besides giving these districts the regular grants we gave them extra grants out of the surplus revenue, these being sometimes greater than the amounts voted by us in supply. We increased the main lines and other public services. Nor did we stop there for, as I pointed out the other night, when we came into power from Bonne Bay to La Scie there was no telegraph communication and now there are four hundred miles of wire and twenty offices.

I did not promise that in my manifesto; nor did I promise that $45,000 would be spent on a main line in the District of Burin. The district needed it and we felt it to be our duty to give it to them. Grand Bank is one of the most important centres in the Colony and one of the most progres sive and prosperous. For years they were asking for a road and this was particularly needed by them owing to the fact that they have no harbour. They could drive to Fortune, a distance of three miles, but from that place to Lamaline there was no road. Now they have a main line through the district and a man in Grand Bank can get in his carriage and drive down to Burin.

That is how some of the surplus revenue was spent and the balance went towards the general grants for public services. All the votes in the public service were increased. All these matters were not touched upon in the manifesto. They were not hinted at or promised and yet we gave them to the people.

We did all this in addition to carrying out the promises contained in the manifesto and if we had not done it we would not be looking for an increased revenue this evening. If we carried out the manifesto and did nothing more we would have had a surplus but the people called for these improvements, which had been urgently needed for years, and we gave them to the different districts.

This is my explanation and I cannot see why the fair and logical mind of my learned friend cannot see the position.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, after the statement of my rt. hon. friend I am convinced that if he stood here for a century he would convince nobody. He has said that he admits that the revenue received by the Government was a million dollars more than the former Government received and he has told us of some public services that were given to the districts over and above those which they formerly obtained. All these increased services would not amount to anything like the amount received by the Government above the ordinary or average revenue. We admit that

there were increased grants and that there were additional amounts voted under the different heads of the pub lic service but we come back to the point that I referred to and that is that in spite of the promise of the Rt Hon. Prime Minister to reduce taxation, if there was an increase of $300,000 in the revenue, there has been an increase of $1,000,000 and instead of a decrease of taxation the Government comes in now and asks for $650.000 a year more in taxes than was voted last year, or $250,000 more than was ever asked by any government in the history of the Colony. In spite of this my rt. hon. friend says he is surprised because we are not convinced by his argument.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, it has been stated that the District of Trinity received a much greater special grant than Placentia Bay. I expect the reason was because the F.P.U. were very prominent in the District of Trinity a few years ago and the Government were very uneasy about the district. They had a man there that they were very anxious to return and they allowed him to spend what money he liked. If there had been a F.P.U. in Placentia the Government would have spent a lot more money there than they did. If there had been no F.P.U. in Trinity there would have been no extra eight or nine thousand dollars spent there. The money was spent there for the purpose of returning Mr. Squires to the House but it failed to return him.

No matter what defence the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister may make he will never convince the Colony that there should be any need for the $650,000 extra taxation that he is asking for to-night. No matter how he may argue the people will not be led away from the plain fact that they have to put their hands in their pockets and pay $650,000 a year more than they did because of the blunders of the present Government. They have to pay it because of the reckless extravagance that has been going on since the present Government came into power. Not only does the Government want to increase taxation but they are also coming in with new loan bills. Where is all this going to end? They cannot keep adding to the taxes of the people. The whole truth of it is that the Government has been very extravagant in the past and it is time for them now to look at the facts squarely and turn over a new leaf by economizing wherever they can possibly do so. It is no use for the Prime Minister to get up and try and justify what they have done. They have done wrong and they ought to be very repentant. They will not do themselves any good by trying to justify their wrongdoing but if they will confess their sins and promise not to be reckless and extravagant in the future we shall grant them our absolution.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bonavista is entirely incorrect from start to finish and I must say that I am surprised that with the knowledge that he possesses after our discussion of public affairs here for over two months he would have made such statements as he has made concerning the grants made to the Districts of Trinity Bay and Placentia Bay. He has advanced the argument that more money was voted to Trinity Bay than to Placentia Bay because the F.P.U. had branches in the former district but as a matter of fact, that had absolutely nothing to do with the votes or grants for all the money was expended in these districts on the per capita basis. Every district received its fair share of the public money and the Govern-

ment made a departure from the former rule, that had been in existence for years, by treating every district alike. In the old days the districts that were represented by the opposition never received a cent over and above the regular grants. For years this was the case with Bonavista, which was in opposition to the Liberal Government, and they never received a dollar from the surplus. There may have been a very exceptional case but I can produce a statement of the annual expenditures and I can show that Bonavista did not receive a dollar while other districts were receiving grants of twenty and twenty-five thousand dollars. Take, for instance, the year 1908, when there was a general election. In that year there was a grant of $25,000 to Twillingate district over and above the regular grant while not an extra dollar was spent in Bonavista. It was the same during the four years previous to 1908. I am not making a charge in connection with this but I am standing here on my defence and I am prepared to prove that during the years that this Government has been in power every district has received its share to a cent. The district of Placentia received its share like all other districts and any hon. member who says that such was not the case is stating what is misleading, unfair and incorrect.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, that statement did not originate from this side of the House. My hon. friend, Mr. Coaker, was quoting what was said by an hon. gentleman opposite.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The hon. member for Bonavista made the statement and I rose for the purpose of showing that he was entirely incorrect.

DR. LLOYD.—In fairness to this side of the House, my rt. hon. friend must admit that the statement came from his own side.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friends opposite have understood me to say that I have a grievance against the District of Trinity on the ground that that district received more public money than it was entitled to and that the District of Placentia was not fairly treated; they have entirely misunderstood me. If there was even a suspicion in my mind that the District of Placentia had not been treated fairly I would not be where I am to-night. I am fully aware of the fact that all the special grants were allocated on the per capita basis and in this connection I endorse all that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has stated this evening.

I made a statement in this House a few days ago with reference to a petition which had been forwarded me for presentation from the District of Placentia and St. Mary's. I was speaking of the prayer of the petitioners who were asking for a lighthouse and I stated how great was the need for lighthouses there owing to the fact that the avocation of the great majority of the people there is the fishery and a proper system of lighthouses was essential for their safety. We have been given several fog alarms and lighthouses by this Government since they came into power and I hoped they would do all in their power to increase the number still more as the need was great.

My position as representative of that district is that if I thought that another district was given preference in the way of public expenditure I would feel it my duty to make it public and resign my seat. However, I believe otherwise and I believe that the district has been treated fairly by the Government and this is why I am here to-night. The people of the

district acknowledge that I have done my best for them from 1909 up to the present time and they appreciate it. As senior member for the district and with eighteen hundred men behind me I shall not be so weak-kneed as to allow the district to be dealt with unfairly but I know that under the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister the people there may be sure that they will not be treated differently from the people of other districts.

I am glad that the agricultural policy is at last being appreciated and its usefulness felt by the people. We have no reason to be afraid of the size of our national debt. Take the case of England and compare its present national debt with that of years ago. Then compare the prosperity of England to-day and England one hundred years ago. The size of a country's debt increases with its prosperity. Compare the prosperity of Newfoundland to-day and 30 years ago. To-day the people are better educated and better off in every way.

I should like to point out that there are as many fishermen on the Government side of this House as on the Opposition side. Mr. Coaker is here as the representative of the people of Bonavista and he should not regard himself as the leader of the F.P.U. in this House.

I consider Mr. Chairman our increased prosperity warrants the building of more means of communication and transport. We are justified by the present prosperity of the country in going ahead with the branch railways and we have received the people's command to do so.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word with reference to the grants for Trinity District. There were many hush grants and grants to private individuals in Trinity District; but I do not agree with Mr. Walsh in his statement that Trinity District received larger grants than Placentia.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Chairman, I gave no definite figures, as I had no definite facts to go by. The District of Trinity is reputed to possess good roads and therefore I thought that that district had received more than its share.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, I think that three-men districts receive more than one-man districts. For one thing there are more representatives to cry out for it and often one representative is in the Executive and has a great pull. Many things, Mr. Chairman, were promised in Sir Edward Morris's manifesto but have not been carried out. Practically nothing has been done to advance the herring fishery, nor have any bounties for clearing land been given. It was promised that our coal areas would be examined; but nothing has been done. Scarcely any of these promises have been fulfilled. One of the things most needed by a fisherman is lumber and yet you place a heavy tax upon it. I think, sir, that this article should not be taxed.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, until to-night I believed that the members for Placentia were jealous of what Trinity Bay had received; but now I learn that they are not. On the contrary, I believe that Placentia got more than its share, and I would like to ask why that is so.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Mr. Chairman, such is not the case, Placentia got only its share. As to the amount received in Trinity District I don't begrudge it.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word or two. I think that it is to the interests of the

district which I represent that I should remind the Government of the wasteful expenditure of some appropriations for public works last year and ask those in authority to keep a close 'tab' on the grants.

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 without amendment.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

And it being now past midnight

Saturday, March 7th., 1914

SAWMILLS BILL

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 operation of Saw Mills" with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the Council's amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs 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 financial years ending respectively, the 30th day of June, 1914, and the 30th day of June, 1915, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to an article which has recently appeared in the "Daily Mail" newspaper which refers to the synopsis of the debates published in outport papers, and also to the partisan nature of the public despatch.

There is also another matter. During the session, I have heard complaints from persons who were refused admittance to the House. whilst others who were supporters of the Government were readily admitted. Such a practice is unfair and I think that no discrimination should be shown.

MR. COAKER—I may say, Mr. Speaker. that this kind of report has been published in the outport papers for years back. The reports have been turned so as to suit the views of the Government. As to the other matter to which Mr. Kent has referred, I have known sealers who were turned away and refused admittance.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Speaker, I know a little about the arduous duties of the Supervisor of debates; since I was Supervisor myself for some years. I know that it is practically impossible for him to keep up to date with the reports. Consequently, the outport papers are in the habit of taking copy from the city papers, without waiting for the official synopsis which he sends them.

MR. KENT—I think it is unfair,Mr. Speaker, for the supervisor to be expected to give a satisfactory synopsis which is up-to-date, besides doing his own work. I am not at all surprised that some papers were unable to wait for the official reports to be published.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr Speaker, this is the first time that I have become aware that such reports were published as not the official ones. I shall not be a party to such a report and I will reserve the right to make an enquiry into the matter.

SUSPENSION OF RULES.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the suspension of the Rules of the House in relation to all matters now before the House.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, March 9th., at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Monday, March 9, 1914.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. George's, on Temperance. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition, and ask that it be referred to the proper department.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from a number of inhabitants of the district of Bay de Verde, on the question of Temperance. It is similar to the petitions already presented on that subject, and I have much pleasure in supporting it.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present several petitions from Botwood, Northern Arm, Peter's Arm, and other places in the vicinity of Botwood, on the question of temperance. Also, a petition from the residents of New Bay on the same subject. There is no necessity for me to make further comment on the petitions, as they have been spoken to at some length, and I would ask that they be sent to the department of the Colonial Secretary for his attention. I trust that when the session closes he will take time to study the matter, and that he will see fit to advise the Government to comply with the request of the petitioners.

DR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of British Harbor and adjacent places, concerning the setting of cod traps in that vicinity. The petitioners are practically all fishermen, and I have no doubt that in the request which they make they have full knowledge of what is best in their interests. I trust, therefore, that the Department of Marine and Fisheries, to which I ask that the petition be referred, will give the matter their most careful consideration.

I also beg leave to present a petition from Smith's Sound, praying for the allocation of a sum of money for the purpose of building a road of sufficient size to enable a horse and cart to travel over it from the settlement to the woods. At the present time the people have to carry their logs from the woods to the settlement on their backs, and this is a very great hardship to them. I know from mixing among the people there what terrible hardships they endure in getting their logs from the woods. I think, therefore, that under the circumstances the Board of Works Department should do everything possible to grant the requests of the petitioners, and I ask that the petition be referred to that Department.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petitions which have just been presented by my hon. friend and colleague, Dr. Lloyd.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Point Verde, in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, asking that the dredge be sent there at the first convenient opportunity. I may say in this connection that the fishermen of Point Verde are prominent not only for obtaining a good voyage of fish year after year, but also

for the splendid manner in which they put up their fish. The consequence of this is that their credit is much better than that of most fishermen all over the Island. They now ask for the use of the dredge, in order that they may make their harbour safer. As hon. members are aware, Point Verde is on the Cape Shore, and it will not be a difficult matter to make it a safe harbour. It is needless for me to say that this will mean much to the fishermen of this vicinity. The people there are most industrious, and, as I have already pointed out, famous as fish catchers and for the manner in which they put up their fish.

MR. F. J. MORRIS.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Devereaux. I think that if we had the dredge there the work would be done in ten days. It would be a great benefit to the people, as they could then land their fish in large nets.

MR. WALSH.—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by Mr. Devereaux. I think that it would be a great boon to the people, and that it would well repay the cost entailed by sending it there.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition for an elective Road Board from Whale's Brook, and another from Brownsdale asking for a telegraph office. I have another from the inhabitants of New Perlican in connection with saw mills. I trust that the Government will see its way clear to grant these petitions, and I ask that they be referred to the departments concerned.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Fogo, on various public matters, and also one from Tilting in the District of Fogo, for a road. Another one is from Joe Batt's Arm, asking for a well; another from Seldom Come By, for a bridge; and another from Fogo, for Temperance Reform. I have much pleasure in presenting these petitions, and trust that they will be favorably considered.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present petitions from New Melbourne and Brownsdale, on Temperance, and from Blaketown, re Elective Road Boards.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present petitions from Bay de Verde, Daniel's Cove, and Grate's Cove, concerning roads. I have much pleasure in supporting these petitions, and I now hand them over to the Department concerned.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Charlottetown, on Temperance matters.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present two or three petitions from the District of St. John's West, which are signed by the Hon. James Angel and a number of others, and relate to the question of Temperance. This matter has been freely dealt with, and I shall not trouble the House now to refer to it at length. It is also signed by the Rev. Mr. Matthews. I have a letter from the Rev. Dr. Curtis, who is one of the Committee in charge of these petitions, and he has forwarded me a telegram from the Rev. Father O'Callaghan, from St. Bride's, who is in support of them.

REPORT OF FISHERIES COMMITTEE.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I ask leave to present the Report of the Joint Select Committee appointed to consider the question of the Fisheries.

To the Honourable The Legislative Council:

To the Honourable The House of Assembly:

The Joint Select Committee appointed to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the Fisheries adopted recently by both Houses, beg leave to report that they have held daily meetings since appointed and diligently considered the several matters as far as practicable.

LOBSTER FISHERY.

Agreeing that that of the preservation of the lobster fishery was of the most pressing importance, they devoted special attention to this at the outset, called a number of witnesses and obtained their testimony with regard to the subject, and also secured a detailed statement of the policy now being pursued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in regard to the preservation of seed-bearing lobsters. Strong representations were addressed to the Committee with a view to the enforcing of a close time, and these were very thoroughly weighed, but the conclusion was reached that the Committee had not had sufficient opportunity or evidence to determine if such was necessary at the present moment, and accordingly further consideration of this was deferred, but it was agreed to endorse the policy at present being pursued by the Fisheries Department of creating reservations in the various sections where the lobster industry was carried on, into which reserved areas berried lobsters could be put; and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was invited to arrange for the necessary legislation to give the officials entrusted with the carrying out of the Lobster Regulations authority to create more of these reservations by their direct action, as it was felt that this would be greatly beneficial to the maintenance of the supply for the present and future years.

BAIT SUPPLY.

Much attention was also devoted by the Committee to the matter of providing for an adequate and reliable bait supply for our people engaged in the codfishery, and the testimony of witnesses with regard to bait freezers and other methods was procured; and it is believed that it will be possible to work out at least an experimental scheme for dealing with this subject.

SEAL FISHERY.

The matter of the seal fishery was likewise considered to some extent, and it was arranged that a list of questions should be prepared, and printed copies supplied for the masters, officers and men of the ships, to which they might make answer, these reports to be handed into the Committee on the return of the steamers from the seal fishery, when the captains, officers and others interested might be examined to secure additional testimony.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

The Committee, however, in view of the variety of the subjects submitted to them, and the magnitude of the task involved in making a complete investigation thereof and in preparing a complete report thereon, find themselves unable, in the limited time at their disposal, to deal with them as they feel they should be dealt with, and they accordingly respectfully recommend that the Legislature adopt an address to His Excellency the Governor-in-Council praying him to appoint a Commission with power to take evidence, to sit during the year and to prepare a full report for submission to the legislature at the next session.

Respectfully submitted,

John Harris — A. W. Piccott, Chairman
W. C. Job
Philip Templeman — E. P. Morris

A. F. Goodridge	M. P. Cashin
P. T. McGrath	J. M. Kent
James Ryan	A. E. Hickman
John Harvey	J. R. Goodison
M. G. Winter	R. Moulton

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, in relation to the matter referred to by the Leader of the Opposition on last Friday, I have made enquiries and I now table the report of the Supervisor of Debates: (Report of Supervisor tabled stating that the matter complained of by Hon. Leader of the Opposition, formed no part of the official synopsis furnished; report accompanied by newspapers containing print of the official synopsis.)

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I notice by some of the papers that it is said that some of the Opposition members in the House did Supervisor Dunfield an injustice. We do not blame him; we simply drew the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that these reports were being published and asked the Internal Economy Committee to hold an enquiry.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table information asked for by Mr. Stone on Thursday last, in relation to an amount sent to Trinity Bay.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Speaker, in the early part of the session, Mr. Jennings asked for a detailed statement of the expenses of a breakwater; but he was informed that the returns had not been received. This is an important matter, and I would ask the Minister to furnish us with a copy of the expenditure.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to Mr. Clift, I may say that I sent the question to the Department, and am expecting an answer soon.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House that they had passed the Bills sent up, entitled, respectively: "An Act to amend the Act 61 Vic., Cap. 8, entitled 'An Act respecting Salaries'"; and "An Act to amend the Act 61 Vic., Cap. 3, entitled 'An Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries'" without amendment.

RULES SUSPENDED.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Rules of the House in relation to all matters now before it were suspended.

SEALING BILL.

On motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Council's amendments to the Bill sent up, entitled, "An Act to amend 55 Victoria, Cap. 11, entitled 'An Act to regulate the Prosecution of the Sealfishery.'"

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. In regard to these amendments I do not see what purpose can be served by going through all them. Some of them improve the Bill, others have made serious departures. I am willing to allow some of them to pass; but I have one or two objections to the amendment to Section 3 in the second last line. That amendment is a very serious departure from the original Bill and to my mind if that passes there would be nothing in the section. The owner might put the food on board but if the cook did not carry out the orders, where would we be to? It would be putting the whole thing upon the shoulders of the cook, and you will be removing all blame from the owner if he puts the provisions on steamers and gives instructions. I am not willing to allow the master to be free from re-

sponsibility. He would give his instructions to the cook and if the cook did not carry out the instructions the master would cease to be responsible. He should be responsible for the carrying out of the instructions. Even if the words "the owner" are not included I believe if the Captain is included in the responsiblity he will see that the cook carries out the work. The amendment to Section 16 provides for appeal in the case of small fines. I suggest adding the words "should the fine exceed One Hundred Dollars"; that would not give the owners or captains an appeal unless the fine were at least $100. The reason I object to this amendment is that the man who makes the complaint might get the captain or owner fined twenty-five dollars, and the master or owner might then give notice of appeal and the matter might never get into Court: the result being that next year no one would be keen on enforcing the Law. If they are simply fined before the Magistrate this would encourage the crew to come forward and see that these regulations are carried out. These are the only serious objections to the amendments and if the Committee sees its way clear to accept my suggestions I am prepared to allow the amendments to go through.

MR. KENT—Mr. Chairman, just one word in reference to the amendments and in particular in reference to clause 3. The master of the ship under this section is amply protected against fines because he is not liable except for such things as happen from his own neglect or default. Section 4 expressly provides for matters which are not due to his act, default or neglect. That amply protects him if he carries out his general duty, as he would not be liable unless he were neglectful. Personally I cannot see the object of the amendments that the Council have made to Section 3 at all. It removes the responsibility from the master and owner, unless any default arises from their personal responsibility. I think Section 4 amply protects them against unfair fines. In regard to Section 16 dealing with appeals. I think it only fair in the interest of the men that a limit should be placed as is suggested by the member for Bonavista. If a breach of law should be involved there might be some objections to placing the limit. but either the master or the owner would have his remedy by way of case stated for the Supreme Court if a question of any serious import should arise. It is not intended to take away the right should any serious question of law arise in any of these cases and he would have his full appeal if the fine is over $100. I hear that a protest has been made by certain Sealing captains against some of the clauses to this Bill, and that such protest has been forwarded to the Governor. This House has this Bill before it and has had for some time. I had no information whatever that captains or any of them had any objections to the matters included in the bill, and I think it is a matter for comment that they should have approached the Governor instead of approaching this House when in Session, particularly considering the fact that Bill has just been adopted It is right to contend upon conditions as they are but we are here considering this Bill in all the various stages and the only information that we have of any objection is that a deputation has been admitted by His Excellency the Governor asking him to do something, whatever that may be. He referred it to the Prime Minister according to the newspaper report. but I think it right to make the observation on the matter because I think it is part of the respect that is

due to this House that when we have a matter before us or any branch of the Legislature any objection should be laid before the House if it is in session by a petition or request. In this case it would come from a body of men who are interested in the matter, and they could be assured of our best consideration, but I think it a breach of the respect due to the Legislature that they should have called upon His Excellency with a matter with which the House is dealing. The Act as it reads at present is practically a consolidation of the Sealing Laws and I hope that this is only preparatory to what will be a consolidation of all our laws. It is a matter that could have advantageously been taken up before now and I am glad that the Council in dealing with many of the sections that form the Act have amended many of the former Acts.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —I do not see anything objectionable at present in the Bill. The principal amendment in regard to the provision for appeal and the $100.00 does not seem to be a serious amendment, and for the reasons assigned and importance of the industry and the advantage of having certainty on the matter are a justification for making such amendments. otherwise one might be inclined to cavil at interfering with the right of appealing until the fine reaches such a large amount. It is not as if it were a civil appeal where the appeal is measured more by the amount. It is more a question of principle. Where it is a question of law, it might be important to have appeal even for the smallest fine.

But, as I say, in a matter like this, where it is important that the rules and regulations should be strictly carried out and enforced not alone in the interests of the men out in the interests of a national industry, there need be no such appeal. In fact, we have in many cases adopted measures where there is no appeal at all, for the reason that where you have appeals they may go on for ever, or at least for a considerable time. Now there is only one other amendment proposed, and that is to section 3. This does not seem to me to be of vital importance, for the reason that if it were left as it is I don't see how it could possibly affect either the owner, master or any other person because after all they can only be responsible where the statute puts a liability. The master, could not be liable, I think,for anything under section 1. He takes the steamer as he finds her Take Captain Kean in the 'Portia' Passengers might have a claim against the Company if the terms of their contract were not carried out, but I don't think they could hold the captain responsible. Even under the Merchant Shipping Act, there are many things that might be very objectionable on board a ship that the captain could not be held responsible for. I merely point this out, not with any view of objecting, though it does not seem to me that any very great harm can be accomplished by leaving it as it is. I see no objection to the amendment

DR. LLOYD—The trouble is, what does it mean?

RT. HON THE PRIME MINISTER —That is what I am looking for

DR. LLOYD—It seems to me that one part of the section cancels the other

MR KENT—I presume the object of the section is to make certain that there is some person on board a ship at the ice upon whom there is a statutory obligation to see that these things were done. Here the person responsible is the Captain. He is the proper person upon whom to

place the responsibility of seeing that these regulations are carried out. He is exempted from responsibility until his attention is drawn to any particular breach of the regulations, and then he must see that the law is carried out If there is nobody made responsible, the men may not get the benefit of these rules at all. That is the object of the section. Now, the amendment of the Council has the effect, to my mind, of cutting down the obligation which is placed by section 4—which, I think, is ample protection for the master, because he is not responsible for anything that is not due to his own act or neglect. That, surely, is sufficient protection.

RT. HON THE PRIME MINISTER —But why draw any distinction between the two. As the amendment will now read, you take away from the owner a liability that seems to be floating around somewhere.

MR. KENT—I think the whole section ought to go out.

MR. COAKER -I have no objection to waiving the whole section. I merely thought that by putting it in there might be a chance of getting the bill through the Upper House

MR. HIGGINS--Mr. Chairman. I would like to call attention to section 15. I suppose the intention is that steamers shall not clear before the 13th. As it reads at present, of course, it is sheer nonsense.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. It quite true that no provision is made for sailing time provided the sailing day falls on Sunday. Other acts do, I think, make provision for 6 o'clock the previous evening. I think that this is meant for clearing, not sailing

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the same with some amendments.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had passed the amendments with certain amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

SAWMILLS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Council's amendments in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting the operation of Saw Mills" were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Council that the House of Assembly had passed the amendments without amendment

PILOT'S BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill —"An Act respecting the Act 1. George V., cap. 24., 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 to 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.

REVENUE BILL.

Third reading of Bill "An Act to further amend the Revenue Act, 1905."

MR. KENT—I would wish to say a word or two in connection with the proposed bill. When the House was in Committee on Friday evening I omitted some observations that I had intended to make upon the matter which the Prime Minister referred to in his speech, in reply to some remarks which I made last week on this subject. Now, I don't wish to delay the House at any great length on this matter, as it has been pretty fully discussed already, but I would like to refer to one or two points. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I would like

to refer to the question of our export trade. I referred to it on the opening day of the debate on the Budget. On that occasion I pointed out that our imports exceeded our exports, and that during the past four years they had done so.

Now as regards this question of the balance of trade it depends particularly upon the country to which you apply this question of the balance of trade as to what inference can be drawn. The matter of the exports and imports of England and the exports and imports of Canada have been referred to. There is no parallel, Mr. Chairman, at all between the conditions which exist in England and those which exist in this country or between the conditions which exist in Canada and in this country. Both these countries are drawing on their reserves. That fact is evident to any person who will study the figures. In the case of England she has a reserve strengthened by reason of her past energy. She has built up her own greatness and her reserves are the result of her own past commercial energy. She occupies a unique position in the world. Take her investments. The income from her investments is continually coming in and helping to build up the capital wealth of England. The same way with her shipping. For instance take the great ships plying between New York and England. These ships are mostly owned by England and their earning are the earnings of England and the English people. Then again, take her financial transactions. England is making large profits out of these.

Now take Canada. Canada of course on the other hand is drawing upon her reserves in a different way altogether. She is drawing upon her great natural resources and is anticipating her future by borrowing. Last year, in 1912-13 her borrowing amounting to $213,000,00 and in 1913 her borrowing amounted to $280,000,000. Government—including Dominion and Provincial—borrowings amounted in 1912 to $35,000,000 and in 1913 to $53,000,000. Municipal borrowing in 1912 amounted to $48,000,000 and in 1913 to $105,000,000. Her borrowings for railway purposes were $69,000,000 in 1912 and $73,000,00 in 1913. For Public Utilities in 1912 she borrowed $21,000,000 and in 1913 $7,000,000. Her Industrial or Loan Corporation borrowings were $55,000,000 in 1912 and $40,000,000 in 1913. Now, of course, all this borrowed money went into Canada. She is drawing on her reserve and anticipating her future. Most of this money was borrowed from England and most of the interest will go out of Canada and into England. Now regarding Newfoundland: With the exception of the money that has been borrowed by the Government itself within the last few years there has been practically no borrowing from abroad. There has been no money brought in for industrial purposes or for the other purposes for which Canada has borrowed. In Newfoundland we largely depend upon our exports and inports to show our international trade relations and it is most important, Mr. Chairman, that the figures in relation to these matters should be correct and should be reliable and before they are issued from the Customs Department that Department ought to be sure that the valuations put upon these exports and imports should be correct, especially the exports over which they have control. I pointed out the other day that Section 101 of the Customs Act requires that the value of these exports should be sworn to. The Customs authorities have in their own hands the means of securing the proper valuation of

our exports. The Prime Minister referred to some other matters which he claimed bore on this question of the balance of trade. Some of them may have bearing upon the question others certainly have not. He referred to bills of exchange sent abroad by our merchants to pay for goods ordered. As a matter of fact these bills of exchange pass to and fro between here and England and other countries. Money does not come and go every time a Bill of exchange is drawn but they are settled in the clearing houses referred to the other day by Mr. Lloyd. Money brought into the country by tourists is as the Prime Minister said a legitimate factor in estimating our purchasing power but the money spent in internal trade has nothing to do with the question as to whether you are buying more from abroad than you are sending out. If you are buying more, then you will have to make up the difference somehow.

Now the interest on local investment has nothing whatever to do with the balance of our international trade. It may increase the volume of it. It may and certainly does increase the internal trade of the Colony. It must be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that a dollar's worth of goods bought from abroad is only half as good as a dollar's worth bought at home,because a dollar's worth bought at home does a double good whereas if bought abroad it does only a single good to the people of the Colony.

Then again, as regards Civil Service Salaries: These may affect our internal trade but they do not affect the balance of our international trade. except perhaps as regards the volume.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been stated that I said that our business men were drawing upon their reserves. I said nothing of the kind, Sir, and I think the House can fairly see the distinction between the position I was pointing out and the statement that our business men are drawing upon reserves. They are two different propositions entirely. I would like to make that correction because I think it might create an entirely false impression. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we do not know how our trade stands. The figures as published by the Customs authorities certainly showed an adverse balance against the Colony. Now the Government are revising their values and I hope that when the next year's figures are issued they will be correct.

Life Insurance is another matter referred to by the Prime Minister. In the case of life insurance one matter offsets the other. The premiums on life insurance practically all go out of the country, while the proceeds of the policy in some cases come in.

There was very little in any other matter which the Prime Minister referred to that I think requires to be dealt with. He certainly has not convinced the House and I do not think he will convince the country that there was any justification for the manner in which the tariff has been dealt with.

Now in the first place, Mr. Chairman, he tries to justify the taking off of the duties last year in the way in which it was done and the putting on of larger amounts this year. I can see absolutely no justification for that whatever. The fact remains that last year he took off $280,000 worth of taxes. That was on the eve of a General Election. After that reduction had taken place he claimed that he could carry on the work that the Government were engaged in without increased taxation. Immediately afterwards—the very first session afterwards—the Government comes be-

fore the House and asks not only for the amount which they took off last year but for an increase of nearly $300,000. The Prime Minister says that this is because of the increased prosperity of the country and in order to meet new services which came into existence since the duty was taken off; but we have no information regarding these matters. Last year great prosperity was claimed by the Government and the reason for taking off these taxes was that it would not injure the Public Service. This year the very reverse position is taken. The prosperity exists or is claimed to exist and still the taxes are increased. There have been no new services which would call for such an increase as $650,000 or $700,000 a year in increased taxation. No, Sir, the reason is to be found in the result of last year's transaction. What was said from this side of the House last year regarding last year's Budget has transpired. The Government could not and did not carry on their public services with that reduction of taxation. I claimed, Mr. Chairman, the other day, that this taxation was practically unnecessary. There is no reason why it should be put on. I think, Sir there has been great extravagance and waste of public monies. We had here the other day men of practical experience who knew what they were talking about who gave instance after instance in which any person—at least any impartial person—must decide that there has been waste and extravagance. For instance, Mr. Jennings, the hon. member for Twillingate, in connection with the service with which he had practical familiarity showed that there has been waste in that direction and I would like to see men who are as familiar with other services as Mr. Jennings is with the lighthouse service to go through the whole of the public services and see where and in what direction waste has tak- n place. The Prime Minister said in his Speech: "I am prepared to submit the expenditure to any impartial tribunal." Let him do so. Let us have an impartial enquiry into the expenditure of the last two or three years and then, Mr. Chairman, the country will learn where and in what direction there has been waste and extravagance; but to come in here and justify matters on broad general principles and say that increased public services demanded these increased expenditures is not sufficient, especially when details of wasteful and extravagant expenditures have been given by various members of this House, who went into figures regarding matters of waste that came within their own knowledge. I pointed out the other day that the Government has always had a very large increase of actual revenue over estimated expenditure. In fact since the Government came into power this has amounted to over $1,600,000 and still last year the Minister of Finance was out in his estimates nearly half a million dollars. For instance last year he estimated revenue at $4,000,000 and expenditure at $3,734,189 giving a Surplus of $260,000 or roughly as he said $250,000. Now he estimates after two-thirds of the year has elapsed that there will be a deficit on this year's financial business amounting to about $190,000, or in all a difference of about $450,000 between the actual result and his figures of last year. This, Mr. Speaker, shows, I think, to the House that proper care and proper enquiry have not been bestowed by the Government on these matters before they bring down their Estimates and that there has been unnecessary expenditure on the part of the Government. I think, Sir, that in estimating the requirements of the

Public Service the Estimates ought to be made as close as possible; giving all latitude to unforeseen emergencies; but Estimates upon which the taxation is based ought not year after year to be so much under the amount realized from the taxes. It leads to irresponsibility, it leads to waste and unnecessary expenditure. If the money is coming there is a temptation on the part of the Government to spend it instead of reserving it for capital expenditure if necessary.

I have already dealt with the tariff changes, Mr. Chairman, and I do not think that anything that has been said on this side has been answered on the other. The fact that this 10% increase bears more heavily upon the ordinary labouring man and fisherman I pointed out the other day and it was very clearly pointed out by the other speakers such as Messrs. Grimes, Lloyd and Coaker. It is no answer to say that a man with an income of $20,000 a year pays a larger amount into the revenue than a man with a small income. It is true that in gross amounts he pays more into into the revenue but proportionately he does not. Take the question of tobacco: The duty is 33 cents a pound and 6%. That makes it about 38 cents a pound. That would work out to the disadvantage of the man smoking the poorer grade of tobacco. After all, Sir, it means something to the man earning two or three hundred dollars a year if he has to pay on an average an additional three per cent. on what he wears and uses in his house and on what his children and his wife wear and on his tobacco and on other things of that kind. It makes very considerable difference in their income. Where a man with an income of $20,000 would not suffer by the increased taxation a man with an income of $400 or $500 a year would certainly hesitate about spending the equivalent of what this duty would mean. That income of $400 or $500 is not worth as much to him as it was before this Budget went through; but it makes very little difference to the man with the income of $20,000. It is a mere bagatelle—a fleabite, as the Prime Minister would say. But to a man with a small income and a large family a tax that takes $20.00 or $30.00 or $40.00 a year from him means something. He has got to curtail and cut down his expenditure in other directions in order to meet this tax. His income does not mean as much to him as it did before the taxes were put on. Then with reference to removal of this 10 per cent. Well, if you remove that tax I believe that in 99 cases out of a hundred the consumer, the man who buys, will get very little advantage from the removal. Then again on small articles like a stick of tobacco the increase is going to be more than 10 per cent. In making up their prices the retailers are not going to split cents and the result will work out to the disadvantage of the buyer.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Government have shown want of thought and a great want of care in the preparation of this Budget and in the preparation of this Act. I think it shows that they did not enquire into conditions as to how the tariff will affect them. If they had worked out in detail this tariff as it affects every item, as they should, I think, Sir, they would have hesitated much longer before they imposed a tariff like this upon the people of the country. It is going to be a hardship and a great hardship to our people. I think, Sir, that the money that will be produced from this tariff will be very much in excess of any of the legitimate needs of the Government. I believe, Sir, if we work out the figures sub-

mitted by the Minister they will point to a surplus. The Minister himself has predicted a surplus of nearly half a million dollars for the year 1914-15. There is no reason whatever why this money should be taken from the country, why all the disorganization that will follow should be brought about or why this tariff change should be put into force.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one or two words in reply to the hon. member. I should be exceedingly sorry if I misconstrued his words the other evening in relation to the balance of trade. Such was not my intention. I gathered from him when he said that we were drawing upon our reserves in this country, the impression that he meant we were not able to pay our bills. If I misunderstood or misrepresented the hon. gentleman I am extremely sorry, but I still contend that his argument could have no force or meaning if it did not have the construction I put upon it. If it is not wroug to draw on our reserves then what point has my hon. friend been able to make? Now I have no doubt in my mind in relation to the whole question of the balance of trade and what it means to this country. I fully appreciate the distinction between the question of the balance of trade as applying to England, Canada and this country but there is a certain similarity although our reserves are smaller than that of England and our borrowings are not anything like that of Canada. Now let me illustrate what I mean. I may first point out that the Customs returns show the values of our exports when they leave here and not their value when they reach the other side. But further; if we had no one in this country with any income of any sort or shape except what they derived from the products of the country and they imported more than they sent away the balance of trade would be against the country and the country would be insolvent. In other words if we had 500 people living in Newfoundland and they sent away $500 worth of fish and had nothing else here and they brought back $600 worth of gooods it would mean that the trade of the country was insolvent to the extent of $100, provided they had nothing else to send away to pay that $100. If I am living alone in this country catching seals and doing nothing else and I send away 1,000 seals of which the value is $1,000 and if I get back $1,100 worth of clothes and food I am $100 behind. But if there is a bank here and I happen to have $1,000 or $1,500 in that bank and I go and draw my interest and send it forward with my seals I am not insolvent if I send forward enough to pay my bills.

Now last year five thousand tourists came to Newfoundland. That is a rough estimate. Averaging these to spend $100 each that would mean half a million dollars. They spent this half million dollars amongst our business people and increased our purchasing power to that amount and that money in turn went abroad to buy goods.

Now as regards the question of life insurance; it has been said that while a great deal of money came into the country as the proceeds of life insurance a great deal also went out in premiums and that the one balanced the other. Now that is not the case. The money that goes out of the country is an annual tax and has to be regarded as part of the general trade but the money that comes in is part of the income of the people of the country. Twenty or thirty or forty years ago it represented a very small amount. Now it amounts to over $100,000 a year. What happens

to that $100,000 when it comes in. It is distributed amongst our people and our industries and our business men and goes home again to pay for goods. Every person in this country to-day who is living out of foreign investments increases the purchasing power of our people and by increasing the purchasing power, increases the amount of imports that come in from foreign countries, and that in turn adds to our freights and other trade. I did not mention the question of freight the other night. We have a few ships earning freights which means something and we have a great deal of money in bank bearing interest every year. All these things increase our purchasing power.

After all the main point raised by my learned friend the Leader of the Opposition is that the Customs authorities are to blame, for not having proper valuation placed on our exports. Now let me point out to him that it is a very difficult matter to place proper valuations on the exports of this country. It is all right with the imports because we have the invoices and we know to a cent what the value of our imports are. But when we come to the value of our exports they may have one value in October, another in November, another in December and another in January and sometimes in January the value of an article would be only half as much as in October. Now as regards the regulations in connection with these valuations; These valuations are of no importance except for statistical purposes, or for the purpose of estimating our international trade; these valuations do not bring a cent into the country and do not affect our financial position. Very often the men exporting fish do not know what the value would be. Suppose a man were exporting a thousand quintals of fish and he went down and swore it was worth $5.00 a quintal. When it got to the other side it might be worth $9.00 a quintal; but on the other hand it might be worth a lot less or it might not be sold at all. Now my hon. friend has been congratulating himself on waking up the Custom House. Well, Mr. LeMessurier himself the Assistant Collector of Customs, woke up the Custom House a year ago when he wrote to Mr. Gosling the President of the Board of Trade and pointed out that exporters were not making accurate and correct valuations and I can tell you this, Mr. Chairman, that it will be a very difficult matter to get the trade of this country to make these accurate and correct valuations. It looks easy enough to find out what the price is in the foreign market and then deduct the cost of handling of freight and of insurance and brokerage on the other side and thus get your valuation but it is a very difficult matter. Sometimes you will have four or five prices quoted for different kinds of codfish, oil, salmon and herring. Sometimes you will have one price in New York and another in England and another in Montreal; but from the viewpoint of statistics it is of interest and value to have these figures as accurate as possible. According to the act exporters must swear to the value of the articles at the time and place of export. But how can a man make a correct estimate when he does not know what he is going to get.

MR. KENT.—He knows what he ought to get.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—He has an idea of what he would like to get but it is almost impossible for a man to go down to the Custom House and make a sworn declaration as to what he is going to get for the articles he is exporting. But supposing all my learned friend said is

correct, who is to blame? Not the Customs officials. They have had no way of remedying the conditions. If exporters or their clerks go down to the Custom House and deliberately swear to a statement of the value of exports, what can the Customs officials do. The only thing that can be done is to constitute a Court and enquire into all these things and prosecute the offenders and send them to gaol. I do not know of any other way of dealing with the matter. The rule and practice at present followed have been in vogue for the last thirty or forty years and the only point in mentioning it now is in connection with the attempt to show that our exports are less than our imports. If they are so, that is no proof whatever that the trade of the country is not sound. I admit that the figures are not reliable, are not valuable; they are not useful but are misleading. Still the difficulty is to get a better system. What is the value of a cargo of fish leaving here? It may be worth $5.00 a quintal to-morrow, and when it gets to the other side it may be worth 50% less. I have seen fish supposed to be worth $4.00 a quintal being sold in the West End to farmers for manure after it had been brought back from the Mediterranean where it could not be disposed of. Then on the other hand I have known fish which was worth $5.00 when it left here which realised $10.00 when it got to the other side. If our exports were articles upon which there was very little variation it would be easy enough to value them. The price of our fish is variable and influenced by many things—competition of other countries, small catches, the purchasing power of the people to whom we sell and a number of other factors. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there is any point in further labouring the matter.

Now as regards the other point made by my learned friend, as regards extravagance. He pointed out that there had been waste and extravagance during the last two or three years and that it had been amply proven by the statements of Mr. Jennings and the statements of others who had quoted individual cases here, and who gave details. Well I am not prepared to say whether there was or was not; but there is no Government or country in the world in which there is not waste and no household in which there is not waste and it is perfectly impossible for any Government or any company or any family to prevent waste. The only proposition I have contended for was that so far as the Government were concerned there was no waste. What can the Government do beyond voting supplies for the Departments and appointing competent heads of these Departments. There are competent heads in all the Departments, and it does not follow because there has been some wrong doings or extravagance in one Department that the whole service is going to the dogs. I have no doubt of the correctness of some of the cases instanced by my friend Mr. Jennings, for whose opinion I have a very high regard; I would not for a moment doubt the statements he made; but if there is a disparity in the quantity of coal going to some lighthouses down in Twillingate District it is only what is going on for the past twenty or thirty years. These lighthouses put in a requisition for coal, the Inspector, Mr. White, passes on it, the coal is sent and the Minister passes the account. It is not the Government that goes down and supplies the coal and puts it in the lighthouse. No Government can individually supervise all the details; all the minutiae of all the public services. You have

got to trust the various Departments and the persons who have charge of these matters.

My learned friend quoted me as saying that I was prepared to submit the expenditure to any impartial tribunal. So I am. I am prepared to submit the public expenditure of this Colony for the last five years to any impartial tribunal. I do not mean to say that everything that would come out would be creditable or satisfactory. In England where they have the best government in the world, the Courts are trying one of the worst Army scandals that has ever been revealed —where firms that had been contracting with the Army officials have been defrauding the Government. These things cannot be avoided. No matter what precautions you adopt you will never avoid these things as long as people are inclined that way. I do not claim that there is not a great deal going on in this country that should not go on, not only in the Government but in every Department of our life. The trouble can only be dealt with when it arises, and general charges do not amount to anything. Mr. Jennings made the statement that $800 was paid for freight down in Twillingate. That looks like a very large amount. I am having an enquiry made into that and if I can get the information I will place it before the House before the close of the session, or when we meet again if I am here and with the responsibility of doing so.

My learned friend went on to say that the Government had not shown due care to the preparation of these Estimates and the preparation of this tariff. All I can tell him is that this matter has been worked on for months and the greatest care has been bestowed on it, and I do not know any more equitable way that you can have a tariff than that ten per cent. because the well-to-do man has to pay and the poor man gets off with a very small amount. The Leader of the Opposition went on to say that I had stated that all the things we were doing could be accomplished without extra taxation and that now we come in here with a very large increase in taxation. When I made that statement four or five years ago I referred to the works that we then contemplated and I was not considering in any way the expenditures that have taken place since. When I made that statement I contemplated an additional expenditure of $300,000 including the interest on the Public Debt. But we have found it necessary in the interest of the public services to add $1,000,000 a year to our expenditure. Every one of these services is necessary and if one tenth of the demands of the people were acceded to it would mean a million dollars more. Every district in the country is crying out for more public services, more public buildings, more telephones, and that is why these expenditures must go on, and that is why there is increased taxation.

As regards the last point made by my learned friend, that when the tax comes off it will not be appreciated, because the consumer will not get the benefit of it; in other words that the man selling the goods will not take it off, I can tell him that competition is so keen now that the consumer will get the benefit of even the smallest reduction in every case. If we were to take a cent off an article tomorrow—off of butter or sugar or tea —or put it on, the trade would immediately respond, so sensitive is the trade on account of competition. I hope that the revenue of the country will enable the Government not only to take off this ten per cent. but to further reduce taxation. It is only put on now in order to meet the de-

mands consequent upon the expenditures for public services. The principle of taxation in this country and the principles of taxation in other countries are entirely different. Here we are merely collecting money and giving it back to the people. In other countries taxes are collected for the purpose of paying armies and building Dreadnoughts, and paying interest on large Public Debts. Here the Government collects today and gives it back to the people to-morrow. Last year we collected $4,000,000 through the Custom House. It was hardly in before it was paid out. First the Marine and Fisheries Department wanted three or four thousand dollars for Lighthouses. Then the Postmaster General wanted $400,000 for telegraphs and post offices all over the country. $360,000 was sent out to pay the teachers. $300,000 was sent out for Poor Relief, and so the money goes, and as I said we are merely collecting the money from the people today and paying it back to them tomorrow. We spend two or three thousand dollars every year on roads or bridges. We collect that money from the people and give it back to them. It is the same in relation to all other public services. I do not know any other system of taxation that we could enforce that would lie more equitably or equally on all classes.

It being now half past six, Mr. Speaker left the Chair until eight o'clock.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill—'An Act further to amend 'The Revenue Act, 1905'' was then 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.

ELECTRICAL COMPANIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bills entitled respectively: 'An Act to amend 3, George V., cap. 4., entitled: 'An Act to incorporate the Conception Bay Electric Company, and for other purposes''; and 'An Act to amend 2, Edward VII. cap. 8, entitled: 'An Act to incorporate the United Towns Eectrical Company and for other purposes''.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, you will remember that these two measures were fully gone into on Friday when they were introduced to the House. They simply give the Company, (the Conception Bay Electrical Company) the right to sell the concessions that were granted to them last year in relation to the installation of electricity and in connection with the operation of electric power for service and generally disposing of the power they had and enable the United Towns Electrical Company to acquire these concessions. As I explained the latter Company acted under the assumption that they had the power to do this work under the corporate charters, and they imported a lot of expensive machinery to carry out the work. They erected the poles to Bay Roberts and the buildings and are all ready to prepare to extend to other portions of Conception Bay. Since the last session here on Friday I talked the matter over with a representative of the Companies in relation to these sections here, by some honorable member in relation to the conferring of monopoly on these companies. It would be remembered that each of these companies has a monopoly for a number of years to

perform these works and to supply electricity to parts of Conception Bay and I have discussed whether this provision giving them the right to buying out certain rights of the Conception Bay Electrical Company would have the effect of making that form of monopoly more objectionable than it really is. We all are aware that every time anybody comes before the House and asks a small right of monopoly for anything, no matter how necessary or unobjectionable that monopoly may appear, there is always objection to it. But it is always apparent in a case like this and I think it is the experience of everybody that it is only by granting monopolies like this that we can get anybody to touch it. This is an initial undertaking to light a lot of comparatively small communities where the chance of selling the balance of the electric power is very small. If we were dealing with a large city we would have to act with very great caution in extending the powers of the Company. It would be an altogether different matter, but in granting powers to a Company for developing purposes in this country, even admitting that the population will increase in the next fifty years very much more than in the last fifty years, still there is nothing to justify our concluding with any certainty that such a concession as is now asked for would be objectionable or burdensome on the public. The history of this Company is this: After having obtained these concessions last year they had the proposition examined by a competent engineer capable of saying whether it would be possible to develop the required power, and as I am instructed upon his report depended whether they would get anyone to put a dollar into it. The report was not satisfactory and they are now simply selling out without getting a dollar for the concession; parting with all their rights under their charter and probably not obtaining sufficient to pay the engineer. Under these circumstances I am myself inclined to recommend to the Committee the adoption of these proposals. If it were a large water power in a very populous centre capable of being developed it would be different but here we have a number of settlements, nearly the whole of Conception Bay, given an opportunity of getting light at a cheap rate; and although the monopoly extends over a large area it will be very much restricted by the competition of cheap illuminants such as kerosene oil ond other cheap oils. It is after all a local matter to a very large extent and the people have asked for it by petition. They have asked that these parties might be granted these concessions and although it is for a term of fifty years, a long period in the life of an individual, it is not any length of time in the life of a country. I might say in reply to those who spoke on the matter last Friday that I would meet their wishes if it were at all possible or if I thought it at all likely that their prophecies would come true. But this is the only protection for an industry or concession that can be granted. While there might be some in it for one company there would be nothing in it for two or three. Under all these circumstances I propose the passing of the amendments to the Acts.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the suggestions made by Mr. Kent a day or two ago that the Government should avail of this opportunity afforded by the amendments suggested and do away with the exclusive monopoly that has been given to this Company. In my mind to place such exclusive power

in the hands of any party is fraught with great danger to the interests of the people. This company has been operating in Carbonear and Harbour Grace and the neighbourhood and they want to go now to Bay Roberts and Port de Grave District, and they ask to be given these exclusive powers. The granting of such exclusive powers into the hands of one Company is a matter upon which we know very little from our own experience but we know what these monopolies mean. There is always a period of evil that follows such grants and the history of cities and states elsewhere has shown that these monopolies where conduct of public powers by individual companies has worked considerable harm to the people and the Government as well. We have many times read of monopolies in the United States and Canada and in the State Legislatures where they find considerable difficulty in getting these electric light companies to serve the interests of the people. They are many times up against the difficulty of getting concessions through Legislatures that the people want and the Legislatures find some difficulty in dealing with these companies because of the exclusive rights granted in former years and the attempts made by these companies at various times to use their power to influence Legislatures. I have no reason to think that in this instance it will not meet with the same fate. These companies want to extend their lights around Conception Bay right to Port de Grave District. To my mind the granting of exclusive control into the hands of this Company is going to mean that some of the other industries in these places will find themselves up against the Company when they want power or light. Supposing for instance that the mine at North River which is showing such good prospects in development should want light or power from this Company and they asked for a proposition for the supply of light, they might find themselves up against exaction because the electrical company would have control of the lighting monopoly. But if there were some amendments made in these places they would not have such an exclusive right, it might be possible to make them within reasonable terms, as such a company as a mining company would, unless it got good terms, provide its own electrical power. But under the provisions of these acts there is no power to do anything of this kind, and if such a condition of affairs arises it would affect not only the company but the whole District, and the same may be said about all the other industries. We have a woollen industry at Hueville that was so successful last year that it contemplates enlarging its operations. The same thing may be said of that company, they may need the electrical power and when they come to this company and this company knowing its exclusive power, this company may be able to make its terms prohibitory. Up to the present time they have been very fair but at some future date they may not be. There is no relief against the actions of the company. No one will be able to say if you did not give us reasonable terms we will make our own power because this company cannot have control. It would be a scandalous condition of things to think that such a thing might happen, and I think it is our duty to protect the interests of the people in this respect. Another thing is in connection with Section 32. Under that section the company must within five years proceed with the construction of such works as may be necessary for the lighting, and they must complete these works

within seven years of the passing of the Act. If I understand that, it means that the Company are not bound to light all the places in the area over which it has control, and if they found it in their interest to leave out, say Brigus or North River or two or three other places they are at liberty to do so. What would be the effect of these exceptions? It would mean that it would be very detrimental to many places, not only would they be without the light or power but they would be without the power to start an electrical company in the said places, and furthermore, it would place these settlements in an unenviable position because other towns have the electric light companies working. Now section 21 dealing with the question of freedom from taxation for fifty years is another section which I thought ought to be reconsidered. We do not know what progress will take place in this country in the coming years. It may be that in many parts of the Colony towns and cities may go up, and if that is so, such monopolies as these will limit their powers to a very large extent. We have Harbour Grace to-day looking for a town Council and other towns will be looking for the same thing in the near future, and when they carry on these Councils they will want to do so without restriction of this kind. Here we have a company that is relieved from all taxes and assessments and rates for a period of fifty years. I think that it is most unjust to those who will be left to bear the burden of taxation and our successors in the near future will hand down the names of those in this House in execration and contempt when they find these exclusive monopolies and these exemptions from taxation. The injustice of the thing appears to me in this way; here are we members of the various districts representing the various cities and towns in the country, all contributing to the upkeep of the Government in order that the laws of the country may be carried out, and every man in the Island has to pay out of his income in order to have these laws carried out a certain amount of money into the revenue. Take a man whose income is $600 a year he pays something like $120 of that into the Revenue, but here we have a company that at the present time is earning dividends to the extent of $20,000 a year and putting by a reserve as well and they are not asked to pay one cent of taxation. I think that that is most unjust, and a Corporation that is securing such a large income from the people of the country as is this electrical company should be made to pay a certain sum in the way of taxation for the upkeep of any Government that may be in power, and I trust that the Government will consider this matter and observe the interests of the people who are coming in the future and will not exempt from taxation men who have means to pay towards the upkeep of the Colony.

MR. HIGGINS.—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say just one or two words. The Prime Minister has stated that this is a clearly local matter and it might be said to be in the nature of a private Bill, but whether private or public we are in the very same position, and those of us who intend to vote upon the measure should be satisfied as to the merits of the companies before we vote, but my reason more than anything else for saying a word this evening is the threat that is dangled over our heads in case we vote for the measure that is to be implied from the interesting remarks of the learned member for Port de Grave. He has impressed upon us

that in the future there will be heaped upon our heads contempt and derision if we grant this monopoly. I quite concur with him when he says that if we were granting any further powers there might be cause for complaint, but we are not doing that to-night. This Assembly is not doing that now. The monopoly is created, the actual fact is that whether the United Towns Electrical Company lights one section and the Conception Bay Electrical Company lights another, the monopoly has already been granted and is in existence now and will remain for a period of fifty years; let there be no misunderstanding about that. The acts referred to by the honourable member show clearly that this is so; and that being so the next question, even if we are going into the consideration of the bill that was passed in the first instance, the next question we have to consider is this: Would it be beneficial that the powers asked for should be granted? Supposing we were now considering the charters in the first instance, would we agree with the remarks of the honourable member for Port de Grave, and it seems to me that I would be inclined to vote for the measure despite the danger that usually hangs around the word "monopoly," because the history of these charters is there is not only difficulty but almost absolute impossibility of getting people to invest capital in any enterprise of this nature unless they have been granted some such exclusive rights. No sane Assembly are going to offer a charter to a company and expect anything should be done under it without having granted to them something in the nature of a monopoly, and particularly is this so in connection with enterprises such as this. Now what is the history of this Company, that has been in operation in the last few years? The hon. member must be aware, as we all are, that the operation of this Company in Carbonear and Harbour Grace has been productive of much good. In other words, as has been stated the people have got the benefit of the light at extraordinarily cheap terms, very much cheaper than we get them in St. John's or than are given in other cities, and the question is whether having these benefits before us we are doing any injury to the people by granting a monopoly of a few years. Everyone knows that the supply of light in Harbour Grace and Carbonear and vicinity is at very cheap rates; that excellent light is given, and that the people of other localities are satisfied in every possible way, so that even if we were granting a monopoly here this evening we would be justified by what has followed, but the question before us to-night is not that. All that these amendments called for to-night is that this company should be granted the power of carrying the light through to Brigus and Bay Roberts, so that they may have the same benefits and obtain the same advantages that have been granted to the towns of Heart's Content, Harbour Grace and Carbonear. I understand that, by the Act passed last year, the Company was given the right to supply the light and the power for 50 years. If that is so, we cannot very well say that a monopoly is now being given, simply because instead of being supplied by the Conception Bay Electric Company the light would now be supplied by the United Towns Electric Company. If this Company comes to us and says: "We are prepared to take over the control of this other company," how can we refuse them? This act does not create a new monopoly. Instead of having two compan-

ies operating in distinct centres, one company only will now operate in both. The position is simply this,— One Company says that it is unable to carry out its charter and wishes to amalgamate with another company. We are not granting them any further concessions and it would be unwise, in my opinion, not to allow these companies to unite. These companies have to receive every inducement before they come here and it means a big outlay and a big risk to them. One is expected in voting on such a matter to have definite reasons and decided opinions. I have made this short explanation that I may give my reason for supporting the Bill. I maintain that we are granting them no further concessions. It is all very well to speak of what the future holds in store for us; but we must also consider the present. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall feel it my duty to vote for the Bill as it stands.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, I think that the Government should avail of the suggestion made by Mr. Kent. I heard that the Company paid a dividend of 20%. If they are able to make such a dividend and have a large amount reserved, I think it is only fair that they should pay some certain amount of taxation. A great many people object to this exclusive control. I have heard many citizens of the District of Port de Grave and of Carbonear and Bay Roberts ask why this Act was brought up. With these few words, Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Government will see its way clear to acting on the suggested amendment.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make. The hon. member just said that he trusted the Government would take heed of his suggestion. We cannot take away the rights which we have already granted these people. Out of courtesy to the hon. member I yesterday agreed to his request to let the matter stand over and ask the companies if they would give up their monopoly rights. This was of course, hopeless; they would not hear of it. We are here merely asked by one company to give them the right to sell all concessions to the other. At a previous session we gave them these concessions as a condition of getting them to go there at all. We gave them this concession for only fifty years, which is a short time in the life of a country. Besides they cannot do what they like; there are other ways in which they can be dealt with by this House. This Company has given every satisfaction in the past and his furnished a cheap and good light. The Conception Bay Electric Company consists not of foreign capitalists, but of a number of our own enterprising citizens. These are the people who have been incorporated. These are the people who got this charter. Now, after having it for a year they come to us and say, we can do nothing with it but we can get another company to buy out our rights and do the work. Well, on the general principle of monopolies I am in entire accord with the hon. member. Monopolies are odious, except where you can do nothing else. Now, here is a case in which by holding out an inducement you may be able to get very great conveniences for all these settlements, and I don't know any other way in which it can be done. I see no risk in it myself. Every time anything like this comes before an Assembly, of course, these dangers are always put forward, and it is proper that they should be put forward, but I have never seen any of the

dangers that are always pointed out in relation to monopolies, at least, we have had no experience of them in this country so far. The trouble is that we have got all our resources lying dormant and undeveloped. We have only one mine working to-day, after all the years. In 1898 when we gave land to the Reid Newfoundland Co. the same arguments were used—you are giving a monopoly of all the lands to one man—and what has been the result. Although fifteen years have passed that man has not been able to sell an acre, and as far as I can see he wont be able to sell one for some time. I think where we make the mistake is by comparing our water powers and the value of our lands with more favored countries. Our lands are alright, but you want a lot of money to develop them, whether they are mineral lands or timber lands or farm lands. That is the trouble that we are suffering from to-day. We are situated near Canada and the United States, where there is plenty of capital and land equally as attractive as our own, and it will take a very long while before we will be able to bring capital from these countries down here. For that reason we have to give concessions Lord Northcliffe came here and asked for concessions that many people considered very objectionable. We had to give him a monopoly to a certain extent. Well now, we know that he has been here for four or five years. His Company has spent nearly $10,000,000 and up to the present time they have not paid a dividend, except a small dividend on a portion of the principal. As far as common stock is concerned, they have paid no dividend whatever. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think that we are not doing anything that we cannot justify when we give some concessions to this company.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Bills be read a third time presently.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 3, George V., Cap. 4., entitled, n Act to incorporate the Conception Bay Electric Company 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.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 2, Edward VII., Cap. 8.,entitled 'An Act to incorporate the United Towns Electrical Company 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.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider 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 financial years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1914, and the 30th day of June, 1915, and for other purposes relating to the Public 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 had passed the Bill without amendment.

It was ordered that this report be received and adopted and that the Bill be read a third time presently.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs 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 financial years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1914 and the 30th day of June, 1915, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," 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.

MR. KENT.—With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on the subject of temperance from Rev. Charles Suter and others, of Bell Island. The matter has been debated before, so that I would merely ask that it be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary with the other petitions.

Mr. Clift gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 10th, at four of the clock in the afternoon.

The House adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 10th

The House met at half past four of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

PETITIONS.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Curling asking for a sum of money to be used in the construction of one-half a mile of main road. I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition and I ask that it be received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Placentia Bay asking for a fog alarm at Merasheen Head. This petition is very numerously signed by all the fishermen in that part of the District. It has nearly four hundred names. I need hardly state that Merasheen Head is a very good fishing ground. It is also very foggy in some parts of the year. I trust that this petition will receive that consideration at the hands of the Government that its importance merits. I also beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Mary's, Peter's River and other outlying settlements in the settlement of St Mary's asking for a sum of money to complete the public wharf. The petitioners complain that owing to the incomplete wharf at the present time the Coastal boat does not call there as expected. It is a very great inconvenience to the fishermen of these outlying settlements as the Coast around there is exceptionally dangerous, and unless this matter is taken up we will find that some day there will be a fatality down there. I trust that the prayer of the petitioners will be heard and that the matter will be favourably considered by the Government.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting these petitions presented by my colleague Mr. Devereaux. In the first case the petition from five hundred fishermen of the western side of the Bay in connection with the fog alarm on Merasheen Island. It is now many years since we first heard a petition

on this subject from that place and the prayer of the petition presented this evening is just as earnest and just as eloquent as the one presented by the members that time. Around Merasheen Head are a great many shoals. It is a good fishing ground in that vicinity and is frequented in the summer season by steamers and fishing boats, and unfortunately it is during the fishing period that the fog is prevalent in Placentia Bay. It is more prevalent in Placentia Bay than in other parts of the country, and unfortunately the fishermen are often placed in great danger in making harbour in foggy or stormy weather. If there is one thing that we should undertake it is an endeavour to comply with such requests as these; we are very much put out ourselves when the electric light gives out in the city or if it is not as good as it ought to be, but we cannot realize what it means for a fisherman to be out in stormy weather surrounded by fog and with no beacon whatever to tell him where he is; there is no fishing coast in the world so badly lighted as Newfoundland. Up around Nova Scotia the coast is simply surrounded with fog alarms and other aids to navigation. Within the past few years there has been a great deal done in this direction here but not nearly enough, and I think that this is such a serious matter that the mere presenting of petitions in relation to the individual points of the particular localities is not sufficient. We ought seriously consider the whole question of the lighting of this coast and the erection of fog alarms on the most dangerous points. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition. I know the locality, and I have been there under very trying conditions, in fog and storm, and I know what is most good for the fishermen there, and I hope that we may soon be in a position to grant the prayer of the petition. Regarding the other petition in regard to the public wharf at St. Mary's, I hope that we will soon be able to allocate a few hundred dollars to add another section to the public wharf at that place.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting both these petitons which have been presented and spoken of by my colleagues; more especially am I interested in the fog alarm to be placed on Merasheen Head, because I am personally more acquainted with the conditions and have been master of a boat on Placentia Bay for about three years and on many occasions I have wished that such an aid to navigation were present on the West side of Placentia Bay. As has been said by my colleague, Mr. Morris, the South coast during the months of July and August is almost entirely engulfed in fog, and although a light house is certainly a necessity in my mind, it is far more important that we should have a fog alarm, because it is in dirty weather that an aid is more urgently necessary and in such weather a light house is of very little use I notice that this petition has been signed by about 500 people,that would take in probably the whole of the West side of the Bay. In stormy weather we frequently have to run for harbor and there are many rocks and a great many dangerous shoals on the rock-bound coast which make it very uncertain whether we will make harbor when conditions are unfavorable. As well as being a great boon to the fishermen it is a great necessity to have a fog alarm at the bottom of the Bay. At the present time there is no fog alarm and there is considerable foggy weather and the men are afraid to take the risk, and Merasheen is a particularly difficult part of the

coast. Sometimes with a southwest wind it makes a great lop and particularly is this noticeable when they get near the land, so that a fog alarm on Merasheen Head would obviate a great danger. I hope the Government will see its way clear to grant the prayer of this petition and thereby do considerable good to the fishermen of Placentia Bay.

I also have very much pleasure in supporting the petition from St Mary's in connection with the wharf I have been there several times and during my last visit this matter was brought particularly under my notice. Whilst I was there the Coastal boat came in and there was a storm on and a great number of people had a lot of freight, and they had to work at great disadvantage in getting it out into their boats. It would not cost us very much money to make this addition to the wharf and it would be a great advantage to the surrounding community.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Pacquet in the District of St. Barbe asking for the sum of $500 to complete the road running around the Harbour at the south west end The local grant is insufficient to complete the road and it is important to have this done. I hope that the Minister of Public Works will see that this grant is made and I ask that this petition be now referred to his Department.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Queen's Cove asking that the Government may see that the Reid Newfoundland Company erect a station at Northern Bight. This station takes in six places or settlements. The shack that is there at present gives no shelter whatever and the matter has already been spoken of before. This petition is largely signed by about one hundred people, and I hope that the Government will have the prayer of the petition carried out.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition. I have been at Northern Bight and I spent a night or two there, and the people drew my attention to the fact that there was no station there and nothing to receive freight, and they asked me to try and get the Government to arrange with the Reid Company to have a proper station put there. and that the station might be kept open. and that a fire may be kept there for heat so that people going there in the night will be able to find shelter. I know I went there about 3 o'clock in the morning on a bad day. I had to wait there for hours. There is no telegraph station and no proper station. There were two or three persons waiting there and they had no shelter, and I hope now that the attention of the Government has been drawn to it that something will be done in the matter. It would be very easy to make arrangements with the section man which he could carry out with great satisfaction.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, in regard to this matter, I may say that the Government has already taken up the matter and hope to receive a report from the Reid Company within a few days. There was a small shelter there but lately it was completely wrecked. The matter has already been taken up and we are having it looked into. I expect that the Reid Company will have some reason if they do not erect a station there as they generally have erected stations wherever they could possibly do so. However, the matter has been taken up, and we hope for a satisfactory conclusion very shortly.

DR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, just one word on this matter. I am very

pleased to hear that the Government has taken up this matter It may be remembered that on the estimates I spoke of the same thing with more especial reference to Come by Chance and Long Harbour, and I understand that what the Government is doing will cover these stations as well.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, the whole matter of these stations has been taken up by the Government.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Amherst Cove dealing with various public matters there. This is one of the large number of petitions received dealing with the same matter. I have presented some twenty or thirty during the Session. I ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bell Island in regard to a matter which deserves the attention of the House. the matter of repairs to the Public Wharf at Portugal Cove. This matter has already been called to the attention of the Government, but this petition contains an additional request. This wharf is used considerably by the business people of Bell Island both for freight and passengers, and this petition asks that if the wharf is built it should be extended as far as Anchor Rock. I trust that this additional request from the other side of the Tickle from the people most concerned with the wharf will impress itself upon the Government, and that they will take measures to have the request carried out. I have nothing more to add to this petition, except to repeat what has already been said of the necessity of having this wharf built.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition and I simply ask that the matter receive the attention of the Government as the need for this is apparent. People going to and from Bell Island find the necessity of this wharf very great. It is a great inconvenience at the present time as the wharf has been carried away almost entirely, and I ask the Department of Marine & Fisheries to give the matter their attention as soon as they possibly can. The spring business is now on, and the people of Bell Island are suffering great inconvenience.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Ferryland asking that a sum of money be granted to clear out the Gut. It is absolutely necessary that considerable work should be done in order to get this Gut open, and I ask to have this petition received and sent to the Department of Marine & Fisheries where no doubt, it will receive that consideration which its importance merits.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Cashin.

QUESTIONS.

MR. CLIFT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House copies of the returns of expenditure of the following allocations made to H. G. LeDrew for public wharf at Pilley's Island, in the District of Twillingate, viz: February 20th, 1913, $100; April 19th, 1913, $100; June 16th, 1913, $150.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES tabled answer.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of the returns of an allocation of $50 said to have been

made to Mr. T. W. Abbott, of Musgrave Harbor, in the year 1910, for the purpose of digging or concreting well at Musgrave Harbor, Fogo District.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—I hope to have this tomorrow.

MR. COAKER—Will information be available to members out of Session, in relation to their Districts?

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

SEALING BILL.

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 amendments made by the House of Assembly in and upon the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled: 'An Act to Regulate the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery' with an amendment in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Council's amendment was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendment was 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 amendment 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 bills sent up entitled respectively: 'An Act respecting Municipal Council affairs'; 'An Act respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate, Ltd'; 'An Act further to amend 'The Revenue Act, 1905''; 'An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1914, and the 30th day of June, 1915, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service;' 'An Act to amend the Act 1, George V., cap. 24, entitled: 'An Act respecting Pilots and Pilotage for the Port of St John's''; 'An Act to amend 3 George V., Cap. 4, entitled 'An Act to incorporate the Conception Bay Electric Company and for other purposes''; and 'An Act to amend 2 Edward VII., Cap. 8, entitled, 'An Act to incorporate the United Towns Electrical Company and for other purposes' without amendment.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn unjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 11th, at half past two of the clock in the afternoon

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 11th, 1914.

The House met at half past two of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER tabled certain correspondence between the Hon. Colonial Secretary and Doctor Keegan relating to general Hospital affairs.

MR. KENT.—Mr. Speaker, I observe that certain perquisites taken by Dr. Keegan have been suspended pending enquiry. My own opinion is that it was not fair to stop the emoluments the medical Superintendent was getting until after enquiry as to whether he was entitled to them or not. I am sorry we have not now time to discuss the matter.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.— Mr. Speaker, I beg to table reply to a question asked by Mr. Stone on the 6th March.

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.

Mr. Speaker at the Bar of the Council Chamber addressed His Excellency as follows:—
May it Please Your Excellency:

The House of Assembly have voted the supply required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the House of Assembly, I present the following Bills for Your Excellency's assent:

An Act for the granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1914, and the 30th day of June, 1915, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

An Act for the raising by the sale of Debenture Bonds, a loan for the Public Service of the Colony.

An Act to amend 'The Revenue Act, 1905.'

An Act to amend the Act 61, Vic. Cap. 8, entitled 'An Act respecting Salaries.'

An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances.

An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for the Extension of the Railway System of the Colony.

An Act to amend Chapters 40 and 41 of Consolidated Statutes (Second Series) respecting the Storage and Carrying of Gunpowder and other Explosives.

An Act respecting the Exhibition of Advertisements.

An Act to amend Chapter 109 of the Consolidated Statutes (Second Series) entitled 'Patents.'

An Act to amend 6, Edward VII., Cap. 3, entitled 'The Aliens' Act, 1906.'

An Act relating to the Inspection of Foods in the City of St. John's.

An Act further to amend 'The Newfoundland Dental Act.'

An Act to amend and consolidate the Law for Protection of Animals.

An Act to regulate the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery.

An Act to amend Chapter 5 of 8, Edward VII., entitled 'An Act with respect to Compensation to Workmen for injuries suffered in course of their employment.'

An Act for the protection of the growth of Partridge Berries.

An Act to amend the law relating to the representation in the House of Assembly.

An Act to provide for the Investigation of Combines and Monoplies.

An Act respecting the Operation of Saw Mills.

An Act to apply to this Colony the law of England in relation to the suppression of what is known as the White Slave Traffic.

An Act respecting the Newfoundland Railway and Train-Ferry Syndicate, Limited.

An Act to amend the Act 61, Vic. Cap. 3, entitled 'An Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.'

An Act to amend 3, George V., Cap. 4, entitled 'An Act to incorporate the Conception Bay Electrical Company and for other purposes.'

An Act to amend 2, Edward VII., Cap. 8, entitled 'An Act to incorporate the United Towns' Electrical Company and for other purposes.'

An Act to amend the Act 1, George . Cap. 24, entitled 'An Act respecting Pilots and Pilotage for the Port of St. John's.'

An Act respecting Municipal Affairs.

His Excellency was then pleased to make the following Speech to both branches of the Legislature:—

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:
Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly:

I am glad to be able to relieve you from your sessional duties at so early a date, a circumstance rendered possible by the diligence with which you have applied yourselves to the business considered by you, and by the harmonious character of your deliberations. I sincerely hope that the various measures passed by you, many of them of exceptional importance, will produce the benefits expected from them.

The measures adopted for dealing with the tariff are such as will, I trust, ensure ample provision for the great expansion in and improvement of the large public services inaugurated during the past few years. The equitable and eminently reasonable principles underlying the proposals you have resolved upon will, I am sure, earn the approbation of the public.

Your prompt and prudent action in resolving upon an enquiry into the fisheries is most opportune. The manner in which it has been received is a guarantee that every element in the country realizes its importance and is prepared to facilitate the working out of the problem. The Commission which you recommended, and which, I propose appointing at an early date, should be in a position to present, at your next session, a report which may be fruitful in conserving and developing the great fishing industries on which the prosperity of this country so largely depends.

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

I thank you for the supplies which you have voted for the Public Service. In the expenditure of them the principles of economy and judicious appropriation will be observed.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:
Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly:

I sincerely trust that the seal fishery, in the prosecution of which so many of our people will shortly embark, will be a successful one, and the harbinger of similar good fortune to other fishing industries which follow it.

In taking leave of you, I earnestly pray that Providence may guide you and our common country along the paths that lead to greater material welfare and prosperity.

After which the Honourable the President of the Legislative Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor, said:

Gentlemen:

It is His Excellency's will and pleasure that this General Assembly be prorogued until Wednesday, the fifteenth day of April next, then and here to be holden; and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly.

INDEX.

ABBOTT, MR.

On Address in Reply, 121
On Supply, 252.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 342.

ADVERTISEMENTS BILL, 27, 29, 215, 316, 445.

ALIENS BILL, 27, 29, 215, 299, 316.

ADDRESS IN REPLY,—

Moved by Mr. Currie, 8.
Seconded by Mr. Higgins, 13.
Committee, 27.
Report, 31.
Debate, 31, 59, 83, 106, 127, 144.
Division, 195.
Received by Governor, 255.

ADDRESS OF THANKS,—

From Governor, 255.

BENNETT, HON. J. R.

On Address in Reply, 114.
On Supply, 246, 271, 398, 404, 410, 502, 504.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 303, 377.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 320.
On Combines and Monopolies Bill, 557.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 649.
On Loggers Bill, 716.
On Question of Privilege, 772.
On Municipal Affairs Bill, 821.
On Revenue Bill, 873.

BUDGET, THE, 611.

BILLS PASSED DURING SESSION, 918.

COAKER, MR.

On Address in Reply, 33, 157.
On Supply 238, 247, 248, 251, 252, 253, 267, 283, 295, 354, 400, 405, 413, 415, 420, 423, 476, 480, 482, 486, 500, 505, 531.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 301, 307, 309, 322, 323, 329, 364, 379.
On Sealing Bill, 381, 435, 466, 471, 587, 590, 894, 897.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 434, 708, 709, 710, 809.
On Combines and Monopolies Bill, 552, 559.
On Workmen's Compensation Bill, 560, 664.
On Loggers Bill 560, 712, 718.
On House of Assembly Representation Bill, 571.
On Saw Mills Bill, 584, 666, 668.
On Railway Loan Bill, 604, 687.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 640.
On Public Service Loan Bill, 671, 674.
On Retiring Allowances Bill, 689.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 711.
On Ways and Means, 758, 788, 802, 803, 810, 815, 816.
On Question of Privilege, 770, 772.
On Municipal Affairs Bill, 828.
On Marine and Fisheries Bill, 827, 831, 833, 836.
On Train-Ferry Service Bill, 846, 847.
On Revenue Bill, 870, 880, 886.
On Public Service Bill, 890.

CROSBIE, HON. J. C.

On Address in Reply, 179.
On Supply, 253.
On Sealing Bill, 470.
On Ways and Means, 800, 802, 803, 804.

CLIFT, MR.

On Address in Reply, 31.
On Supply, 263, 469, 474, 488, 528.
On Public Services Loan Bill, 597, 675.
On Railway Loan Bill, 689.
On Question of Privilege, 771.
On Ways and Means, 775.

CURRIE, MR.
On Speech from Throne, 8.
On Supply, 368, 485, 487, 541.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 655.
On Public Service Bill, 890.

CLAPP, MR.
On Address in Reply, 137.
On Supply, 244, 265, 270, 271, 282, 397, 399, 411, 501, 531.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 433.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 648.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL, 55, 59, 217, 316, 703, 711.

CONDOLENCE, RESOLUTION OF,—
Hon. J. S. Pitts and Judge Prowse, 139.

COMBINES AND MONOPOLIES BILL, 409, 525, 549, 609, 767.

CONCEPTION BAY ELECTRIC CO. BILL, 767, 849, 854, 906, 917.

DEVEREAUX, MR.
On Address in Reply, 64.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 434.
On Fishery Resolutions, 520.
On Supply, 529.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 647.

DWYER, MR.
On Address in Reply, 71, 156.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 302, 374.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 712.

DOWNEY, MR.
On Address in Reply, 72, 94, 193.
On Sealing Bill, 441.
On Fishery Resolutions, 516.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 651.
On Loggers Bill, 718.
On Marine and Fisheries Bill, 829, 831, 833.
On Train-Ferry Service Bill, 840, 848.
On Revenue Bill, 888.

DENTAL BILL, 55, 59, 217, 316, 465.

EMERSON, HON. C. H.
On Address in Reply, 154.
On Sealing Bill, 442, 470.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 639.

FISHERY RESOLUTIONS, 454. 507.

FISHERY COMMITTEE REPORT, 892.

GUNPOWDER AND EXPLOSIVE BILL, 27, 29, 381, 426, 448, 703, 710, 711.

GRIMES, MR.
On Address in Reply, 39, 135.
On Supply, 286, 401, 406, 482.
On Inspection of Foods Bill. 312, 348.
On Combines and Monopolies Bill, 558.
On Sealing Bill, 589.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 646.
On Loggers Bill, 714.
On Ways and Means, 783.
On Conception Bay Electrical Co. Bill, 885, 907, 911.
On Revenue Bill, 889.

HICKMAN, MR.
On Address in Reply, 98.
On Supply, 404, 410.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 432, 709, 810.
On Sealing Bill, 472.
On Fishery Resolutions. 508.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 653.
On Marine and Fisheries Bill, 831, 833, 834, 836.
On Train-Ferry Service Bill, 846.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATION BILL, 409, 525, 569, 609, 767.

HALFYARD, MR.
On Address in Reply, 40, 102, 106.
On Supply, 244, 248. 272, 371, 388, 483, 543.

On Inspection of Foods Bill, 310.
On Loggers Bill, 718.
On Question of Privilege, 774.
On Ways and Means, 778.
On Revenue Bill, 889.

HIGGINS, MR.
On Speech from Throne, 13.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 302, 313, 334, 342.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 319.
On Supply, 413.
On Sealing Bill, 440, 470, 471, 544, 587.
On Loggers Bill, 717.
On Municipal Affairs Bill, 820.
On Electric Companies Bills, 909.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION,—
Members of, 31.
Report tabled, 79.

INSPECTION OF FOODS BILL, 55, 59, 216, 300, 374, 396, 691, 702.

JENNINGS, MR.
On Address in Reply, 43.
On Supply, 248, 251, 274, 277, 280, 282, 355, 408, 412, 423, 482, 484, 505, 539.
On Inspction of Foods Bill, 329, 380.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 432.
On House of Assembly Representation Bill, 573.
On Saw Mills Bill, 585, 586, 665.
On Sealing Bill, 591.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 643.
On Loggers Bill, 718.
On Ways and Means, 777.
On Marine and Fisheries Bill, 829, 834.
On Train Ferry Service Bill, 848.
On Revenue Bill, 880.

KENNEDY, MR. M. J.
On Address in Reply, 133.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 312.
On Municipal Affairs Bill, 824.

KENT, MR. J. M.
On resignation Sir Robert Bond, 8.
On Address in Reply, 17, 59.
On Resolution of Condolence Pitts and Prowse, 141.
On Supply, 200, 224, 243, 246, 251, 254, 257, 290, 294, 355, 356, 370, 397, 403, 407, 411, 412, 414, 416, 453, 491, 506, 528, 661.
On Advertisements Bill, 215.
On Inspction of Foods Bill, 217, 301, 305, 310, 313, 322, 380.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 219, 319.
On Patents Bill, 214, 298.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 433, 709, 808, 809.
On Sealing Bill, 443, 467, 894, 897.
On Fishery Resolutions, 464, 511.
On Combines and Monopolies Bill, 551.
On Loggers Bill, 568, 715, 718.
On Saw Mills Bill, 584, 666, 667.
On Public Srvices Loan Bill, 597, 668.
On Railway Loan Bill, 601.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 635.
On Ways and Means, 736, 801, 804.
On Question of Privilege, 768, 770, 773.
On Municipal Affairs Bill, 819, 828.
On Marine and Fisheries Bill, 837, 838.
On Conception Bay Electric Co. Bill, 854.
On Public Service Bill, 890.
On Revenue Bill, 897.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE, 103.

LOGGERS BILL, 371, 373, 560, 712.

LOAN BILLS,—
Railway, 593, 676, 818.
Public Services, 593, 594, 668, 818.

LOCAL AFFAIRS RESOLUTIONS, 610, 634.

LABRADOR BOUNDARY DISPUTE, 691.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS BILL, 704, 708, 763, 818, 853, 917.

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT BILL, 719, 736, 805, 828, 854, 894.

LLOYD, MR.

On Address in Reply, 73, 83.
On Supply, 236, 244, 359, 362, 402, 405, 411, 418, 491, 493, 496, 499, 503, 505, 529, 663.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 313, 322, 375, 377.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 321.
On Combines and Monopolies Bill, 556.
On Public Services Loan Bill, 597, 668, 671.
On Railway Loan Bill, 603, 656, 686.
On Local Affairs Bill, 653, 656, 702.
On Saw Mills Bill, 665, 702.
On Labrador Boundary Dispute, 691.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 710, 810.
On Question of Privilege, 768, 770, 771.
On Ways and Means, 801, 813, 814.
On Revenue Bill, 857, 868, 885, 888.

LeFEUVRE, MR.

On Local Affairs Resolutions, 646.
On Public Services Loan Bill, 673, 674.

MORRIS, RT. HON. SIR E. P.

On Resignation Sir Robert Bond, 7.
On Speech from the Throne, 21.
On Address in Reply, 45, 182.
On Resolution of Condolence, Pitts and Prowse, 139.
On Patent Bill, 214, 297.
On Advertisements Bill, 215, 316.
On Aliens Bill, 215, 299.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 216, 300, 302, 314, 321, 322, 325, 344, 374, 376, 380, 702.
On Dental Bill, 217, 316.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 217, 316, 318, 711.
On Supply, 230, 245, 252, 253, 269, 292, 295, 357, 360, 369, 399, 408, 410, 416, 418, 420, 421, 480, 482, 483, 491, 503, 516, 530, 533.
On Explosives Bill, 381, 426.
On Sealing Bill, 385, 896.

On Partridge Berries Bill, 427, 432, 708, 709, 710.
On Fishery Resolutions, 454.
On Combines and Monopolies Bill, 549, 554, 557.
On Loggers Bill, 566, 714.
On House of Assembly Representation Bill, 569.
On White Slave Traffic Bill, 574.
On Saw Mills Bill, 574, 664, 667.
On Railway Loan Bill, 603, 606, 679.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 636, 656.
On Public Services Loan Bill, 673.
On Retiring Allowances Bill, 690.
On Labrador Boundary Dispute, 691.
On Train-Ferry Service Resolutions, 703, 846, 847.
On Question of Privilege, 768, 774.
On Ways and Means, 789, 814, 815, 817.
On Municipal Affairs Bill, 818, 827.
On Marine and Fisheries Bill, 828, 832, 835, 836, 837, 838.
On Electrical Cos. Bills, 849, 854, 855, 906, 911.
On Pilots Bill, 856.
On Revenue Bill, 864, 873, 885, 887, 902.
On Public Service Bill, 890.

MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS, HON.
On Address in Reply, 90.
On Supply, 200, 229, 355, 449, 479, 480, 493, 497, 498, 661, 663.
On Public Services Loan Bill, 594, 668, 670.
On Railway Loan Bill, 598, 608.
On Ways and Means, 611, 751.
On Marine and Fisheries Bill, 836, 838.

MOULTON, MR.
On Address in Reply, 96.
On Supply, 246, 252.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 308, 328.
On Sealing Bill, 439.
On Fishery Resolutions, 518.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 652.
On Saw Mills Bill, 666, 667.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 809.
On Marine and Fisheries Bill, 834.

MOORE, MR.

On Address in Reply, 110.
On Supply, 424.
On Revenue Bill, 879.

MORRIS, MR. F. J.

On Address in Reply, 146.
On Supply, 262.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 318, 321, 712.
On Sealing Bill, 443.
On Question of Privilege, 769.
On Marine and Fisheries Bill, 830.

PETITIONS,—

Abbott, J., 143, 395, 446, 548, 593, 851.
Bennett, Hon. J. R., 277, 468, 659, 696, 915.
Cashin, Hon. M. P., 916.
Clapp, W. M., 79, 352, 394, 660, 765, 915.
Clift, J. A., 143, 220, 445, 468, 473, 526, 692, 697, 704, 728, 765, 891.
Coaker, W. F., 125, 142, 351, 474, 610, 700, 706, 707, 725, 766, 892, 915, 916.
Crosbie, Hon. J. C., 734.
Currie, J. S., 395, 447, 547, 659, 726.
Devereux, R. J., 394, 425, 446, 474, 526, 657, 705, 731, 765, 806, 851, 891, 913.
Downey, J. F., 350, 393, 425, 593, 692, 734, 763, 891.
Dwyer, J., 79, 699, 806.
Emerson, Hon. C. H., 103, 213, 220, 469.
Grimes, G. F. A., 197, 350, 473, 490, 732, 806.
Halfyard, W. W., 195, 473, 707, 730, 764, 892.
Hickman, A. E., 221, 352, 469, 526, 700, 706, 806, 807, 891, 892.
Higgins, W. J., 124, 425, 547, 593, 698, 763, 806, 916.
Jennings, Mr., 143, 213, 220, 296, 350, 393, 446, 468, 472, 526, 656, 692, 705, 706, 729, 765, 805.
Kennedy, G., 692, 805, 851.
Kennedy, M. J., 276, 468, 699.
Kent, J. M., 29, 79, 425, 594, 658, 695, 704, 722, 806, 913, 916.
LeFeuvre, T., 395, 426, 447, 548, 659, 706.

Lloyd, Mr., 223, 315, 526, 661, 705, 729, 807, 891, 915.
Moore, P. F., 916.
Morris, F. J., 394, 425, 446, 474, 526, 657, 708, 807, 892, 913.
Morris, Sir E. P., 222, 469, 692, 719, 892.
Moulton, R., 79, 104, 213, 220, 352, 610, 728.
Parsons, E., 104, 142, 372, 469, 525, 548, 728, 866.
Piccott, A. W., 104, 142, 198, 548, 706, 733.
Stone, J. T., 125, 187, 213, 221, 223, 277, 297, 351, 352, 446, 468, 473, 525, 596, 610, 657, 660, 705, 729, 764, 807, 851, 891, 892, 915.
Targett, A., 104, 125, 197, 213, 221, 223, 277, 296, 351, 353, 446, 468, 593, 610, 660, 708, 730, 852, 892.
Walsh, W. J., 394, 426, 446, 657, 706, 766, 807, 892, 914.
Winsor, R. G., 143, 395, 446, 474, 548, 593, 706, 729.
Woodford, W., 692, 805, 851.
Young, M. M., 548.

PATENTS BILL, 27, 29, 214, 297, 316, 474, 490.

PARSONS, MR.
On Address in Reply, 112.
On Supply, 424.
On Ways and Means, 804.

PARTRIDGE BERRIES BILL, 388, 427, 703, 708, 808, 828.

PILOTS AND PILOTAGE BILL, 763, 767, 850, 856, 897, 917.

PRIVILEGE, 767.

PICCOTT, MR.
On Supply, 279, 289.
On Sealing Bill, 591.
On Loan Bill, 596.
On Loggers Bill, 718.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL, 818, 890, 912, 917.

QUESTIONS,—
Mr. Abbott, 58, 82, 106, 214, 256, 297, 315, 372, 490, 527, 661, 701, 735, 767, 807, 852.
Mr. Clapp, 126, 198, 255.
Mr. Clift, 29, 80, 255, 409, 447, 490, 528, 916.
Mr. Coaker, 27, 29, 56, 80, 105, 198, 315, 372, 611, 917.
Mr. Dwyer, 126.
Mr. Grimes, 57, 83, 126, 144, 213, 353, 489, 528, 548, 735, 766.
Mr. Hickman, 256, 354, 448.
Mr. Halfyard, 57, 106, 126, 200, 255, 297, 353, 373 526, 528, 610, 661, 702, 736, 767, 916.
Mr. Jennings, 81, 198, 199, 256, 315, 372, 396, 490, 527, 548, 661, 701, 735, 766, 808, 853.
Mr. Kent, 28, 29, 56, 80, 105, 198, 256, 297, 354, 527, 611, 661, 853.
Mr. Lloyd, 372, 448.
Mr. Stone, 57, 81, 126, 198, 213, 256, 315, 354, 396, 490, 527, 610, 734, 766, 808, 852.
Mr. Targett, 82, 126, 200, 257, 315, 396, 549, 661, 701, 735, 766, 767, 808.
Mr. Winsor, 57, 82, 106, 213, 297, 354, 853.

RESIGNATION SIR ROBERT BOND, 7.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL, 656, 689, 702.

REVENUE BILL, 850, 857, 897, 906, 917.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE,—
Opening, 4.
Closing, 919.

SUPPLY, 55, 59, 144, 200, 224, 257, 297, 354, 373, 388, 397, 410, 426, 449, 469, 474, 490, 528, 549, 661, 702.

SELECT COMMITTEES,—
On Address in Reply, 27.
On Fishery Resolutions, 525, 544.

STONE, MR.
On Address in Reply, 95.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 308, 341.

On Supply, 401, 410, 483, 484, 485, 502, 530.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 655.
On Public Services Loan Bill, 674.
On Question of Privilege, 774.
On Revenue Bill, 884, 889.

SEALING BILL, 195, 212, 381, 435, 465, 469, 488, 544, 587, 609, 818, 894, 917.

SAW MILLS BILL, 574, 664, 702, 890, 897.

SALARIES BILL, 719, 736, 805, 828, 853, 894.

SUSPENSION OF RULES, 891, 894.

TARGETT, MR.
On Address in Reply, 139, 144.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 340.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 433.
On Supply, 540.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 647.
On Marine and Fisheries Bill, 837, 839.
On Revenue Bill, 883.

TRAIN-FERRY SERVICE RESOLUTION, 656, 703; BILL, 763, 805, 840, 854, 917.

UNITED TOWNS ELECTRICAL CO. BILL, 763, 767, 850, 856, 906, 917.

WOODFORD, MR.
On Address in Reply, 122, 127.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 649.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL, 373, 560, 664, 702, 818.

WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC BILL, 472, 525, 574, 609, 767.

WAYS AND MEANS, 547, 611, 736, 775, 810.

WALSH, MR.
On Sealing Bill, 466.
On Revenue Bill, 889.

YOUNG, MR.
On Sealing Bill, 545, 588, 590.
On Saw Mills Bill, 586.

WINSOR, MR.
On Address in Reply, 112.
On Supply, 248.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 339.
On Sealing Bill, 444, 465, 590.
On Local Affairs Resolutions, 647, 651.
On Saw Mills Bill, 666.
On Revenue Bill, 882.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

DURING THE

FIRST SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1914

NEWFOUNDLAND

OF

TWENTY-THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF THE

FIRST SESSION

DURING THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF NEWFOUNDLAND

SESSION 1914

WEDNESDAY, Jan'y 14th, '14.

This being the day appointed by Proclamation for the meeting of the Legislature, at five minutes to three o'clock the House met, when the Commissioners nominated and appointed by His Excellency the Governor took their seats. The Hon. President then commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to proceed to the Hon. House of Assembly and inform the members thereof that His Excellency the Governor's Commissioners desire their immediate attendance in the Council Chamber to hear the Commission read.

The Commission was then read by the Clerk of the Legislative Council.

The President of the Legislative Council, addressing both Houses of the Legislature then said:

Hon. Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

Gentlemen of the Hon. House of Assembly:

It is not convenient for His Excellency the Governor to declare the reasons of his calling this General Assembly on this day; and it being necessary that a Speaker of the House of Assembly should be first chosen,—

You, Gentlemen of the House of Assembly, repair to the place where you are to sit, and there proceed to the appointment of some proper person to be your Speaker, and present such person whom you shall so choose here, to-morrow at three o'clock for His Excellency's approbation.

The House of Assembly then withdrew.

On motion of Hon R.K. Bishop, the House adjourned till tomorrow Thursday, at 2.45 p.m.

THURSDAY, January 15, 1914.

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY.

At 4 p.m. after the members of the House of Assembly had retired and His Excellency had withdrawn, the Hon. President took the Chair and the Clerk read the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON—I rise with pleasure Mr. President to move the appointment of a Select Committee to draft an address in reply to His Excellency the Governor for the gracious speech with which he has been pleased to open the present session of the Legislature.

Before doing so, I desire to say that since last I had the pleasure of attending in this House, some new members have been appointed to the Legislative Council, and I take the first opportunity that I have had to welcome the Hon .Messrs. Goodridge, Ryan and Templeman. I also desire to extend a most cordial welcome to the two latest additions which have been made to the membership of this House. Hon. Mr.

Power and Hon. Mr. Murphy.

I now crave the indulgence of the House, Mr. President for a few minutes to make a personal explanation. I stand at the present moment in a most peculiar position. I hold in my one hand a copy of the Evening Telegram of date October 14th, 1908, I hold in my other hand a copy of the Evening Herald of October 7th 1913, just within a week, five years afterwards. During the contest of the General Election in 1908, the present Prime Minister in his Manifesto to the people of the country, made no less than thirty six promises to the electors of the Colony, undertaking that if elected to power these promises he would pledge himself to faithfully carry out. It was upon these promises, or some of them that I made a speech in the British Hall during the political contest in October 1908. I said at that time it would be impossible for Sir Edward Morris to carry out his promises without increasing taxation.

At that time I further said: "I am not partisan enough to support any wild cat scheme, no matter whence it comes from, if I don't believe it will benefit our country, but I am Liberal and Conservative enough to back up and support any measure no matter what side it comes from, that I believe will raise our people and the country into a more prosperous condition." I further said that: "If my friend Sir Edward, can show me how all that he promises to do can be carried out without further taxation, I will join his party to-morrow and shout Hosanna to our new Leader.'

The promises which Sir Edward made have been faithfully carried out, and that without increased taxation. This is the first opportunity that I have had to put the reason before my friends and the country for my supporting the Morris Government in their Branch Railway Policy. First—I promised to do so if there were no changes in the tariff for increased taxation. Second—In the Morris Manifesto of 1908 and 1909 the construction of Branch Railways was the principal plank before the people of the country, and the people returned the Morris Government by a large majority, to carry out their Railway policy, and other progressive measures. Nothing else was left for me but to carry out my promise, and support the Government which I did, and so far I have had no reason to regret it.

Some of the promises, Mr. President, which were made by Sir Edward Morris and his candidates in the general election of 1908, which I criticized and said that it would be impossible to carry out, were:—

Promise No. 1—Reduction of Taxation. Carried out.

Promise No. 2—Branch Railway lines. Successfully carried out, and at the present time there is completed, Bonavista Branch, 83¾ miles; Trepassey 105 miles; Heart's Content 34¼ miles; Bay de Verde, 52¾ miles; Fortune Bay so far finished, 15 miles Total 295¾ miles completed.

Promise No. 3—Increased grant for Education (which I shall refer to later). Carried out.

Promise No. 4—Our Fishery Policy. Carried out.

Promise No. 5—The Providing of Steam Subsidies. Carried out.

Promise No. 6—The Establishment of a Daily Fishery and Telegraph Service. Carried out.

Promise No. 7—The Extension of our Telegraphic System; successfully

carried out, and the best answer to this promise is the certificate from the Postal Department where the Superintendent says:

"At the end of 1908, the last year of the Bond Government we had 123 Telegraph Offices open and in operation. Since then we have opened 54 new offices. In 1908 we had 16 local cables aggregating 19 miles, in operation. Since then we have laid 18 cables aggregating 42¾ miles.

Promise No. 8—The Dredging of Shallow Harbours around our coast. Carried out.

Promise No. 9.—The Extension of Lighthouses, Fog Alarms, Public Wharves, Breakwaters and other Marine Works. This promise has been most faithfully carried out, as the following Certificate from the Lighthouse Department will show:—'Number of Lighthouses open and in operation since 1908, 28. Number of Lighthouses now in course of construction 15. Lighthouses improved since 1908, 18. Fog Alarms opened and in operation during the same period, 8. Fog Alarms now in course of construction 5. Fog alarms improved since 1908, 3.' In addition to the foregoing I find that twenty five wharf and small fishing lights have been supplied to different harbours around the coast.

Promise No 10—The providing of a Winter Coastal Service to Northern ports and such additional Bay Steam Service as trade requirements may demand. Carried out.

Promise No.11—Hospital Extension for Outports. Carried out.

Promise No. 12—The providing of Old Age Pensions. At that time Oct. 14th, 1908, I over-estimated the scheme. The following is what I said in part:—

"The providing of Old Age Pensions for our people is a matter that demands immediate attention and this it shall receive at our hands. Legislation of this character is already in operation in Australia, New Zealand, Germany and Great Britain, with the examples of these countres before us a feasible scheme applicable to our circumstances and one within the means of the Colony and not requiring additional taxation, can be devised, so says Sir Edward. Now, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, it is true old age pensions are in operation in the countries that I have just mentioned. In Great Britain it is only in an experimental stage and does not come into operation until the first of January, 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 tonight the cost is many millions of pounds sterling. But my friend, Sir Edward, in his message to the people of Newfoundland says he can give old age pensions without increasing taxation. If he can 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 at 225,000 and give a pension to one out of every sixty five that would mean 3,500 old people would be required 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

fisher folk 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 feel a little independent. But whether it be the Bond or the 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 how 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."

The present Government put the Old Age Pensions in operation in the year 1911 by giving four hundred old men from 75 years of age a pension of fifty dollars a year amounting to twenty thousand dollars. In 1912 they added four hundred more; making the total forty thousand dollars, and in 1913 another four hundred were added; bringing the amount up to sixty thousand dollars, so that during the past three years, a sum of one hundred and twenty thousand dollars has been spent in Old Age Pensions. To-day there are twelve hundred old men receiving a pension.

The work accomplished by the present Government during the past four years, has simply been marvellous. The three great measures which stand out most prominently before the people of the country are, Branch Railways, Old Age Pensions and the Reduction of Taxation.

Had I refused my support to the Government, after I made the promise to do so, I would not have been true to myself or the country that I have made by home for three quarters of my life.

The speech from the Throne, Mr. President, with which His Excellency has been pleased to open the present session of the Legislature, I propose to review paragraph by paragraph.

No. 1—We join with His Excellency in the hope that the continuance of the prosperity and contentment amongst the people of the Colony will prevail for many years to come.

No. 2—We note with pleasure that His Excellency the Governor during the past year visited different parts of the country, and made himself acquainted with our people and their various pursuits. We hope during the present year that he will be able to see much more of the country, and the many industries of the Colony.

No. 3—This refers to the intended visit of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Connaught, during the coming summer. We earnestly hope that the health of the Duchess will continue good—and should their engagements permit them to visit Britain's oldest Colony, their welcome to Newfoundland will be as whole hearted as was given to their Majesties the King and Queen, when they visited here as the Duke and Duchess of York some years ago.

No. 4—Early session of the House. We agree with His Excellency that the calling of the House together so early in January, should be of mutual benefit to the Government and members of both Houses.

No. 5—This refers to the General Election in October last, and the law abiding character of the people. We entirely endorse His Excellency's declaration that there is no more law abiding people in any part of the British Empire than we find in all parts of the Colony. Particularly is this so in St John's—where party feeling runs high.

No. 6—The fishing industry, codfish, lobsters and the American Tariff Law. Mr. President,—the Harvest of the Sea. The fishing industry of the country must be for some years the mainstay and backbone of the trade and commerce of the Colony, especially the codfishery. It is a commodity, in which the fishermen have a direct interest from the time the fish are taken out of the water.

Mr. President and Hon. Gentlemen, we are all interested in this great industry, the fisheries of the Colony, the harvest of the sea and its great wealth. Providence has blessed this country with a bountiful supply of bait, and to spare. The bait or caplin which annually comes in upon our shores, it would be difficult to place a value on. It is one of our best national assets, and no matter what the debt of the Colony is at the present time, whether it be twenty seven millions or more, or less, the value of our bait fishes to this Colony would pay it many times over. Who can estimate the value of our bait; and what it would be worth to the United States, Canada or France? We earnestly hope the Government will pay earnest attention to our great fisheries because the cod fishery is the greatest industry of the Colony and has always been a noted one. The fishermen of the United Kingdom, France Spain, Portugal and the United States have frequented the shores and Banks of Newfoundland during a period ranging from Anno Domini 1500. So prolific is it that it seems to yearly increase instead of decrease. Though the mean annual export of cod from Newfoundland does not vary much, more people are engaged in the fisheries about its coast and more fish is consumed by the fishermen as well as caught by the fishermen of different nations, which frequent its banks. It is not easy to estimate the value of the codfish taken from the waters contiguous to Newfoundland. The French, Portuguese, Canadians and fishermen of the United States carry on a Bank Fishery on the Grand and Lesser Banks to the South of Newfoundland, and the Labrador banks, and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

In 1814 when the Banks were occupied solely by British fishermen the catch amounted to 1,200,000 quintals of dry codfish valued at £2. 0. 0 Stg. per quintal, while the yield of cod oil was 6,000 tuns, valued at £32. 0. 0. Stg. per tun. At the time the fishery was prosecuted on the Banks and eight hundred vessels were employed. At the close of the French and United States wars in 1818, foreign fishermen resorted again to the Banks, the price of fish suddenly declined, causing widespread disaster to the Newfoundland merchants and eventually quite an abandonment of the Bank fishery. In 1834 there were only twenty vessels fishing on the Banks from Newfoundland and in 1848 there was not one.

In the period from 1805 to 1816 no French fishermen had dared to fish in Newfoundland waters, but as soon as the Treaty of Paris was signed,

the French fishermen not only occupied the Banks, but increased their occupation of the harbours on the Treaty Coast. In 1852 they occupied fifty-one harbours. They had one hundred and eighty-six fishing places; one hundred and one vessels, eight hundred and eighty-three batteaux, one hundred and seventy-eight cod seines and five thousand nine hundred and seventeen men were engaged in the shore fishery.

Now that the French have aban doned the absolute claim which they had made to the fishery on the Treaty Coast, the Shore and Bay fishery is wholly in the hands of Newfoundland fishermen.

The Bank Fishery, as at present prosecuted by the fishermen of the Colony, was resuscitated in 1876, since which the numbers of vessels engaged have varied considerably.

Return of Bank Cod Fishery from 1889 to 1913.

Year	Crews	No. of Vessels	Total Bank Catch Cwts.
1889	4,401	230	236,821
1890	3,719	279	147,948
1891	2,175	165	103,688
1892	1,392	100	90,467
1893	957	71	58,494
1894	785	58	54,541
1895	565	43	46,984
1896	616	48	54,802
1897	872	66	58,762
1898	1,000	74	74,002
1899	1,163	90	97,399
1900	1,400	112	116,278
1901	1,531	118	113,841
1902	1,444	110	131,102
1903	1,386	100	89,321
1904	1,215	87	70,872
1905	1,161	83	71,329
1906	1,378	97	75,153
1907	1,261	83	88,086
1908	1,433	107	120,000
1909	1,377	100	131,452
1910	1,567	100	144,524
1911	1,924	122	149,924
1912	2,065	124	155,517
1913	1,830	104	152,374

The total of codfish exported from the coasts of Labrador during the season of 1912 was 194,995 qtls., valued at $682,482, as compared with 161,043 qtls., valued at $676,381 in 1911, showing an increase of 33,952 qtls., and only $6,101—the small advance in valuation being due to the lower prices available this season. viz.: $3.50, as compared with $4.20 last year.

The following is a comparative statement:

1908 ..	288,363	qtls. valued at	$779,958
1909 ..	168,692	" "	623,362
1910 ..	81,368	" "	325,472
1911 ..	161,043	" "	676,381
1912 ..	194,995	" "	682,482

The direct exports from Labrador during the years 1911-12-13 were as follows:

Dry codfish, 1911-12, 161,043 qtls., valued at $676,381.

Dry codfish, 1912-13, 194,955 qtls., valued at $682,482.

	1911-12 Val. at	1912-13 Val. at
Salmon	$18,148	$23,839
Trout	12	18
Herring	24	24
Cod Oil		120
Seal Oil	1,666	772
Seal Skins	582	306
Feathers.	61	71
Furs	31,952	9,712

The direct exports of Dry Cod from Labrador during last session—111,876 qtls., valued at $525,817.

These were employed in:

1912—827 vessels, 5,468 men, 9,470 people engaged.

1913—884 vessels, 5,890 men, 9,338 people engaged.

The markets for dry codfish are as follows:—

Markets for Dry God.

From 1903-4 to 1907-8 Annual Mean. Qtls.	1908-9 Qtls.	1909-10 Qtls.	1910-11 Qtls.	1911-12 Qtls.	1912-13 Qtls.
Brazil 318,492	382,180	395,143	368,794	423,980	417,155
Portugal 310,184	256,080	321,296	258,523	206,206	203,989
Italy 221,511	380,762	253,524	132,153	212,061	207,617
Spain 198,890	280,311	199,662	174,711	214,934	248,266
Canada 114,347	128,344	85,938	77,159	109,169	125,088
Br. W. Indies 77,499	105,282	93,885	78,719	90,876	73,323
Un. Kingdom 48,353	58,548	25,755	10,968	12,866	21,167
Greece 37,759	65,202	89,708	42,715	69,280	60,527
Am. W. Indies 19,383	40,798	18,508	13,434	8,251	14,356
United States 16,775	24,732	8,565	16,234	34,425	29,315
Malta 2,896	5,418	3,206	3,206	2,126	1,706
Canary Islands 1,909	1,930	4,336	4,882	3,273	5,470
Costa Rica .. 1,458	937	847	121	71	81
Colombia 1,024	855	124	78		
Panama 195	793	760	7	412	441
Argentine R.	214	109			
China	1				

Salt Bulk Fish Shipped to the United States.

1909-10	1910-11	1911-12	1912-13
3,728 qtls.	30,325 qtls.	97,805 qtls.	49,556 qtls.

The figures that I have just presented to the House will give our outport friends who are interested in the fisheries of the Colony, an idea what countries are our largest consumers. I look forward, at no distant date, to the time when the United States will become one of our largest customers. It is interesting to note what they have bought from us during the past four years in salt bulk fish—between 1909-10 and 1912-13 they took one hundred and eighty-one thousand qtls. about 3¼ cents per pound, or equal to $7,50 per quintal, talqual, dry. In that vast country, with a population of ninety millions of people, the possibilities are very great of increasing cur trade with the United States to an enormous extent.

The Norwegian fishery for the past season was seventy-six millions of cod fish, as compared with ninety-nine millions, two hundred thousand in 1912, showing a decrease of twenty-three millions, two hundred thousand. Before passing from our great national industry, the fisheries, the harvest from the sea, I would impress upon all our fishermen the great necessity for making well cured, clean dry fish, as it will always command a good price. If buying fish talqual was abolished, and a proper system of standardizing the cull of fish adopted, the earnings of the fishing classes would be still greater.

I find from the latest information obtainable that the Customs dues on fish in the different countries specified, are as follows, and may be of interest to our people.

Austria-Hungary—Dry cod, 3s. ½d. per cwt. Lobster in tins, £1. 16s. per cwt.

Belgium—Dry cod, free, tinned, 6s. 1¼d. per cwt.

Brazil—Dry cod at the rate of 60 reis per kilo; of which amount 65 per cent. is payable in paper and 35 per cent. in gold. Thus one drum of fish 128 lbs., 58.5 kilos at 60 reis. rs. 3,510

of which 65 per cent. in paper; rs. 2,-281, 35 per cent. in gold; rs. 1,228 at 27s.; 2s. 9d. at 15½ exchange 2,200; s. 4.481, at 16 per cent. exchange, 5s. 9½d.

Bulgaria—Cod, dry or salted, 10s. 2d. per cwt. Preserved, 14s. 2½d. per cwt.

China—Dry cod, 8¾d. per lb.

Denmark—Dry Cod, free. Lobster, 13s. 8½d. per cwt.

France—Dry cod, 10s. 6d. per cwt. Lobster, 10s. 2d. per cwt.

Germany—Dry cod, 1s. 6d. per cwt. Shellfish in tins, £1. 10s. per cwt.

Greece—Dry cod, 1s. 7½d. per cwt. for Newfoundland fish.

Holland—Dry cod, salted, etc., free; hermetically sealed, 21s. 2d. per cwt.

Italy—Cod, dry, 2s. ½d. per cwt.

Japan—Cod, dry, 3s. 5½d. per cwt.

Norway—Cod, smoked, salted, 28s. 3d. per cwt.

Persia—Free.

Portugal—Dry cod, 8s. 11d. per cwt.

Roumania—Dry cod, 4s. 10½d. per cwt.

Russia—Dry cod, 4s. per cwt.

Spain—Stock and codfish, 9s. 9d. per cwt. Salt, smoked, 4s. 10½d. per cwt.

Sweden—Fish, salted and preserved, free.

Switzerland—Fish, dried, salted, etc., 4¾d. per cwt.

Turkey—Fish of all kinds, 11 per cent. ad valorem.

United States—Dry codfish, free; dry codfish, skinned or boned, free, salted codfish, not dry, free; herring, pickled or salted, free; herring, fresh or frozen, free; salmon, fresh, pickled or salted, free; trout, pickled, free.

The Lobster Fishery.

In paragraph six of the Speech from the Throne: His Excellency says that the Lobster Fishery for the past year was small, but the high prices which ruled, helped to offset the shortage. The Government has made a pronouncement upon the Lobster Fishery in the following terms:—"One of the most alarming features of the lobster fishery is the fact that since 1898, or in less than 25 years, the catch of lobsters has steadily declined from 76,226 to 26,170 cases in 1912, which, at the current price, represents a loss to the country of over a million dollars a year. To arrest the further decline of this valuable fishery and to insure to our people a larger share of the splendid returns now coming from the high prices of lobsters, the Government proposes to continue its policy for the preserving of the seed lobster, and to apply to this object the most modern methods in use in other countries, to increase the supply available so that this most desirable result may be speedily achieved."

So prolific is the female lobster that no less than ten thousand eggs are covered over the small female when taken from the water, and it has been computed that if five per cent. of the eggs could be saved the lobster fishery would be one of our richest harvests from the sea. Germany is our best market for lobsters. The customs duty of lobsters going into Germany is 21 marks, or $5.00 per case of 48 one-pound tins. I am not going to weary the House with a long array of figures on the rise and fall of the lobster industry, but propose to publish them for the information of the packers throughout the country through this House, and I would strongly impress upon every packer in the Colony that the lobster is for human food and should be clean, sound meat, neatly packed and sealed for market, by doing this you will always command the highest price and uphold the name of Newfoundland in the Continental markets. The following are the figures from 1889 to 1909. From 1910 to 1912-13 I propose to deal with in our articles of export.

The number of cases packed during each year since 1888 shows that the Fishery has been a fluctuating and gradually decreasing one as far as quantity is concerned.

Year	No. of Cases	Export Value
1889	76,226	$472,524
1890	69,552	520,078
1891	57,249	429,681
1892	32,589	260,048
1893	35,403	265,522
1894	48,056	312,364
1895	51,016	428,881
1896	56,372	465,069
1897	58,883	529,947
1898	61,951	619,510
1899	56,166	565,362
1900	37,523	441,202
1901	36,271	448,501
1902	38,368	412,256
1903	31,881	387,466
1904	31,575	410,405
1905	43,522	512,662
1906	31,328	276,490
1907	26,999	383,767
1908	26,060	418,605
1909	25,826	343,619
1910	26,058	337,835
1911	23,803	360,495
1912	28,924	507,132
1913	26,047	476,940

In 1889 the export amounted to 76,226 cases containing 3,658,848 lbs. lobsters valued at $6.20 per case. In 1909 the export amounted to 25,826 cases containing 1,233,848 lbs., valued at $13.10 per case. During that period the export has declined in quantity 66.1 per cent.; the value has decreased 27.3 per cent.

There has been a serious decrease in the catch of lobsters during the past season.

In 1912, 26,148 cases were packed.

In 1913, 16,565 cases were packed.

9,583 cases decrease

The price, however, naturally, and to some extent compensated for this shortage. The reason for the short catch is attributed to very rough weather during the season, entailing great loss of traps and gear. However, it should be noted that the catch is steadily declining, in spite of the increased inducement of higher prices. It is evident some measures of protecting this valuable industry ought to be devised, and strictly carried out.

The largest number of cases shipped was in 1889, 76,226, and in 1913, 16,565, a decrease of 59,661 cases in twenty-five years. The current price paid for lobsters is as follows:

1900	$12.00 per case
1901	12.25 "
1902	11.00 "
1903	12.75 "
1904	13.50 "
1905	12.50 "
1906	12.50 "
1907	14.00 "
1908	13.00 "
1909	12.50 "
1910	15.00 "
1911	17.00 "
1912	18.00 "
1913	22.00 "

The total value of our exports of lobsters for twenty one years from 1889 to 1909 amounts to $8,904,509. The value for 1910-13 I have already referred to.

Mr. President, in this Colony we have no commercial asset taken from the sea, that is quicker turned into gold, than the lobster, therefore it requires the greatest care and wise legislation for its protection.

Paragraph No. 7 deals with the agricultural prospect which, viewed in the light of last year's operations is most gratifying. I join with His Excellency in this paragraph of the Speech from the Throne, that the stimulus imparted to agriculture during the year 1913 has been the best in all the years that has preceded it.

What has been the history of farming in this country? We find that in 1813 Governor Keats first officially recognized agriculture here by direction of the Home Government, he being "authorized to grant leases of small portions of land to industrious individuals for the purpose of cultivation, taking care however, to observe an annual quit rent either nominal or real, according to the circumstances of each individual case. The records show that between October 25th 1812, and July 10th 1813, twenty six persons had enclosed plots of land of various dimensions, but amounting in the aggregate to seventy five acres. St. John's with a population of nearly 10,000 seems to have grown out of its original situation, and to be changing its character from a fishery to a large commercial town, and for a considerable time past has offered such advantages to the farmer and gardener as to overcome all the restraints which nature and the policy of the Government have laid on the cultivation of a soil certainly less sterile than it has generally been considered. More than a thousand acres are in cultivation and as many more perhaps enclosed, the produce of which is confined to hay, potatoes and vegetables of various kinds, crops of which may be seen as plentiful as in England,whilst the environs of the town, the natural beauties of which are very striking, present tc the view several well-cultivated and productive little farms." With the advent of Sir Thomas Cochrane as Governor in 1825 agriculture may be said to have received its first impetus for that gentleman was a progressive and far-sighted administrator and a fervent believer in husbandry as a material factor in the well-being of the Colony. He inaugurated road-making encouraged agriculcure, and established a country seat for himself in Virginia Waters in the suburbs of St. John's. To him we owe Cochrane Street and Military Road in this city and some of the highways reaching from the town to the outports in the vicinity. It was first declared of him in a pamphlet of the period that "he has done more real good to the Colony since his appointment than all his predecessors put together. He has, so far as his limited authority permitted him given every encouragement to the cultivation of the soil and has himself shown the example; he has encouraged every measure calculated to promote the internal resources of the country; he has made roads, much of them at his own expense, and he has been the patron of education for the poor and the rich."

With the advent to the Governorship of Sir John Harvey in 1841, agriculture received a still greater stimulus, for he was a man of the type of Sir Thomas Cochrane, possessing the same progressive ideas and shortly after his arrival on November 27th, 1842, he organized an Agricultural Society in St. John's. In June 1843, a ploughing match and horse race under the society's auspices took place near Mount Pearl, in the western suburbs, which over four thousand people attended, and in August 1848, five years later, another similar event took place in the East End on farms north of the King's Bridge. This was attended not alone by the Governor, but by Prince Henry of the Netherlands, who was at St. John's in a warship. and several

prizes were presented for various farming successes. So greatly had the encouragement afforded by Sir John Harvey operated to advance agriculture that on his departure from the Colony, he was presented with an address by the society, in which it was testified that "under the influence of his continued encouragement and support, the Society steadily advanced in the diffusion of a desire for agricultural knowledge, and succeeded not only in introducing great improvements in the practice of agriculture, but in developing some of the natural resources of the Colony which were previously imperfectly known".

In 1869, or forty-five years ago, the first agricultural exhibition was held in St. John's, the late Venerable Archdeacon Botwood being one of the chief promoters. Agricultural exhibitions, cattle shows, etc. have been held here at irregular intervals since then, but not until the exhibition organized by the Agricultural Board in 1911 was there anything in the way of a general display of products from all parts of the Island. Through the agency of the late Monsignor Sears of the West Coast the utilization of the rich farm lands of that region was materially advanced, even before the railway was enterprised and the foundation of a number of thriving settlements assured. The public men of the period also played an important part in endeavoring to promote the more general tillage of the land, but not until 1878 when Sir William Whiteway moved resolutions 'for a survey for a line of road connecting Bay of Islands with Notre Dame Bay, via the Humber Valley and also for a line of road into the Gambo and Grand Lake districts with a view of opening up and settling the agricultural land in these districts' was any Government formally indentified with the development of agriculture as a feature in its party policy. This movement was further stimulated in succeeding years by the adoption of the railway policy by the Whiteway Administration in 1881, this being the agency that, perhaps more than any other, contributed to the permanent progress of agriculture in Newfoundland.

No better evidence can be afforded of how the railway has become a dominant factor in contributing to the promotion of agriculture than is seen in the case of the section of the railway line between St. John's and Harbor Grace, especially on the South Shore of Conception Bay, where the people have been converted in thirty years from a fishing to an almost purely pastoral people, great numbers having abandoned fishing pursuits entirely and maintainng themselves in comfort through their cultivation of the soil. It is with a view to utilizing the railway system and especially the branch railways now being built, that the present Government adopted the agricultural policy which it outlined at the last session. These branch railway lines will open up to settlement and cultivation large tracts of arable land, and will enable the people of the sections through which they pass to utilize these tracts to an extent that is not possible at present. The movement of goodly numbers of people in some of the bays from the outer sections to the rich alluvial areas in the sheltered inlets at their heads, to engage in

farming there, which has made some progress already, is certain to be greatly increased by the construction of these branch lines, and a further and more conclusive proof of the possibilities of farming here will thus be afforded.

It was in 1910 that the present Government put their agricultural policy in active operation. During this year no less than seventy-three societies were formed; in 1911 there were 77 on the list, in 1912 86, and in the year that has just closed, we find the grand total of Agricultural Societies number 91. In the district of Bay de Verde there are 5; in Bonavista, 10; in Burgeo and Lapoile, 3; in Burin, 8; in Carbonear, 1; in Ferryland, 2; in Fogo, 5; in Fortune Bay, 4. in Hr. Grace, 3; in Hr. Main, 2; in Placentia and St. Mary's 13; in Port de Grave, 2; in St. Barbe, 6; in St. George's 14; in St. John's East and West, 1; in Trinity 6; and in Twillingate 6. During the past year, there were 5 Agricultural Exhibitions held, one each in Brigus, Hr. Main, Placentia, Bonavista and Trinity. At the Brigus exhibition there were 1,571 exhibits—51 exhibits of horses, 44 of cattle. 44 of butter, 36 of eggs, 297 of potatoes, 81 of cabbage, 81 of turnips, 50 of carrots, 36 of beet, 23 of preserves and fruit, and 20 of home-made pickles—represented by 36 settlements of the district.

Harbor Main came next with 92 exhibits, represented by 22 settlements. Of this number 124 were sent from Holyrood, 36 from Kelligrews, 304 from Hr. Main, 85 from Avondale, 118 from Chapel's Cove, and 32 from Topsail—potatoes, cabbage, turnips, carrots, poultry, butter, cream, and eggs.

The Government has given encouragement and assistance in every way possible for the advancement of Farming. Placentia had 745 exhibits, consisting of horses, cattle, sheep, pigs, poultry, eggs, butter, potatoes, cabbage, turnips, carrots, parsnips and beet.

At the exhibition which was held in Bonavista there were 612 exhibits, representing 20 settlements—62 from Brooklyn, 312 from Bonavista, 47 from Musgrave Town, 47 from Salvage Bay, 68 from Happy Adventure, 28 from Port Blandford, 24 from Keels, and 17 from Plate Cove.

At the Trinity exhibition there were 480 exhibits, consisting of horses, cows, poultry, eggs, butter and potatoes.

Farming during the past four years by the encouragement and assistance given by the Government, has advanced more than it did during the previous quarter of a century.

At the great exhibition which was held in St. John's during the fall of 1910 there were 2,500 exhibits and 890 exhibitors, represented by every farming district of the Colony—Bonavista with 63, Burin with 22, Burgeo and LaPoile with 2. Bay de Verde with 6, Fogo, with 53, Ferryland with 20, Hr. Main with 33, Hr. Grace with 30, Port de Grave with 20, Placentia and St. Mary's with 22, St. John's East with 207, St. John's West with 215, St. George's with 73, St. Barbe with 22, Trinity with 23 and Twillingate with 16.

With the above facts before us, Mr President, we get a slight idea of the country's development in agriculture during the past four years.

In paragraph 8 His Excellency draws our attention to the value and volume of our exports and the increasing output of the mining companies at Bell Island, and of the pulp and of the paper companies in the Exploits Valley and the high prices obtained for our fishery products are the principal contributions to our economic stability.

The output of iron ore for the calendar year amounted to 1,458,525 tons, valued at $1,604,000, against 1,176,590 tons for the previous calendar year valued at $1,294,249.

Mr. President, I question very much if there is another island in the world for size and population that contains so much wealth. The amount spent in wages alone must reach a sum not less than $1,500,000 in one year. In addition to that amount, the Morris Government secured in 1909, by special agreement that 7 1-2 cents per ton be paid into the revenue of the Colony on all the ore exported from Bell Island so that the amount paid by the Company in 1913 would amount to $110,000.

The Speech from the Throne, also informs the people of the Colony that the export of pulp and paper for the last fiscal year amounted to $2,400,000 as against $1,600,000 for the previous year, and the output continues to increase. The annual amount in wages paid by this company must be very large.

Before reviewing the Trade and Commerce of the Colony: In this House there are several Hon. Gentlemen who are largely interested in our export trade, who I have been informed, say that some of our exporters are, in many cases, passing export entries for fish or other products and that proper care is not exercised in having full value made out. Under valuations are very unfair to the country, and very likely, in some years of our trade to have exports less than our imports. I earnestly hope that, for the future, principals of firms will take more interest in a matter of this kind by seeing that actual values are passed for, rather than nominal valuations.

The average prices of codfish exported to different countries during seven years ending 30th June, 1909, were as follows:

United Kingdom	$3.99 on 7 yrs.
Canada	4.56 " 7 "
United States	4.47 " 7 "
B. W. I.	4.88 " 7 "
Italy	4.45 " 7 "
Spain	4.22 " 7 "
Brazil	5.39 " 7 "
Malta	5.22 " 7 "
Greece	4.26 " 7 "
Canary Island	5.29 " 6 "
Costa Rica	5.21 " 7 "
A. W. Indies	5.32 " 5 "
Monte Video	5.50 " 2 "
Buenos Ayres	4.80 " 3 "
Honduras	6.09 " 3 "
Panama	4.98 " 3 "
Austria	5.50 " 1 "
Portugal	5.48 " 7 "
Colombia	5.16 " 3 "
Egypt	6.00 " 1 "
Mauritius	5.72 " 2 "

The price of fish in our local market:

	1910	1911	1912	1913
M'cht'ble	7.00	6.80	6.50	6.50
Madeira	6.00	6.80	6.50	6.30
Large W. I..	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Small W.I. ..	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.00
Labrador ..	4.00	4.20	4.70	4.90

The principal artcles of export for the fiscal years endng on June 30th, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913 were:

	1909-10		1910-11	
Articles of Export	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Dry Codfish—qtl.	1,502,269	$7,307,778	1,182,720	$6,544,604
Herring (pckl.) brl.	56,534	156,587	73,897	205,996
Herring (bulk) brl.	58,975	93,414	62,780	93,053
Herring (frozen) brl.	23,719	52,241	33,072	89,661
Salmon (pckl.) tcs.	3,074	56,845	2,897	55,163
Lobsters (preserve) cases	26,058	337,835	23,803	360,495

Articles of Export	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Cod Oil—tuns	4,873	352,549	3,391	300,940
Refined Cod Oil (gal.)	44,307	26,464	83,999	58,607
Seal Oil—tuns	5,232	459,814	3,873	385,250
Seal Skins—number	372,504	460,220	221,651	275,287
Whale Oil—tuns	2,015	147,340	1,620	144,991
Copper, viz.,—				
Ingots, regulus green ore—tons ..	37,036	197,709	42,131	231,693
Iron Pyrites—tons			5,448	26,290
Iron Ores—tons	1,050,880	1,165,867	1,175,185	1,292,702
Lumber M. feet	7,707	144,666	6,085	125,279
		$11,834,997		$8,798,932
	1911-12		1912-13	
Dry Codfish—qtl.	1,388,178	$8,001,703	1,408,582	$7,987,389
Herring (pckl.) brl.	74,734	227,391	73,854	219,060
Herring (bulk) brl...	65,510	97,643	42,931	60,205
Herring (frozen) brl.....	35,683	83,669	18,549	43,514
Salmon (pckl.) tcs.	4,602	84,365	4,866	91,720
Lobsters (preserve) cases	28,924	507,132	26,047	476,940
Ccd Oil—tuns....	2,578	286,523	3,164	265,435
Refined Cod Oil (gal.)	51,227	42,300	36,842	18,122
Seal Oil—tuns	2,778	296,519	2,884	270,275
Seal Skins—number	311,254	380,699	212,285	321,551
Whale Oil—tuns	1,578	162,141	1,534	139,120
Copper, viz.,—				
Ingots, regulus green ore—tons ...	32,057	200,575	17,800	120,650
Iron Ores—tons	1,116,930	1,118,622	1,243,200	1,367,520
Lumber M. feet	504	8,215	413	6,306
		$10,639.721		$10,242,556

I have no desire, Mr. President, to delay the House much longer. I shall be as brief as possible, but I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without drawing the attention of Hon. Gentlemen of the Legislative Council, and through this channel the people of the country, to the fact that our imports and exports for 1912-13 are the largest in the history of the Colony, amounting to $33,000,000. I have reviewed the total Trade Imports and Exports, origin and destination, for 25 years—1888 to 1913.I will not weary you with them in detail but group them in four periods, the term of a Government; 1889 to 1892, Imports and Exports $51,000,000; 1893 to 1896-7 $50,000,000; 1896-7 to 1900-1 $55,000-000; 1901-02 to 1904-5, $76,000,000; 1905-6 to 1908-9 $90,000,000; 1909-10 to 1912-13 $111,000,000.

You will observe Mr. President, that the increase of our Imports and Exports during the twenty five years has been $60,000,000. The last four years of the Bond Government they amounted to $90,000,000, and in the four years of the Morris Government to $111,000.000 for an increase over the Bond Government of $21,000,000 in a term of four years.

I am proud to be the instrument through which this glorious record of the Colony's Trade and Commerce has been conveyed. If I changed my

views and supported the Railway Policy of the Morris Government. I did so on a question of National Policy, without committing an unpardonable political sin; and I hold that the politician who, upon questions of National Policy never changes his mind is no good, neither true to himself nor to his country.

These figures in detail are:

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

	United Kingdom.			Canada.	
Year	Imports	Exports	Year	Imports	Exports
1888	$3,265,229	$2,372,429	1888	$2,041,144	$ 528,635
1889	2,653,152	2,055,586	1889	2,076,258	567,903
1890	2,174,524	1,514,131	1890	2,434,319	631,104
1891	2,341,706	1,966,581	1891	2,499,945	794,844
1892	1,867,455	1,769,749	1892	1,981,466	213,913
1893	2,680,853	1,308,650	1893	2,886,901	619,611
1894	2,538,942	1,347,425	1894	2,643,032	763,569
1895-1896	1,875,754	1,727,852	1895-1896	2,231,641	638,741
1896-1897	1,960,999	1,347,273	1896-1897	1,593,931	478,110
1897-1898	1,519,253	1,355,920	1897-1898	1,823,238	482,512
1898-1899	1,935,025	1,443,266	1898-1899	2,088,093	541,727
1899-1900	2,224,253	1,942,093	1899-1900	2,805,490	520,137
1900-1901	2,328,622	1,831,941	1900-1901	2,489,499	711,746
1901-1902	2,244,178	2,104,932	1901-1902	2,612,042	1,046,109
1902-1903	2,143,464	2,173,090	1902-1903	2,869,898	1,102,659
1903-1904	2,479,138	1,993,195	1903-1904	3,423,225	1,102,708
1904-1905	2,654,908	1,940,945	1904-1905	4,105,569	1,135,848
1905-1906	2,651,196	1,662,612	1905-1906	3,521,939	1,777,169
1906-1907	2,669,934	1,492,795	1906-1907	3,669,998	1,611,480
1907-1908	2,668,802	1,209,428	1907-1908	4,257,647	1,863,784
1908,1909	2,493,670	1,426,223	1908-1909	3,937,009	1,542,090
1909-1910	2,940,401	1,824,235	1909-1910	4,559,759	1,454,314
1910-1911	3,092,429	2,345,342	1910-1911	4,607,720	1,745,389
1911-1912	4,024,771	2,892,550	1911-1912	4,818,761	1,802,172
1912-1913	4,405,103	3,427,026	1912-1913	5,215,537	2,260,348

	United States.			Elsewhere.	
Year	Imports	Exports	Year	Imports	Exports
1888	$1,602,138	$ 349,732	1888	$511,889	$4,145,257
1889	1,615,143	485,202	1889	262,512	3,745,588
1890	1,247,754	452,100	1890	523,258	3,502,351
1891	1,526,674	580,577	1891	501,133	4,095,156
1892	966,261	700,003	1892	197,695	3,703,309
1893	1,665,227	648,452	1893	339,588	3,704,199
1894	1,577,060	678,437	1894	405,704	3,021,738
1895-1896	1,473,721	489,027	1895-1896	405,745	3,782,567
1896-1897	2,135,008	533,518	1896-1897	248,396	2,564,888
1897-1898	1,671,134	427,478	1897-1898	175,238	2,961,023
1898-1899	1,928,834	620,056	1898-1899	359,293	4,331,266
1899-1900	1,993,505	1,005,525	1899-1900	473,799	5,159,821

1900-1901 .. .	2,088,465	884,068	1900-1901	569,917	4,932,223
1901-1902 .. .	2,501,806	1,227,461	1901-1902	478,659	5,194,022
1902-1903 .. .	2,920,914	1,357,031	1902-1903	545,668	5,343,724
1903-1904 .. .	2,991,002	1,470,497	1903-1904	555,279	5,814,697
1904-1905 .. .	2,750,114	1,418,624	1904-1905	768,702	6,173,925
1905 1906 .. .	3,609,122	1,278,997	1905-1906	631,947	7,367,498
1906-1907 .. .	3,447,359	1,394,269	1906-1907	639,649	7,609,617
1907-1908 .. .	3,859,892	1,177,709	1907-1908	729,770	7,564,848
1908-1909 .. .	4,232,680	848,176	1908-1909	738,978	7,032,418
1909-1910 .. .	4,571,192	1,163,313	1909-1910	728,344	7,383,135
1910-1911 .. .	4,943,874	1,249,550	1910,1911	739,893	6,635,466
1911-1912 .. .	5,074,371	1,401,865	1911-1912	815,593	7,778,232
1912-1913 .. .	5,573,733	1,330,667	1912-1913	817,992	7,654,848

Total Trade.

Year	Imports	Exports	Total
1888	$7,420,400	$7,396,053	$14,816,453
1889	6,607,065	6,854,279	13,461.344
1890	6,368,855	6,099,686	12,468,541
1891	6,869,458	7,437,158	14,306,616
1892	5,012,877	6,386,974	11,399,851
1893	7,572,569	6,280,912	13,853,481
1894	7,164,738	5,811,169	12,975,907
1895-1896	5,986,861	6,638,187	12,625,048
1896-1897	5,938,334	4,925,789	10,864,123
1897-1898	5,188,863	5,226,933	10,415,796
1898-1899	6,311,245	6,936,315	13,247,560
1899-1900	7,496,147	8,627,576	16,124,723
1900-1901	7,476,503	8,359,978	15,836,481
1901-1902	7,836,685	9,552,524	17,389,209
1902-1903	8,479,944	9,976,504	18,456,448
1903-1904	9,448,664	10,381,897	19,830.561
1904-1905	10,279,293	10,669,942	20,948,635
1905-1906	10,414,274	12,086,276	22,500.550
1906-1907	10,426,040	12.101,161	22,527,201
1907-1908	11,516,111	11,815,769	23,331,880
1908-1909	11,402,337	10,848,913	22,251,250
1909-1910	12,799,696	11,824,997	24,624,693
1910-1911	13,383,910	11,975,747	25,359,657
1911-1912	14,733,490	13,847,809	28,608,299
1912-1913	16,012,365	16,583,267	32,595,632

In Groups of Four Years.

Whiteway Government, 1899 to 1892	$ 51,636,352
Whiteway Government, 1893 to 1897	50,318,559
Winter Government 1897 to 1900, and Bond Government 190-'01	55,624,650
Bond Government, 1901-1905	76,624,853
Bond Government, 1905-1909	90,608,810
Morris Government, 1909-1913	111,188,281

Our trade with the United Kingdom during the past fiscal year, 1912-13, including imports and exports amounted to $7,833,129; our trade with Canada comes second, with a total of $7,475,885; our trade with United States third, with $6,904,400. Our trade and commerce is in favor of the United Kingdom, $978,077, in favor of Canada $2,955,189, and of the United States 4,243,066. We hope in the near future that our trade with the United States as a customer of fishery products especially our salt bulk fish will balance the account. You will observe, Mr. President that Canada bought from us 929,681 more than the United States.

Mr. President I am now going to quote figures for a few minutes that will astonish hon. gentlemen of this House. Our imports for the year 1912-13 reached the marvellous figures of $16,012,365. Out of this sum $9 272,730 pays duty; either ad valorem or specific, and $6,739,635 is on the free list; over forty per cent. of our gross imports. I will now give you the countries where our imports come from.

	Dutiable	Free	Total
United Kingdom	3,352,646	1,052,457	4,405,103
Dominion of Canada	2,462,568	2,752,969	5 215,537
British West Indies	35,998	272,353	308,351
Ceylon	90,192	50,059	140,251
India	15,822	1,250	17,072
Malta	462		462
Argentine Republic		4,727	4,727
Austria	2,415		2,417
Bavaria	1,370		1,370
Belgium	13,793	1,363	15,156
Brazil	177		177
China	219		219
Denmark		5,938	5,983
Foreign West Indies	2,399		2,399
France	12,822	1,384	14,206
St. Pierre	3,546	6,964	10,510
Germany	28,368	5,474	33,842
Greece		43,801	43,801
Holland	42,836	3,745	46,581
Italy	226	525	744
Japan	337		337
New Zealand	378		378
Norway	11,579	4,044	15,623
Portugal	15,719	2,945	18,664
Spain	15,339	108,519	123,858
Sweden	7,036	2,448	9,484
Switzerland	1,306	74	1,380
United States	3,155,181	2,418,552	5,573,733
	9,272,730	6,739,635	$16,012,365

On the free list we had nearly seven million dollars at the close of the fiscal year 1912-13.

Imports from Canada on the free list were $2,752,969 and from the United States $2,418,552 making a combined total of $5,171,521. This amount in value on the free list represents to a very large extent, the foodstuffs for our people, such as pork, beef, flour, sugar and other necessaries of life. The Government in adjusting the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure must choose between $9,272,730 that pays duty, and $6,739,635 that is duty free. The Government, however, proposes to do this I observe without departing from the principle embodied in last session's enactment namely, that the producing classes should have so far as possible the necessaries of life untaxed, or in other words the Morris Government, during their term of office, have given to the fishermen of the country, and all classes of our people 'A Free Breakfast, A Free Dinner and a Free Tea.'

In paragraph No. 9 Mr. President, the revenue for the fiscal year 1912-13 it is stated, was in excess of the previous year, and resulted in a surplus of one hundred and fifteen thousand dollars. The revenue for the first half of the current fiscal year is said to be below the estimate, a fact not surprising when we consider the large amount of duties that were taken off pork, beef, tea and sugar—amounting to nearly four hundred thousand dollars, giving the producing classes practically a free breakfast, a free dinner and a free supper. We observe the Government propose to adjust the revenue and expenditure without departing from the principles embodied in last session's enactment. The revenues collected for the past eight years were:

BOND GOVERNMENT

Year	Revenue	Expend.	Surplus
1904-5	2,574,069	2,443,814	130,255
1905-6	2,660,805	2,591,235	69,570
1906-7	2,758,690	2,625,336	125,845
1907-8	2,829,078	2,785,835	43,183
	$10,823,642	10,426,220	$368,853

1908-9. This year the Bond Government was in power the greater part of it, and was really responsible for the financial condition of the Colony. The expenditure was $2,947-868, and the revenue $2,748,647. showing a deficit of of $199,221 which was paid by the Morris Government, chiefly provided by a loan of $155-000, the balance was ($44,221) paid out of Current Revenue. The Morris Government commenced with a clean slate as follows.

MORRIS GOVERNMENT.

Year.	Revenue	Expend.	Surplus
1909-10	3,447,988	3,137,774	310,214
1910-11	3,527,126	3,354,746	172,380
1911-12	3,736,456	3,524,653	211,803
1912-13	3,919,440	3,803,561	115,479
	$14,630,610	$13,820,734	$809,876

The total surplus revenue of the Government for the four years 1910 11-12-13, has amounted to $809,876. We find that out of this surplus in the four years, over and above the usual grant, the sum of $364,100 has been spent by the Public Works Dept for general improvements of Roads and the other public utilities throughout the Colony; that during the same period $228,150 over and above, the grants voted by the Legislature from the surplus fund has been expended by the Department of Marine and Fisheries making a total in these two Departments alone of $592,250, and in addition to these amounts from Surplus Revenues in 1909-10 $200,000 was in vested in 4 per cent Government debentures to make a beginning of

the Old Age Pension fund, making a total of $792,250.

The accumulated balance of the credit of the surplus fund from revenue ending 1912-13, amounted to $1,272,807.47, and was expended as follows:

Expended on roads .. ..$	486,464.33
Light House construction	45,000.00
Harbor Improvement and Marine Works	221,899.06
Outports for buildings ..	41,236.47
Extension Marconi system	14,000.00
Extension Telegraph system	59,223.66
Completion Fever Hospital	3,000.00
Completion Museum	30,000.00
Extension and improvements General Hospital (in aid of)	66,254.00
Encouragement Herring Fishery	26,045.03
General Elections, 1908 ..	40,328.59
Education	10,000.00
To cover part deficit current account, 1908-9 ..	6,786.92
Festival of Empire (in aid of)..	10,213.00
Government Bonds for Old Age Pension Fund	200,000.00
Addition to General Post Office	3,000.00
	$1,263,452.24
Balance	9,355.23
	$1,272,807.47

I wish to say Mr. President, a few words now on behalf of Education. I know the Government grant is a very large one showing that in the general prosperity of the country the teachers and education have not been forgotten. There is no greater capital that parents can give to their children than a good education. The gradual increase of the grant from 1852 to 1913 is shown by the fact that it has risen from 31 cents per head to $1.40 per head thus:—

Education.	Revenue.	Grant.	Population.
1852		30,000.00	96,295 31c per head.
1857		36,000.00	109,300 33c per head.
1861		54,000.00	119,304 46c per head.
1861		65,462.00	146,535 45c per head.
1869		88,860.00	
1880	835,859	95,700.00	
1883	1,128,876	119,500.00	193,121 52c per head.
1888	1,389,058	144,450.00	
1892	1,909,851	154,085.00	202,040 74c per head.
1898-9	1,789,974	156,168.00	
1900-1	1,991,154	248,824.00	220,984 90c per head.
1905-6	2,660,805	317,963.00	
1909-10	3,447,988	350,523.00	242,619 $.140 per head.
1912-13			

—2 years Bond Government, population 220,984. Total amount 1900-1. 1905-6. $404.992.00

2 years Morris Government population 242.619. Total amount 1909-10 1912-13. $686.486.00, showing an increase of 22.000 of the population.

I now devote a word to the 'Hands Across the Seas' movement, one of Empire and Education under the

auspices of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, the Government of Newfoundland, and the departments of Education of the Provinces of Manitoba, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan; Alberta; Quebec and New Brunswick. The President of the Newfoundland Branch is W. W. Blackall, B. A., Superintendent of Education, and the Secretary S. P. Whiteway a leading teacher of the Methodist College staff. The movement in Newfoundland has also the hearty support of V.P.Burke Esq., Dr. Curtis, T. Hanrahan Esq., The Secretary of the Council of Higher Education—A. Wilson Esq., and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association which includes Principals Harrington, Wood, Ryan, Kennedy, Miss Sterling, Richards of Carbonear Dwyer of Holyrood, Guilfoyle of Hr. Grace. The objects of the movement are both Educational and Imperial and may be summarized as follows:

. To give an insight into the Educational system of Great Britain.

2. To strengthen the Bonds of Empire and Imperial Fraternity.

3. To bring the people of Canada, Newfoundland and other British Colonies into closer touch with the Motherland and other places of the Empire, through the medium of the schoolroom.

Last July thirty school teachers from different parts of the Island took passage by the S.S. Sardinian for Glasgow. I happened to be a passenger by the same steamer, and during the voyage I learned much information from them about the movement of Hands Across the Seas. From the time those teachers arrived in Glasgow, July 16th until August 20th, their programme was a continual one of sight-seeing and education. In London the teachers or a deputation from them, were the guests of their Majesties, the King and Queen, at a garden party. The Right Hon. and Mrs. Harcourt, the Right Hon. gentleman being Secretary for the Colonies,gave them a grand reception at his beautiful country home. Twenty five to thirty cities and towns in Scotland, England, Ireland and the Channel Islands were visited.

My reason for bringing this matter before the House is the close connection it has with education. I earnestly hope that the Government when dealing with the vote for Education, a sum of money will be voted to assist our Teachers in their annual trip to study personally the geography of the country. They have taken as their Motto—One King, One Flag, One Fleet, One Empire.

No. 10—Mr. President, refers to the increasing price of coal to our people, a very serious matter at this season of the year. Various causes I have no doubt, have led to an advance in price, but whether the Government should enquire into this question is a matter of opinion. The duty upon coal is collected through the Custom House, and paid over to the Municipal Council. Hard and soft coal in 1898 paid the same duty, 40 cents per ton: and the amount collected was $22,103. In 1901 the duty was increased to 50 cents per ton, and the amount collected was $34,455. After that year the duty was increased, soft coal 70 cents per ton, and hard coal to $1. The total revenue collected in 1912-13 was $70,376. The amount of coal imported into St. John's and other parts of the Colony must reach something like two hundred thousand tons.

Retail prices during the last quarter of a century have risen from $4.50 to $4.80, $5.00, $5.20, $5.50, $6.00, $6.20, $6.50, $6.80, $7.00, $7.20 and the present time $7.60. If the Government made an enquiry and found that the price charged by the importer was too high, and that the profit was too much for the capital invested, then it becomes a monopoly or combination to keep up prices. I suggest that the Government enter into a Reciprocity Treaty with the Dominion Coal and Steel Company, and say "we are trading with you; now you trade with us; for years you have had cheap ore; now you give us Reciprocal treatment." I am glad to observe from paragraph ten that the Government have determined to find out, if at all possible whether our coal areas are commercially workable and have invited Professor Dunstan to thorougly examine the carboniferous areas of the country.

In paragraph 11 of the speech from the Throne we observe with great gratification that the Government are giving special attention to the supply of bait, the key note to the harvest of the sea. We earnestly hope that some means will be adopted, whereby our fishermen will have a constant supply during the coming season.

Paragraph 12 has reference to the general Railway Policy of the Government. On this question my views are pretty generally known. In fact it was the dividing line between my friends and supporters that I split on, and by supporting the Morris Government on their branch Railway Policy, I committed a political sin that has never been forgiven by the leader of the Liberal Party at that time. What would a tree be without its branches, any more than a main line of railway be without its branches? I referred in another part of my speech to the completed part of the Railway branches. We have in operation at the present time:

Main line 546 miles.
Brigus Branch 38½ miles.
Broad Cove 23¾ miles.
Placentia 20 miles.
Burnt Bay and Lewisporte branch 9½ miles.

Total 645¾ miles. The completed branch lines under the Railway Contract of 1909 are 295¾ miles, making a grand total of nine hundred and forty one miles of Railways in this Colony.

Paragraphs 13 and 14 refer to negotiations between the Governmeni and British investors, with a view to the utilization of some of the vast water properties on the Labrador, and the establishment of large industries; and to negotiations with British capitalists for the construction of a railway from Notre Dame Bay to Bay of Islands, and for the establishment of a train ferry service between Bay of Islands and the Eastern seaboard of Canada. In these negotiations we hope the Government will be eminently successful. What to a very large extent, has built up the Dominion of Canada, but British Capital? There is no less a sum of British Capital invested in that great and growing country than four hundred millions of pounds sterling or two thousand million dollars. Once we assure the British Public and Capitalists of a sound investment we are bound to see the development and progress of our country.

I now come Mr. President, to the last paragraph of the gracious Speech from the Throne—the Whale Fishery.

This pargraph I consider, is of the greatest importance to the country at the present time. It means on the one side, passing a law to prohibit the Whaling Industry if found to be detrimental to our great fishery the cod, as well as to our bait supplies of caplin and squid. The royal fish of the sea, the whale.

What is the history of the big fish, and what part has it played in our commerce of the Colony? To some it has paid large dividends, to several companies it meant the loss of several hundreds of thousands of dollars. During the past season there were only five companies in active operation, against fifteen a few years ago, employing about 250 persons. The last season's returns have not yet been made to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but, I understand, the catch is much less than last year's 289 whales.

I am sure the investigation to be made by the Government will be the best and the most competent to undertake work of this kind. Whaling must go if found to be injurious to our national commodity, the codfish. On the other hand,we must remember that there is still a large amount of capital (about $250,000) in the whaling industry. During the past six years the total amount of whales killed were as follows: ..

Year	Whales	Oil gals	Guano tons.
1907	481	496,862	1,037
1908	396	420,846	507
1909	518	518,749	938
1910	384	416,831	618
1911	335	405,644	516
1912	289	400,553	655
	2,403	2,659,485	4,271

The whale fishery, in its present form was begun in 1897-8 and reached its greatest development in 1904-5 since which it has declined. It is thought that too many steamers were engaged in the fishery and that the fish were driven to other places by the constant pursuit of them in the waters around our coast. The following values will show its progress from 1900-1 to 1912-13:—

Article.	1900-01	1901-2	1902-3	1903-4	1904-5	1905-6	1906-7
Oil	$54.221	$112,859	$256,378	$297,415	$384,062	$222,761	$173,961
Fertilizers			27,171	38,981	115,955	80,133	20,760
Gills	9						
Bone	13,550	12,285	9,590	29,557	34,835	27,143	19,318
Hide	14	143				150	
Meat				173	214	1,704	
Glue				700	35	16	
Total	$67,794	$125,287	$293,133	$366,826	$535,201	$331,907	$214,224

	1907-8	1908-9	1909-10	1910-11	1911-12	1912,13
Oil	$174257	$134,526	$147,340	$144,991	$162,141	$139,120
Fertilizers	22,000	19,490	13,333	29,808	34,574	11,659
Gills						
Bone	15,034	13,845	13,332	14,281	11,055	12,380
Hide	100	250	50		300	40
Meat		20	9			
Glue						
Total	$211,391	$168,131	$174,064	$189,080	$208,070	$163,199

During the above period of thirteen years, the gross valuation of the Whale Fishery amounted to three million and forty seven thousand, two hundred and seven dollars ($3,047,-207). We can safely trust the Government that justice will be done as to the future of the royal fish of the sea, the Whale.

Fiscal Year.	Skins.
1896-97	$117,204
1897-98	129,840
1898-99	136,563
1899-00	162,330
1900-01	282,895
1901-02	420,869
1902-03	325,236
1903-04	259150
1904-05	370,636
1905-06	314,189
1906-07	194,300
1907-08	140,137
1908-09	433,620
1909-10	460,220
1910-11	275,287
1911-12	380,699
1912-13	321,551

	Harps.	Hoods.	Total
1902	249,612	24,607	274,219
1903	296,179	21,381	317,560
1904	273,596	10,877	284,473
1905	163,867	13,233	177,100
1906	313,089	28,747	341,836
1907	242,072	2,979	245,051
1908	213,349	514	213,863
1909	254,916	14,386	269,302
1910	322,915	10,434	333,349
1911	269,172	35,419	304,591
1912	153,400	21,730	175,130
1913	262,269	10,696	272,965

Before closing, Mr. President, I desire briefly to make some reference to our Seal, Herring and Salmon Fisheries. These three articles of export are of great value from the harvest of the sea.

The value of the Seal Fishery for the last thirteen years has been as follows:—

	Oil.	Total value
	$246,363	$363,467
	218,279	348,119
	252,036	318,509
	433,605	595,935
	424,632	707,527
	379,445	800,314
	453,684	778,920
	303,067	562,217
	374,974	745,610
	297,430	611,619
	447,967	642,267
	308,897	449,134
	252,262	685,882
	459,814	920,034
	385,250	660,537
	296,519	677,218
	270,275	591,826

The seal fishery is as liable to fluctuations as is any other form of the chase or of the sea fishery. At an early period of the history of this fishery in Newfoundland much larger catches were obtained by the sailing vessels. In 1830 the catch amounted to 558,942 seals; in 1831 to 686,836 seals; in 1840 to 631,385 seals; in 1844 to 685,530 seals; in 1858 to 507,624 seals. Prior to the introduction of steam sailing vessels, the catch had dwindled to 125,950, and the smallest catch on record is that of 1872, when only 76,261 seals were landed by the fleet.

The herring fishery for the past year shows a decrease, compared with 1911-12, of $86,000. There is something about the prosecution of our herring fishery I cannot understand. The herring industry should be much larger than it is. In 1906-7 our exports amounted to $406,409. The figures of the exports of herring from 1906-07 to 1912-13, it will be observed that the export of herring, which form an item of considerable importance were as follows:—

	1906-07	1907-8	1908-9	1909-10
United States	$203,218	1907-8	1908-9	190910
Canada	170,707	$209,861	$117,806	$168,625
British West Indies	13,827	160,191	100,734	80 644
United Kingdom	17,128	22,850	6,915	34,679
American West Indies	1,355	10,495	11,550	15,001
Mauritius	150	410		3,033
Spain				
Colombia	21	10	8	10
Brazil				
Costa Rica		10		
Germany				363
Panama			13	
Total	$406,409	$403,817	$237,026	$302,355

	1910-11	1911-12	1912-13
United States	$199,799	$187,286	$146,662
Canada	130,431	129,049	107,427
British West Indies	40,074	69,667	62,511
United Kingdom	8,018	8,409	3,687
American West Indies	650	7,255	
Mauritius	3		
Spain			
Colombia	45	42	
Brazil	9,918	7,066	2,494
Costa Rica	82		4
Germany			
Panama			
Total	$389,020	$408,774	$322,785

The proportional distribution of the herring exported has, therefore, been during the last seven years—

To the United States	51 p.c.
To Canada	41 "
To British W.Indies	5 "
To United Kingdom and other places	3 "

The apparent decrease in the export of herring in 1908-9 is due to the refusal on the part of some of the United States vessels, which loaded at Bay of Islands, to report their cargoes although the fish was caught by Newfoundlanders, but shipped in United States vessels.

I believe our herring fishery should be of great commercial value to this Colony; in fact if Capital and cure were properly introduced, it should be equal in value to that of the cod-fishery. At Yarmouth on the East Coast of England, the principal seat

of the English herring fishery, and famous the world over for its Yarmouth bloaters, the herring fishery has just closed for the past season, with a total catch etimated at 500,000,000 five hundred millions of herring. The value was not stated, but it must be something enormous. Thousands of people are employed in Yarmouth, cleansing and curing for the continental markets; such as Russia and Germany. What little conception we seem to have as to the meaning of 500,000,000 herring? If you take each herring to measure eight inches and that is only an average size, putting them head and tail to form a herring bridge stretching across the Atlantic Ocean from Liverpool to New York, with this great catch you could build over twenty bridges, each three thousand miles long. I look forward to further development of the herring industry.

I am glad to observe Mr. President, in looking over the reports, that a great improvement in our salmon fishery has taken place during the years 1912-13. Our exports during the year 1909-10 to 1912-13 have steadily increased as you will see from figures I shall quote:—

	Pickled tcs.		Canned css.		Smoked	Fresh	Total Value
1909-10	3,074	$56,845	62	$ 332	$ 14	$13,005	$70,196
1910-11	2,897	55,163	256	1,310	51	15,579	73,103
1911-12	4.602	84,365	418	2,656	37	17,582	104,640
1912-13	4,866	91,720	2,736	16,410	100	25,207	139,437

As a member of the Council ,or controlling body of the Board of Trade for the past two years, I wish to state here that no one, unless he is in close touch with the working of that Executive, can realize the vast amount of work that is done in one year. I earnestly hope that business men in St. John's and the outports will become members and before long the membership will not be less than 500. During the past year many questions of vast importance to the Trade and Commerce of the Colony have been dealt with by the Board of Trade. Among the many matters that have been discussed by the Council during the year, I may mention a few:

Inferior Pack of Lobsters; Common Carriers; Pilfering; Public Enquiries: Common Carriers; Freight Embargo; Bait Act; Herring sold at Halifax; Tariff Charges; Movements of Steamers (Coastal); Weights and Measures; Fishery Board; Fish Inspection; Cold Storage; Imperial Transport Conference; Bait Protection Service; Herring Inspection; Municipal Matters; Coal; Telephone Service; Wireless Telegraphy on Vessels; Fish Contract for Italy; Hotel; Shore Fish Shipped at Labrador; Overcrowding on Railway Cars; Lobster Cans; British Empire Trade Marks; Labrador Boundary; Standardizings of Cull of Fish; Fish Exporters Under Valuation; Absentee Landlords; Portuguese Tariff; Motor Engines; Common Carriers; freight, etc.

All of these questions have been discussed by the Council of the Board of Trade during the year. Some of the more important questions have been communicated to the Government. I have no doubt but that they will receive the best consideration possible from the Executive Government of the Colony.

Our local industries during the year have all been operated to the fullest extent. It may be interesting for some of us to know that no less a sum than $2,000,000.00 annually is spent in wages by our local manufacturers, or about $40,000.00 per week. I have estimated that no less a sum than $6,000,000 is spent annually in wages by some of our large employers of labor, including the local manufacturers. Manufacturing in St John's is now well established. The general prosperity which has continued throughout the Colony for the past four years has been felt by our local manufacturers as well as the Trade generally. We are now supplying the wholesale buyers from our local factories, with ready-made clothing, oil skins, soap, paint, boots and shoes, butter, tobacco, leather, underclothing and top shirts; biscuits and fancy biscuits of all kinds; lines and twines, etc.; all of our factories during the year just closed have been working overtime. Local goods made are in every case to be compared with the best imported. At Harbor Grace and Carbonear, boots and shoes are extensively manufactured. At Fortune trunks, suit cases, and Furniture are turned out in large quantities. During the past year, all classes of our artisans have been earning good wages.

During several months of the year workmen were very difficult to find. We earnestly hope for a continuation of prosperity for the country, and all classes of our people.

Mr. President, for much of the valuable statistical information that I have been able to put before this House,and the country, I am indebted to my courteous friend, H. W. Le-Messurier, Esq., Assistant Collector of Customs, whom I wish to thank publicly. Mr. President, I beg to move the appointment of a select committee to draft a reply to His Excellency the Governor for the gracious speech with which he has been pleased to open the present session of the Legislature.

HON. MR. MURPHY—I rise Mr. President to second the motion by Hon. Mr. Anderson that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's speech.

The hon.member has gone so thoroughly into every paragraph of the speech that he leaves me very little to add that will be of interest to this House. No doubt every member of this Chamber, as well as the whole country, will be pleased to hear that their Royal Highnesses, the Duke and Duchess of Connaught, will, if at all possible, visit us during the summer months. Should they do so I have no doubt that they will receive that spontaneous, warm hearted welcome which Newfoundlanders are ever ready to extend to any member of the Royal Family.

It is pleasing to hear of the general prosperity of our people all over the Island and His Excellency's report of same, over the different parts of the Island he visited during the summer months, and of the good results our agricultural societies and exhibitions are having among our fishermen-farmers around the coast The present generation have not given as much time and attention to cultivating the land as their fathers and grandfathers, who in most cases cleared it, and much of it has been neglected and gone to waste in consequence.

These exhibitions will no doubt show them what great results and how much more their neighbours are getting out of the land, and encourage them to go and do likewise. There is no poverty in any part of the Island where the people look after their land, they are independent and want nothing from Government or merchant, and with the increase now taking place in the use of motor boats to enable them to get both fish and bait with greater certainty and less hard work, and with the present high prices of both fish, farm products and cattle, there should certainly be better and more prosperous times for our fishermen-farmers around our seaboard.

Then when the bad year comes, as come it certainly will, when fish cannot be had even with motor boats on some parts of our coast, they can go to any large labor-giving industries where they will get paid for whatever time it suits them to work there and they can now get to these industries without loss of time, not as of old, and they can return in a hurry if anything goes wrong with their families. They can risk going away to earn for them now, thanks to our railway and steamboat facilities, and if these facilities have not yet reached some isolated homes, I trust they will very shortly.

And judging from what our local industries are now doing and the enormous increase in their output yearly, and with such good prospects for many more industries in the near future, I trust the day is near when our people will no longer have to leave the country to find employment. I see nothing but prosperity ahead of this country in the future. It is full of resources; it only needs capital and enterprise to develop these, and we have both right here among ourselves, if we wish to use them instead of waiting for the foreign article to be brought to us.

Our men of capital, with few exceptions, have always been very timid about investing money in new industries, while they were ever prepared to invest millions in the fishery business, anything from a whale to a caplin was sufficient inducement to open up the money bags, and yet, I have seen during the past forty five years nine out of every ten of them, go down to failure; some continued for many years, but sooner or later they met their financial Waterloo. It made little difference to the fisherman for when his merchant failed, he could always find another and another; and the process was repeated indefinitely.

To what extent, I ask is this fish business today helping to build up our present prosperous condition? With good fisheries and good prices we still have hundreds of poor fishermen coming from Labrador every summer with not enough fish to pay their summer's account with their merchant. It is the same every year with the shore fishermen on some parts of our coast, and if we had no railways and no labor-giving industries to help these poor people, hundreds of them with their families would have to be provided for by their merchants or the Government, the same as they did forty years ago, and whch they still have to do in isolated places, where they have neither steam nor railway communication during the long winter months.

I claim, therefore, that for our present prosperity and for the continuance and increase of the same, we must look elsewhere than to our fisheries. We must depend more on

our farming, mining, lumbering, and all the other industries we have, which are giving permanent employment to thousands of people, men and women, boys and girls, who work hard and constantly for three hundred days of the year. These people are not crying out to the Government for help; they are helping themselves by their hard and constant work.

Our real fishermen-sailors, who solely depended for a living on the seal fishery, codfishery, coasting and foreign sailoring, are few in number today. We have fishermen-farmers, fishermen-miners, fishermen-lumberers and fishermen-laborers of every kind, and it is the increased earning power of these people and of the thousands of permanently employed, clear of the fishery that is building up the present prosperity of this country; and it is from this source a large part of our increased revenue is coming. Our wealthy people are few in number; they lived twenty years ago as now and smoked the same brand of cigars, but the poorer people, whom we have in thousands have become very much more prosperous and by helping them by better pay and constant employment we are laying a solid foundation for the future welfare of the country.

Mr. President, my hon. friend, Hon. Mr. Anderson says the fishery is still our mainstay. I am sorry it is so, for like the business it is made of it is very unreliable and I trust we will soon have a mainstay made of more reliable and better material. It is a precarious business, a gamble a risk that no poor man with a family depending upon him should take as it often follows that he does not earn enough to cover his living expenses until such time as he can get away to some more certain industry, where he is sure of earning good wages.

Thirty six years ago I left the fishery business after a ten years sad experience and loss of money. In fact it cleared me out of everything except what little energy I had left, and some saw mill machinery which I had fortunately invested in the previous year. I have never since ceased to induce men to seek other means of employment. It was a good thing for me that I had bought that machinery, for no man in this country at that time could be induced to invest in the lumber business, practically all the spruce, fir, hemlock and pine lumber we then used was imported by a few merchants, who never failed to tell their customers that we had very little lumber in this country and that what we did have was no good; and only the imported article was recommended.

At the time when I went into the lumber business, to show how little our Government knew about it, there was a law in force which would only grant one square mile of timber land no matter how large a mill was built, and another law which only allowed you to dam two thirds of any river for mill purposes. Several large lumber firms came here from Canada and offered to erect large mills if they were granted suitable timber limits, but were refused by the Government. Some twelve or fifteen years ago speaking to one of our leading political men, of the future prospects of our lumber business, he remarked that in fifteen or twenty years from then all our lumber would be cut out. I replied that by that time we would be just about beginning to develop the business. We were then cutting about thirty five million feet a year. Today

we are cutting from 150 to 200 million feet, and there is no reason why we should not be cutting, sawing and grading six times that quantity and employing labor accordingly. We have the timber, the water power, the men, and millions of money and if our own people would have only have a little more confidence in the grand resources of our country, they could do for themselves what outsiders will shortly do for them,—pocket the money made out of our resources, instead of our own people having the benefit of them.

The late Hon. A. W. Harvey, head of the firm of Harvey and Company, with his advanced progressive ideas was the first to see the possibilities of our pulp busness. His firm was the first to start a pulp mill, as they were also the first to start many other local industries, and if it had not been for the mistake made in the location, it would be running today and giving permanent employment to a great number of the people of that locality, and I further know that had it been a success he was prepared to start one or two pulp mills where there would be no mistake in the location.

We have one good example of local industries set out for us right here in this town in the Horwood Lumber Co. Ltd., of which I understand Hon. Mr. Bishop is a director, outside of what this firm is doing in ths city and the large number of people they employ permanently, they have built and operated for years saw mills at Dog Bay and Burnt Bay and will complete and start within the next three months a large first-class up-to-date Pulp Mill that will give permanent employment to hundreds of our people in the future. They have not waited for foreign capital, they are not being advertised every day or two in our papers, they are quietly building up another large local industry out of local capital. I have known the managers of this firm for years, and I predict for them through their experience and careful management, larger dividends than have been forthcoming to date from businesses of like kind

I have been thirty six years engaged in local industries, lumbering, shipbuilding, electric light and power supplying and others. Our company is selling cheap electric power to-day, which has enabled many small industries to start business, while as soon as extensions are made, and many others are prepared to follow altogether directly, and indirectly, they will employ a large number of our people, and my only regret is that I cannot get money fast enough to invest in good paying industries. Our Newfoundlanders are the best all round workmen in the world, born mechanics, suitable for any industry we may start. They did not take kindly at first to the lumber business and I had to import men from Nova Scotia. Our people were sailors and rather looked down then on any kind of work on land. Today all has changed; they are more ambitious now and the man who did well at the fishery as well as he who did very little, are all anxious to earn more money; and so we see hundreds of well-dressed young men travelling on the railways to points where they are certain good money can be made. Everything to-day points to an increased prosperity among our people. We are no longer a country with but one industry, our people are earning good money. Future prospects are bright, 'full speed ahead' is the word, We have turned the corner and are on

the high road to prosperity. Mr. President, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion made by Hon. Mr. Anderson, for the appointment of a committee to draft an Address in Reply to the gracious speech of His Excellency the Governor.

The motion being put and carried, the Hon. the President, named the following as the committee for the said purpose. Hon. Messrs. Anderson, Murphy, Skelton, J.D. Ryan and Angel.

HON. MR. BISHOP—Before moving the adjournment of the House I should like to congratulate the hon. gentlemen who have recently been honored by the King in being appointed to the Legislative Council of Newfoundland and to extend to them the welcome of the Council to its deliberations. The Hon. Mr. Power is known to all through his long residence here, and from his mature experience and well known attainments he will be assuredly a valuable member of this branch of the Legislature. Hon. Mr. Murphy has had legislative experience in the Lower Branch of the General Assembly and I feel that the very lucid speech we have just listened to from him will be sufficient evidence that in him also we have another valuable acquisition to the debating power of the Chamber. I wish also to congratulate the mover of the address and I do so with particular pleasure from the fact of the hon. gentleman admitting here that five years ago he entered into a criticism, eloquent and incisive, of the policy of the government as he had regarded it then, and that he has now not only admitted his error of that time, but has acknowledged the success and wisdom of the policy and performance of the Government.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House then adjourned until Monday next Jan. 19th at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, Jan. 19, 1914

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

The President read a certified Minute of Council appointing the following Internal Economy Commission:—

Hon. the President,
Hon. R. K. Bishop,
Hon. P. T. McGrath,
His Honor the Speaker,
Rt. Hon. Sir E. P. Morris,
Hon. J. R. Bennett,
Hon. C. H. Emerson.

HON. Mr. ANDERSON presented the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech and moved that it be read a first time.

The Address was then read a first time.

HON. MR. ANDERSON moved that the Address be read a second time.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Without detaining the House Mr. President for any lengthy comments, there are two or three matters to which I desire to refer at this time. The first of these has reference to the present status of the paper and pulp industry in [illegible] Colony. There is a paragraph in the Speech dealing with the subject. I dare say some of the members present have seen the last report of the A. N.D. Co. In that report occurred a paragraph intimating that the industry was suffering under tariff burdens which the Directors evidently consider unfair; and the intimation was given that until some adjustments were made further investment upon capital account could not be recommended.

Without going into this matter in any detail, for I am in fact, not posted in details sufficiently to do so [illegible] without even arguing that our tariff does seriously prejudice the success

of these enterprises, I must call the attention of the authorities to the fact that this matter is of sufficient importance to call for full and immediate examination. If there is any reasonable way in which the industry can be relieved and helped, the interests of the Colony are all in favour of doing it, provided of course, that the cost is moderate and the contention sustained. I therefore hope that it will be fully investigated without delay and if too late to do anything this session, that at least another year should not be allowed to pass witsout very full enquiry. I am sure Hon. Mr. Murphy as seconder of the Address, will appreciate the force of the matter, seeing how warm was his advocacy of such industries. He will appreciate that there should be a considerable development of the sulphite pulp, and paper industry here, and that there are many places where, though grinding may not be possible, sulphite manufacture can be successfully carried on. I believe that the principal trouble lies with duties connected with this sulphite and paper industry and that some of the duties now collected have never been really adjusted in their proper relation to the industry and are really not intended to apply to it. Of course, I may be right or wrong on these points, for I do not pretend to be posted, but the matter is of much importance to the Colony, for I think that there can be no doubt that if the Anglo Newfoundland Development Co. were paying its shareholders 5 to 10 per cent,—and that is not too much where such a large amount is invested in pioneer work in a new country, other large industries of the same type would have been started before this, and I think it extremely unlikely that any similar new large developments will be started until the A. N. D. Company pay a dividend and we know that as a result of several years work no dividend has yet been earned. I do not know what there really is in the specific claim that there is an unfair taxation on the industry, but I do know that the statement is there in the annual report. I feel that it is a matter of such importance that it ought not to be passed over without attention being called to it.

Another matter in the Speech which I want to say a word about is the reference to the lobster fishery. The lobster fishery unfortunately has declined to a regrettably small volume, and it is really sad to see that that is so, for our lobsters are amongst the finest in the world. We used to have enormous numbers of them, but they are simply being destroyed for want of protection and care, and I think that the Government directly, or through the Department of Marine and Fisheries ought to take heroic measures, if necessary, with the idea of trying to re-establish the lobster fishery and preserve it as a permanent industry. When we consider the small amount of expenditure upon individual plant and outfit that is required, the enormous value of the product, as it comes from the water, for it is worth pound for pound six or seven times the value of codfish, the fact that there is no cullage or deterioration, the fact that the article is cash from the moment it comes from the water and requries no long period of preparation, that lobsters are constantly increasing in value, these are facts which make it imperative that something should be done, and all must believe that care and proper legislation will result in rehabilitating our lobster fishery. All

these things I say, Mr. President, lead one to impress upon the authorities the need of taking strenuous action, and trying to do something to conserve this most valuable asset.

There is one other matter to which I wish to refer, a matter of general policy, which does not appear in the speech, the subject of Public Health. In the year 1912 the Speech from the Throne announced that the Government had concluded that the time had arrived when a permanent and energetic policy should be adopted, and that it was the intention fortwith to adopt it. Since then no reference has been made to the matter and I have been disappointed that in the opening speeches of the last two sessions, there has been no reference at all to the question of a permanent policy dealing with Public Health. When the present Government first came into power in 1909, one of their very first actions was to take up this question, and appoint a commission, whose duties were to investigate, report and put into shape some practical method of dealing with the problem of Public Health. That Commission gave a very great deal of thought and time to the subject, and put in a series of reports. These, like so many other reports which are made, I fancy were read by very few people, and I think that so far as any real attention to their recommendations went, nobody paid any attention to them, and as a Member of that commission, I feel some chagrin that a large amount of time and thought and practical work and effort have been apparently wasted. The net result of their several reports was that this problem was one that must be dealt with as a problem of prevention not as one of cure. It further pointed out that prevention was really a matter of education; education through the schools, first of all and then to the adult population by means of pamphlets, advertisements of various kinds and by visiting people in their homes; and in pursuance of these recommendations that Commission appointed a number of outport doctors to represent them in various definite lines of work and particularly to report. They supplied a number of schools with books on hygiene and physical exercises, assisted and helped to establish a Domestic Science School in St. John's; obtained the services of Dr. Wakefield as traveling lecturer and started tentatively the medical inspection of schools and school children, and at their instance a course of lectures was for several years provided by Dr. Tait to all teachers in training.

When in 1912 the Commission found themselves in a rather embarrassing position, a sort of fifth wheel to the coach, they of course resigned, but in doing so they made a strong recommendation that these lines of work should be continued and developed as being the most practical and efficient for further extension. All the work however, appears to have been simply allowed to drop and two years have been entirely lost.

In that same year, 1912, the Speech from the Throne. also announced the Reid gift, a gift certainly of the most munificent kind, and one for which the donors deserve the thanks of the whole colony; but the form in which the application of the gift first of all came before the Legislature, was so crude that it certainly required revision. It received a large amount

of criticsm, much of it reasonable and indeed unanswerable. The attitude of the authorities was, I think, however, hostile to these criticisms; perhaps however, they have modified their position now. But nobody, I think, knows what their attitude or policy is or if any policy has been definitely thrashed out and decided upon at all. But at least, Mr. President, I hope it has not been determined to go ahead with the original scheme, the putting up of a curative sanatorium in each electoral district involving the Colony in an expenditure of $75,000 per annum, which it cannot afford, and much of which will certainly give no adequate returns. I myself urged strongly at the time that a thorough test should first be made with one sanatorium. That position I adhere to now. There can hardly be a doubt in anyone's mind that if it can be shown that this gift in its present form is not in practice desirable, the Messrs. Reid would be only too delighted to put it in such a form as would commend itself to those who have studied the question.

I am not going to enter into a discussion for or against branch railways, Mr. President, but I should like to say that the words I listened to from our new member Hon. Mr. Murphy,were most lucid and interesting and a very sane defence of branch railways, on the ground that they really extend the workingman's year enabling him to move elsewhere and do productive work when he could do nothing at home. There is a great deal in that. But I do at any rate hope, that when the branches now under construction are completed the Government or Legislature will call a halt and that hereafter the concentrated policy of the Colony will be shifted and fixed upon Education and Public Health as paramount to anything else. They are both urgent. They are really one and the same thing and there should be a department to deal officially with them.

I also listened with sympathy and pleasure to Hon. Mr. Anderson's reference to the 'Hands Across the Sea' movement. It is a good one and will have the sympathy of every well wisher; but a great deal more than that needs to be done. Our competent teachers must be paid to stay in the Colony and they must be better equipped than they are.

I do not, Mr. President, want what I have said here to be construed as disparaging in any way to any efficient health work now being done in St. John's. As far as I know however this work is directed primarily to cure. It cannot be too strongly urged that you can never eradicate such a disease as Consumption by a policy of cure. An ounce of prevention is worth pounds of cure in this matter.

I trust, before the present session closes we shall be somehow enlightened as to the policy and also that further time may not be lost in pursuing a practical energetic method of treating the Public Health problem.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—Before the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech, passes Mr. President I shall make a few remarks on some of the matters referred to therein. Before doing so, I have to thank my hon. friend Mr. Anderson the mover of the Address for his kindly reference and congratulations on my and other appointments to this branch of the Legislature since he

was here last. I congratulate my hon. friend on his speech and the able and efficient manner in which he has moved the Address in Reply. It must indeed, be highly gratifying to Sir E. P. Morris, the Premier, to have a former colleague, but opposed to him at the last election now supporting him, praising his policy and proving by statistical information how greatly the country has benefited by his progressive policy; and I admire Mr. Anderson's honesty in admitting his error and the enthusiasm with which he now supports Sir Edward's policy and his admiration at the carrying out of his pre-election promises.

In reviewing the various topics referred to in the speech it is most gratifying to hear that His Excellency is taking such interest in our people as to visit so much of the country generally, which must be beneficial; and his announcement of his invitation to their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Connaught, to pay this country a visit the coming summer will be received with pleasure by the people, who if the invitation be accepted, will receive them with that whole hearted loyalty characteristic of them towards the Royal family. The more the country is visited by people of influence and standing the more will it be appreciated.

It is indeed most creditable to us how the recent election; fought with a vim and party feeling seldom exceeded; should have been carried out with so little disturbance, more especially in the case of the city, where demonstrations of rival parties taking place at the very same time were conducted without disorder. This shows in my opinion, that the grants for Education in the past,have not been spent in vain. It was very different in the olden times as no doubt some of us can remember.

My hon. friend, Mr. Anderson stated in the course of his remarks, that the fisheries were the main stay of the country, a remark I think, that nearly all of us agree with, but my hon. friend, Mr. Murphy, did not take that view of it and stated our new industries were more advantage to us and that he would discourage any more men from going to the fishery.

Now Sir, I take it that the present prosperous condition of the country is due in the first place, to the enhanced value of our fishery products; secondly, to the new industries and local manufactures and money spent on railway building, but I would ask where has the wealth that is undoubtedly in the possession of the fishermen been accumulated? What industry is there that will yield such results as the fishery of late years? To-day banking outfitters are manning their fleets with men on wages, at $40 to $50 a month with the option of shares exceeding that amount. I know sharemen who made $450 for six or seven weeks work the past season, and I know of a fisherman with three sons, and one cod trap, whose earnings in 1912 were over $3,000 and in 1913 exceeded $5,000. What employment can show as good results; but, of course all are not so fortunate, still at present prices there is no employment which gives them as good an advantage.

I am quite in accord with my hon. friend, Mr. Murphy that we should do all in our power to encourage and foster all new industries and manufactures, as he has himself shown in a practical manner by in-

vesting freely and working in them himself when looked upon unfavorably by others, and I consider that where any industry in which capital has been invested; and which gives a large amount of employment is in a fair way of collapsing owing to our present tariff favoring outside manufactures, that the Customs tariff should be amended.

The fisheries are the main stay of the country and should be carefully conserved and there ought in my opinion to be a strong fishery board, comprised of men appointed to that Board, either from scientific or practical knowledge, and not from their position or politics or wealth, and have more power given them in the regulation of matters connected with the fishery.

In speaking of the fishery I cannot even at the cost of being thought tiresome, refrain frem repeating my remarks made last session, in regard to the cure of fish. There is at the present day, in my opinion, a want of care and attention from the time it is caught, and it is treated in a manner that in my young days would have brought speedy punishment. It is an article of food and should be treated as such, but it is hard to blame the fishermen, as long as the abominable system of purchasing codfish talqual exists, as the man who makes good fish gets no more for it. It is really a very serious matter, as we are losing markets for want of good quality and our codfish, heretofore the best produced, is fast losing ground while our competitors are paying more attention and making their product better.

If we take care with our codfish, there is no reason to anticipate low prices again, and the opening of free markets in the United States is a large factor in favour of that position, as the large and the fast increasing population of the United States must depend on us for much of their requirements in the way of fish. We certainly can catch it cheaper than they can fit out and come here to catch it, and the cost of transit in the present day is very little to take it to the coming market in the United States. I was at one time strongly in favor of giving to the United States free bait for free fish, as I valued the opening of their market to our fish so highly, but it is good to see that Sir E. P. Morris has got the free market for our fish and still retains the bait. It is due to his firmness that we have done so well.

With regard to the standardizing of our fishery products I should like to see this placed in the hands of the Board of Trade, which I still believe could do much to alter the evils of which I have spoken, and thus enhance the value of our output.

In the concluding paragraph of His Excellency's speech allusion is made to the Whale Fishery and the appointment of a commission is foreshadowed to make enquiires in this matter. I have had fifteen years' experience in the conduct of this fishery and I must say that I fail to see or know of any locality where this fishery has been conducted that either the supply of fish or bait has been affected. I believe the bait, fish, and whales all come to the shore from natural causes. and in proof of which the past season there has been an abundance of caplin and no whales. However, I

am well aware that there is a consensus of opinion among the fishermen that the prosecution of the whale fishery is injurious to our other fisheries, and that being so, there can be no reason for not making an enquiry by Commission, and if it can be shown that the whale fishery injures our codfishery, then steps should be taken to stop it. But it must not be forgotten that a great deal of capital has been invested in this industry under license from the Government, and much money has been lost in its prosecution. However, I don't think there is much need of enquiry, as the fishery is fast dying out itself and there is no chance of further investment therein, as with one or two exceptions no dividends were paid this year or last year.

I quite agree, with my hon. friend Mr. Harvey in his remarks on the lobster fishery which has shown a steady decline, and the attention of our Fishery Bureau should be carefully given to find out the cause and remedy it, if possible. It is too valuable a fishery to be lost to us.

His Excellency alluded to the agricultural development which has taken place lately among our people, and I fully concur in the liberal grants that have been made for its encouragement, as I regard it of great importance to our welfare and as an aid to the fishermen of the country. I would like to see, if it can be prudently done, a larger grant made for the importation of improved stock poultry and seed. In this connection I believe that the branch railways will be of great benefit. I at one time thought that the only justification for a branch railway to Trepassey was the making of a winter port, but from the experience of the past three months I am of opinion that it is going to be a paying branch and it will be a matter of surprise to many to know, that even before it was fitted for taking passengers, comfortably, thousands travelled by it and that the quantity of traffic over it since has been unexpectedly larger. I think it will be a great impetus to agriculture, as Trepassey and its neighbourhood is very suitable for sheep raising, etc., and also many parts of the district of Ferryland, and the facility for getting cattle to St. John's by rail will be eagerly availed of.

Referring again to the Speech, while it is gratifying to hear that the country is in a very prosperous condition and the statistics which Hon. Mr. Anderson has quoted are such as to convince us that we are progressing in every way, still I regret to see that the Speech has to allude to a shortage in the Revenue for the first six months of the current year, owing to the large reduction made in the tariff last session placing pork, beef, sugar and tea on the free list. While I give Sir Edward Morris credit for carrying out his pre-election promise and the desire of the Government to relieve the tax on food, I cannot agree that it was wise or prudent, and I think it was a great mistake, resulting as it has after a prosperous six months in a serious deficiency at present, owing to the reduction made last session. Over half the imports of the Colony come in duty free and it is difficult to see how we are

going to raise the required revenue on less than half of the imports, comprising almost wholly clothing and luxuries. On few necessaries to-day is any customs revenue collected, and I contend that no Finance Minister can forecast with any accuracy the amount of revenue to be collected when based on the import of luxuries only, which are already heavily taxed, and to be fairly safe he must, in my opinion, rely on taxing some necessary imports. An increased tax on spirits will stimulate smuggling, and many other heavily taxed imports will not be imported on an increased tariff, and it is a serious matter for the Colony to have a deficit and our large expenditure not equalized by revenue is a serious blow to the Colony's credit. In this country it is difficult to find any way to raise a revenue except by a tax on imports and in my opinion, if it is to be safe, some of it must be raised on the imports of food. While I strongly favour the Old Age Pensions, I believe that justly a tax on flour to the extent of fifteen or even twenty cents a barrel would be a proper way of providing for it, and should be imposed specially for that purpose, in which case a slight increase in the yearly revenue might be made. The people who receive such have contributed towards it. It is all very well to have a sentimental idea of freedom from taxation on food, but there is no tax to be relied on to give the necessary amount except a tax on foods, at least to some extent.

We hear of the high prices now demanded for coal. Undoubtedly $7.60 is a high price, but the price must be higher than it used to be comparatively. The labor engaged in mining it has increased, the freights have gone up owing partially to advance in the seamen's wages, cartage has gone up, the municipal duty has gone up and the labour handling it in St. John's has gone up. If the price of labour advances, that which labor produces must advance and the cost of living advances also. I do not think the high price of coal is altogether a curse, but may be a blessing in disguise, and it will make us I hope, more desirous of developing our coal fields, which our venerable geological surveyor, Mr. Howley, reports so favourably of; but I think the Government are taking the right course in securing a gentleman with the reputation of Prof. Dunstan to examine and report. Nothing can be more beneficial to our country than the working of its own coal fields. While we have every confidence in Mr. Howley's reports, if we get a favorable report from Prof. Dunstan, it will carry more weight with capitalists abroad.

With regard to further branch railways, I agree with my hon. friend Mr. Harvey, that we should complete our present branches and see how they work before enterprising further extensions. It will not be as easy, I fear, to raise money in the near future as it has been in the past. While we should do everything in our power to foster new industries and encourage our local manufacturers now spending in this city alone two million dollars in wages annually, we must not forget that the fisheries will undoubtedly be the mainstay of the country, and use every effort to utilize them to the

best advantage. I shall have some thing further to say on the various matters referred to in this Speech when they come before us,

The motion was then put and carried unanimously, and it was ordered that the Address in Reply be engrossed, and presented to His Excellency by the whole House.

The House then adjourned until Thursday, Jan. 22, at 11 o'clock a.m.

THURSDAY, Jany 22nd.

The Council met at 11 a. m. pursuant to adjournment.

There being no quorum present the House adjourned till tomorrow at 11 a. m.

FRIDAY, Jan. 23rd

The Council met at 11 a.m. pursuant to adjournment.

There being no quorum present the House adjourned till tomorrow at 11 a.m.

SATURDAY, Jan. 24th

The Council met at 11 a.m. pursuant to adjournment.

There being no quorum present the House adjourned till Monday at 11 a. m.

MONDAY, Jan. 26th

The Council met at 11 a.m. pursuant to adjournment.

There being no quorum present the House adjourned till tomorrow at 11 a m.

TUESDAY, Jan. 27th

The Council met at 11 a.m. pursuant to adjournment.

There being no quorum present the House adjourned till tomorrow at 11 a.m.

WEDNESDAY, Jan 21st.

The Council met at eleven o'clock and when the minutes of the previous sitting had been read, **HON. R. K. BISHOP** rose and said:—Mr. President, I desire to move the following Resolutions:—

"THAT the Legislative Council hereby reccrds its deep regret on the recent demise of the Honourable James S. Pitts, C.M.G., an event which has deprived the Council of an estimable member and the consideration of a gentleman who, during a long and prosperous commercial career had acquired the confidence of the public, and whose character both in public and private life was unimpeachable.

RESOLVED—That the Council deeply sympathize with the family of the late Honourable Mr. Pitts in their affliction, and that a copy of these Resolutions be sent to Mrs. Pitts in token of their sympathy.

RESOLVED—That the Council do now adjourn until Monday next at 4.30 p.m., as a mark of respect for the memory of their late brother member.

In moving these resolutions, Mr. President, I desire to express my personal feeling of sympathy in respect of our deceased friend and fellow Councillor, Mr. Pitts. He had attained a very prominent and honourable position in the public, as well as the commercial life of the country; he was a man of sound judgment, and while conservative and deliberate, he was at the same time progressive; and while he considered carefully every project proposed to him, when he had decided to embark his capital he was always active and energetic for the success of the enterprise, and upon many of the directorates of a large number of the institutions of the Colony he occupied a seat. It was the privilege of some of us to meet him in that capacity frequently, and all who knew him will

bear testimony that his judgment was sound, he was always courteous, and that he was ready to hear the other side of the story and then give his decision, after an impartial hearing of the matter under consideration. It was not in commercial life alone, however, that Mr. Pitts was prominent. He was a liberal supporter of his Church in its various enterprises, and also showed markedly his interest in education. As a member of this Legislature, where he occupied a seat for many years, his attitude was always uniform. He seldom showed strong party feelings, but was ready to give his vote for anything which was shown to be for the interest and welfare of the country. He was honoured as the Leader in this House in the Government of which he was a valued member for many years, and when a few years ago he received distinction from His Majesty the King, I am sure the public were gratified that the honour had been bestowed on a worthy man. I beg to move the Resolutions.

The Resolutions were then carried, when on motion the House adjourned till Monday next at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, Feb. 2nd.

The Council met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

The President announced that His Excellency would receive the Committee of the whole Council at 11.30 a.m. on Tuesday to receive the Address in Reply.

HON. MR. BISHOP tabled the regulations adopted by the Governor-in Council for carrying into effect the Act respecting the Assistance of Sufferers in Marine Disasters.

HON. MR. BISHOP also tabled the Report of the Internal Economy Commisson which was read to the Council by the Clerk.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till tomorrow at 11 a.m.

TUESDAY, Feb. 3rd.

The Council met at 11 a.m. pursuant to adjournment and proceeded to Government House, to present the Address in Reply to His Excellency.

On returning to the Council Chamber the President informed the House that a deputation of the whole House, having waited upon His Excellency, had received the following reply:

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.

(Sgd.) W. E. DAVIDSON,
Governor.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House then adjourned till Friday next at 4.30 p.m.

FRIDAY, Feb. 6th.

HON. PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received a letter from Mrs. Pitts thanking the Council for the resolutions of sympathy upon the recent demise of Hon J.S. Pitts, C. M. G.

HON. PRESIDENT announced that he had received a message from the House of Assembly informing the Council that that House had passed the accompanying bills, entitled respectively An Act to amend Chap. 109 Consolidated Statutes. Second Series, entitled 'Patents,' and an Act to Amend 6 Edward VII Cap. 3, entitled 'Alien's Act' in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop these Bills were then read a first

time and ordered to be read a second time tomorrow.

HON. MR.BISHOP tabled the Report of the Examiners of the Council of Higher Education, 1913, the Report of the Postmaster General for the year ending June 30th, 1913 and also the Report of the Commissioners on Lunacy, requesting that it be read by the Clerk which was done.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House then adjourned until Monday next at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, Feb. 9th.

Pursuant to adjournment the House met at 4.30 p.m.

Second reading of Patents Amendment Act. ..

HON .MR. BISHOP.—The object of this Bill is to enable persons holding Patents outside of this country to secure patents here without forwarding the original drawings or descriptions and to permit them to obtain patents here by sending certified copies of such description after having obtained a patent in Great Britain. The change is a very slight one and simply permits a certified copy of the drawings and descriptions to be used instead of the original. I therefore beg to move the second reading of the Bill. The Bill was then read a second time and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop ordered to be submitted to a committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of the Alien Amendment Act.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The change in this Bill from the present is very simple as the law stands. Any vessel carrying 20 or more Aliens may be visited by the Customs, and the Bill is to be changed by striking out the words 'twenty persons' and permitting the examination of vessels having any number of passengers. This is the only change. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill. The Bill was accordingly read a second time and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly informing the House that they had presented the following Bills, entitled respectively, An Act respecting the Exhibition of Advertisements 'An Act to further amend the Newfoundland Denal Act, and An Act to amend and Consolidate the Law for Protection of Animals and in which they requested the concurrence of the House.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Act to amend and consolidate the law relating to the Protection of Animals was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Act relating to the Exhibition of Advertisements was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Act to further amend the Newfoundland Dental Act was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till to-morrow at 4.30 p.m.

TUESDAY, Feb. 10th

The House met at 4.30 p. m. pur-

suant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill to amend the law relating to Patents.

Hon. Mr. Anderson took the chair.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Before the Bill passes Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest to the hon. gentleman in charge of it, that he consider the addition to it of a clause providing that parties to whom patents may be granted for articles that can be manufactured in this country shall be required to have them manufactured here. The reason why I make this suggestion is that in 1907 Mr. Lloyd George introduced an amendment to the British Patent Act making it obligatory that parties who obtained patents should manufacture the patented article in the United Kingdom; and the result of the decision was an enormous stimulus to British manufactures.

Of course, I recognise that it is not possible to go so far in this colony, because there are many articles for which patents are obtained which it would not pay to manufacture; but at the same time there are articles patented here that could be manufactured in this country, or articles that may be patented in future that can be manufactured; and that being so I think we ought to provide an impetus to our manufactures by making it necessary that wherever possible articles patented here shall also be manufactured in this country. I tried to get the solicitor today to draft a section to this effect, but he was in court, and if the hon. gentlemen in charge of the Bill has no objections, I would ask that the Committee rise and report progress and in the meantime I will have the proposed amendment prepared.

HON. MR. BISHOP—Certainly.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

The House went into Committee on the Bill to amend the Aliens Act 1900.

HON. MR. ROBINSON in the chair.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

HON. MR. BISHOP moved that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Second reading of Cruelty to Animals Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—With reference to this Bill, I may say that it has been prepared at the request of the Society for the Protection of Animals. The Bill, as it now comes before us, has been taken largely from the Imperial Act, and also from Acts of the United States. There are some modifications from the Imperial Act where thought necessary, as conditions here are not identical with those in Great Britain. The necessity for the Act and the benefits derived from it will appear more particularly when the Bill goes through Committee. The Bill is a rather lengthy one, but there is one item to which I shall refer which strikes me as being important and that is the section deailng with the use of dogs for hauling purposes. All of us have seen the highly objectionable and cruel practice, not

only of little boys, but of adults harnessing young pups to sleds and other vehicles, and ill-treating them. The Bill provides that no dogs under thirty pounds weight shall be used for hauling purposes, and for the information of members I shall read the average weight of certain breeds of dogs:

St. Bernard—160 to 210 lbs.
Mastiff—160 to 200 lbs.
Newfoundland—110 to 150 lbs.
Labrador Retriever—70 to 100 lbs.
Pointer—45 to 60 lbs.
Eskimo—70 lbs.
Bloodhound—80 to 110 lbs.
Irish Wolfhound—Up to 148 lbs.
Deerhound—80 to 110 lbs.
Collie—40 to 65 lbs.
Greyhound—55 to 65 lbs.
Bull Dog—45 to 50 lbs.
Bull Terrier—40 lbs.
Boston Terrier—23 to 30 lbs.
Fox Terrier—20 lbs.
Dachshund—20 pounds.
Irish Terrier—22 to 24 lbs.
Scotch Terrier—15 to 30 lbs.

It will appear therefore, that any dog that does not weigh over 30 pounds should not, under any condition, be allowed to be harnessed to a sled for hauling purposes. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

The Bill was read a second time and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Second reading of Exhibition of Advertisements Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill is intended to prevent within the city limits or within an area of five miles from the Court House, as the City Council shall propose, or elsewhere in the Colony, as the Governor-in-Council shall propose, the exhibition of Advertisements which are unsightly or which may be objectionable. Very frequently advertisements are put up in places where they are an eyesore and decidedly objectionable, and the object of this Bill is to prohibit an advertisement that does not commend itself to the Municipal Council or the Governor in Council. A busy and enterprising advertiser has already exhibited advertisements in the vicinity of Bowring Park, and it is feared that this practice may be extended elsewhere. Hence the bill. I beg to move that it be read a second time.

The Bill was here read a second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr Bishop, ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House tomorrow.

Second reading of the Dental Amendment Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The change in this Bill Mr. President, from that which passed last year is very trifling and is suggested by Mr. Norman C. King, the Registrar of Education in the United Kingdom in a letter forwarded through the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—The statement that the amendment is trifling is open to question. Sub Section (d) was not placed in the Act without a purpose. Qualifying for actual registration involves considerable extra expense and would handicap our students, who might select British Dental Colleges. The amendment calls for qualifications that are not essential and demands higher at-

tainments from British dentists than from those on this side of the Atlantic. Graduates of British Dental Colleges have all the qualifications Newfoundland requires. Personally I see no advantages, and some disadvantages, as the result of the amendment under discussion.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I don't see how it affects the standing of our dentists in this country.

HON. .MR. ROBINSON—It discrimnates in the qualifications required.

HON. MR. BISHOP moved that the second reading of the Bill be deferred.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till Thursday at 4.30 p.m.

THURSDAY, Feb. 12, 1914.

HON. PRESIDENT announced that he had received a communication from His Excellency the Governor granting leave of absence to the Hons. R. K. Bishop, George Knowling and John Anderson for the remainder of the session.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the Aliens' Amendment Act was read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House has passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Patents Amendment Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg leave to move a further amendment to this act, rendered necessary for the purpose of keeping it in conformity with the Judicature Act, which prescribed the mode in which deeds and documents shall be prepared for the purpose of registration. The amendment that I would move is that section 19 of the said chapter, as amended by the act 2 Ed. VII cap. 8, is hereby further amended by the addition of the words "Notary Public" after the words "Consular Agent."

The amendment was adopted.

HON. MR McGRATH—I move, Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the intimation I gave at the last sitting, another section to stand as section 3 and to read thus:—

"Section 12 of Chap. 109 of the consolidated statues is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"12. Any letters patent, which may be taken out under or by virtue of this chapter for the manufacture of an article or the carrying on of a process which in the opinion of the Governor in Council can be profitably manufactured or carried on in this country, and which within two years next ensuing from and after the date thereof or from and after the date of the passing of this act, (whichever shall be the longer period) shall not have been manufactured or carried on in this country, shall be void."

I might say that the legislation at present under Section 12 is:—

"Any letters patent which may be taken out under or by virtue of this chapter, and which shall not have been brought into operation within two years next ensuing after the date thereof, shall at the expiration of the said period of two years be void."

As a matter of fact this section is evaded or got round by parties who have secured patents, by their publishing a notice in the newspapers at or about the expiration of the two years, to the effect that they

are ready to bring into operation in the colony the process or article patented, and inviting parties to offer royalties for permission to use or manufacture these articles here; but, of course, the royalties asked for this are prohibitory, and it is thus made impossible for anybody to avail of these offers, consequently the patentees are able to retain their patents and not manufacture or give the country any advantage whatever in return for the protection they enjoy.

The amendment which I offer will absolutely void the patents after two years; that is to say, a patent which in the opinion of the Governor-in-Council it is possible to manufacture here. Of course there are so many articles that could not be manufactured here. For instance, it would not pay to manufacture safety razors, and the Governor-in-Council would not cancel a patent thereon; but it may be possible to manufacture things in connection with the fishery, mining and paper making industries and therefore I maintain that where, under these circumstances, it is possible for the manufacturing to be done in this Colony, we should enforce the principle embodied in my amendment and oblige all parties obtaining such patents to manufacture these articles in the Colony. As I said at the last sitting, the fact which suggested to me this amendment was that in 1907 Mr. Lloyd George effected an amendment to the British Patent Law of similar tenor to this, providing that all parties obtaining patents in England would have to manufacture there or the patents would lapse, with the result that an enormous stimulus was given to British industries. I recognize, of course, that we are not likely to have factories going up every day all over the country, but we ought to protect ourselves with a view of securing any industry that it is possible to establish amongst us in the future.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Does the notice in the papers of which you speak get over the obligation to manufacture or bring into operation?

HON. MR. McGRATH—Yes, so I am advised. That is the explanation given me by several legal gentlemen whom I have consulted on the matter within the past few days, moreover, Mr. Kent during the passage of this bill in the Lower House, dealt with this same matter, and the desirability of effecting such a change in the Patent Law as would enable our people to derive more benefit from it.

HON. MR. GIBBS—While there may be a great deal in what Hon. Mr. McGrath has stated with regard to the working of patents in this country and the effect of the law as now upon the Statute Book, I may say, it has never been clearly defined here what is the definition or meaning of "brought into operation," and whether it means that the parties are compelled to manufacture or lease the rights to parties here none are able to say at present, because the point has never come before the court for adjudication. The hon. gentleman endeavours to apply, to a certain extent, conditions in other countries which do not prevail here. It is true that Lloyd George caused the Patent Laws of England to be changed, and that great stimulus was given the manufacture of different articles and the introduction of a large amount of foreign capital, but we must also recognize the fact that the English manufacturers were paying very heavy sums for the use of German and other patents which they were using in the manufacture of very

many kinds of articles and as a consequence of very heavy royalties the Germans were able to more than successfully compete with the English manufacturer, and that is one of the reasons which caused Lloyd George to make the amendments to the acts.

Now, we have not in this country any industry, which could attempt to manufacture any of the articles which from time to time are patented here. Under the Patent Law as it now stands we get the benefit of the best articles which are manufactured. If we place power within the hands of the Governor-in-Council to abrogate patents now in existence or which may be applied for and granted in this country, we simply leave this country open for all kinds of frauds and infringements to be sold here, whereas to-day we get the benefit of the best articles manufactured; but open the doors by abrogating laws now in existence and a different condition might prevail. I quite agree that if this country was in a position to manufacture all or any of the articles which are patented from time to time, it would be wise on our part to compel the manufacture here, but until we have arrived at such a stage industrially I do not think it wise to do so.

With regard to the fshery, Governments in the past have taken, and I think those in the future will take, the stand that they do not issue patents with regard to the manner or means in which the fisheries shall be carried on in this country, so that my Hon. friend need have no fears on that point, that so far as the fisheries are concerned the Governments in the future, as they have in the past, will recognize the necessity for protecting that industry from patents which may increase the cost of production to the fishermen or others engaged in the prosecution of that industry, and, that being the case, I personally do not see what point there is in the amendment proposed by my hon. friend. If the conditions industrially warrant, within the next two or three or five years we could not pursue a better line of policy than the one he suggests, but at present I do not see that anything can be gained. but perhaps lost, in the manner I have described.

I have not had any conference with the Government upon the question of this amendment, but I may say that this is not the first time an amendment of this kind had been discussed by the Government, and after giving a good deal of thought and consideration they came to the conclusion that an amendment of this character would not be desirable, and that the country was not in a position from an industrial standpoint to warrant such an amendment.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I fail to see, Mr. President, wherein my Hon. friend's observations in any way meet my arguments or establish any ground for rejecting the amendment. On the contrary, I think his speech forms the strongest reason in favor of some such change in the existing Patent Law, as I am proposing. He says, first, that the Courts have never defined what is meant by the phrase "bringing into operation" patents in this Colony and that therefore nobody knows exactly what that term means or what the process of bringing a patent into operation involves. My amendment would cure all that. It prescribes a clear cut and well defined policy, putting an end to the evasion now practised, rendering decisions by the Court unnecessary, and giving the Colony some return for

the protection it affords to patentees. The amendment is not arbitrary or prohibitory. It does not propose to void every patent or deprive every patentee of his rights. It simply declares that whenever there is a reasonable prospect in the opinion of the Governor-in-Council of a patent being profitably manufactured in this Colony, the patentee is to be required to so manufacture it or else lose the protection our law gives him, and there is nothing hard, unreasonable or objectionable in that clause, because that is the purpose of the existing section in the Act, and my amendment would not be necessary only that the existing section is persistently ignored and evaded.

He next admits that Lloyd George was obliged to amend the British Patent Law because the Germans and others were restricting British manufactures that this became necessary if Britain were to retain her trade supremacy. Surely there could not be a better reason for our enacting some similar provision, some clause that will force patentees to manufacture their patents in this country when possible and give our people greater employment. The amendment simply proposes to do in this country today what Lloyd George had to do in England in 1907 and what far seeing statesmanship should have done there many years before, secure to the people the fruits of industries made possible by the protection they afford.

My hon. friend then goes on to tell us that if we enact this amendment we open the way for all sorts of infringement and fraudulent articles to be brought in here, but I fail to see wherein the country or the people who live in the country will suffer in any way by that. Presumably if substituted articles are brought in, they will be sold cheaper because of there being no patent rights to be paid for, and in many cases they will doubtless be as good as the originals and in any event the importation of the patented articles would not be prohibited and anybody who wants these can always buy them in the open market. The effect of conditions under our existing Patent Law is that no manufacturing is done because exorbitant fees for the right to manufacture here are demanded by patentees. In defiance, moreover, of the intent of the section in the Act which this amendment would repeal, that section declared that patents would be void in two years if not brought into operation obviously meaning that the country was to get some benefit in return for the protection given; but that clause is evaded and when we propose to substitute a clause which would put an end to such events, we are told that such is undesirable.

Then my hon. friend informs us that there is no need for this Bill to-day, but that if there was a need in two, three or five years, he would favour this policy. My answer to that is that we can make no mistake by putting this law on the Statute Book and perhaps having industries established as a result of it, for why should we wait until future years to do a thing which certainly cannot bring us harm.

I am aware that, as the hon. member has stated, it has been the practice of Governments in the past to decline to grant patents for articles or processes in relation to

the fisheries of that Colony, which were thought likely to hamper our people in the prosecution of these industries or to render their prosecution more costly for them, but I can conceive on the other hand of patents which, in relation to processes of curing or preserving our various fishes. if we compelled them to be operated in the Colony might materially enhance the value of our staple industries to all engaged in them. My understanding of the position of successive Governments with regard to this matter is that while there is no law on the Statute Book prescribing this practice, they treat every application for a patent on its own merits and decide on their course of action in accordance with their judgment as to the effect the granting of a patent would have on the fisheries and the fishing classes.

HON. MR. GIBBS—With permission of the House I desire to say in reply to the hon. gentleman, that the amendment which he now proposes is really the one proposed in England. with this exception, that over there it was the Comptroller of Patents who had the discretion, as head of the department whenever in his opinion it was desirable in the interest of trade, that the law should then be put in force. But we lose sight of the fact that under him he had a body of experts of the highest trained men, technically, in the world, and these were continually at work in the endeavour to find out what particular patented article could be manufactured to the advantage of the people of Great Britain and of her trade. How could the Governor-in-Council determine whether a particular article could be manufactured to the benefit of trade in Newfoundland? This requires men of technical training and knowledge and we can't expect this on the part of the Governor-in-Council. We had no help here of that kind, and even if we had, it would involve a very large amount of research and work. Can any hon. member seriously state that we are in a position today to manufacture any one article that has been patented here for the past 20 or 25 years? And even if we were, what is the advantage to be derived from the amendment? My hon. friend refers to the fact that we now enjoy the privilege of getting the best articles that can be manufactured under patents, here in our market, and if we open the door we will have all kinds of goods here classed as articles patented in another country. Not so at all. A man may come here and sell a bone handled razor for a 'Gillette' and he can't be prevented because a 'Gillette' is not patented here. The same may be applied to every article so manufactured for years for trade or business. There is nothing to prevent persons from coming here and calling certain articles by certain names, which are not theirs at all. At present we are protected from such imposition, but if we open the door we open it for all kinds of imposition. It is a desirable policy if we can carry it out, but we are not in a position to do so, and it may be a long time before we are.

HON. MR. McGRATH—My hon. friend's argument, Mr. Chairman, is interesting and ingenious, but it overlooks the fact that the law on our Statute Book at present pur-

ports to void a patent after two years, if it is not brought into operation, and that my amendment is merely to render the existing law more effective by substituting for the present clause, which is flagrantly evaded, one that will put an end to these evasions and give effect to the purpose the original enactment intended. Then with regard to the point he makes about the qualification of a Patent Official and the Governor-in-Council, I have merely to say that the position here today is simply this: The Governor-in-Council is the controlling authority in regard to patents and we might just as well leave it to the Governor-in-Council to decide whether there is a fair prospect of an article being profitably manufactured here, as we leave it to the Governor-in-Council today to pass upon the patents that are sought from time to time.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The Governor-in-Council does not pass upon the patent itself now, but merely decides that the papers are in proper form.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I know that, and I know further that you may go before the Governor-in-Council today and ask for a patent for a certain article and I may go before him to-morrow and ask for a patent for the very same article and both of us will be given a patent paper.

HON. MR. GIBBS—That is not so.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Pardon me, it is so, unless my information on the subject is incorrect, and it comes from some leading authorities in these matters. Moreover I will amplify my statement and say that not alone will the Governor-in-Council give my hon. friend a patent today and give me one tomorrow, but he will give each member of the House coming up in turn, day after day, a patent for the same article until the list of the House is exhausted, and then leave it to us to fight it out in the Courts as to which is entitled to the patent. I think my hon. friend will find on further inquiry, that this is an exact statement of the position as regards patents in this Colony today.

While my hon. friend was last speaking the solicitor of the House suggested to me that the terms of my amendment could be improved and if there is any disposition to favourably consider it, I would ask that the Committee rise, report progress and enable him to have until to-morrow to put the amendment in better form, and my hon. friend might also ascertain the views of the Government regarding this proposition.

HON. MR. ANGEL—As it appears to me, this Bill provides that after a patent is assigned by any person having a patent in any part of the world,he can come here and take out and operate a patent in Newfoundland and the hon. gentleman opposite Mr. McGrath, wants to make it necessary to have it manufactured in Newfoundland and provides an amendment compelling a patentee to that course.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Not in every case, only where in the opinion of the Governor-in-Council it may be profitably manufactured.

HON. MR. ANGEL—It should not be surrounded with such restrictions. The manufacture is lim-

ited here as we only have 250,000 people to cater for, and to manufacture such articles here one would have to put up special machinery for the purpose, and to enable him to manufacture we must put duty on imported articles coming into competition with him. There should be no restriction to compel any man to manufacture, particularly in Newfoundland, because the manufacture of any article must necessarily be small. If it were an article like flour there might be some sense in manufactuirng here, but some articles are limited to very few consumers. If you were to patent boots and shoes, everybody must wear them and the output might be extensive. If, again we propose to give our fishermen motor boats there will be a large number of them manufactured here, and under these circumstances it would be perfectly right to manufacture them here but we must put a duty on the imported article. Hence I do not see how you can do any good by restriction of that kind. Give a free hand and if you can manufacture in the country and sufficient quantities be sold, people will soon find it out. It will be a long time before you will get patents in sufficient numbers to make it pay and this would be no surprise with the restriction proposed. I do not think that it would be worth while .to alter the original Bill and put the restrictions upon it advocated by Hon. Mr. McGrath.

On motion the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill relating to the exhiibtion of advertisements. Hon. Mr. Murphy in the chair.

HON.MR. (J.D.) RYAN--I would like to ask if this Bill would be likely to interfere in any way with private property or the rights and privileges of individuals. A person possesses a piece of land, for example, an advertiser comes and applies to him to put up an advertisement on his land, and I would like to know if such owner will be debarred by this Bill from deriving the revenue from letting his land for this purpose. Again others come and paint houses or other erections for advertising purposes and it would be a great hardship to prevent this, especially where by such displays people got their houses or building painted free of charge. Any restrictive legislation applying to the supposition I have cited would be unfair and I think unjust. I would like to be sure on this matter, as to whether this Bill will so interfere with the rights or privileges of our people living in the city or country. This is the day of advertising; the advertiser is found all the world over and anyone going from Halifax to New York, London to Liverpool Liverpool to Holyhead, or Fishguard to London would see those advertisements on all sides. I hope that the Bill imposes no losses or other hardships on people, owning property.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In reply to my hon. friend I may say that the Bill does not aim at restrictions of the kind he refers to. It only aims at regulating the exhibition of advertisements which might affect public parks or play grounds, or disfigure the natural beauties of th-

landscape. It would not apply to persons utilizing the gable of a building here to advertise goods and wares, except of course that the class of goods or wares advertised were of such a character as might offend public decency. Regulations of this kind are in force in all cities and countries and the classes and kinds of advertising matter and places where some are to be exhibited are regulated by ordinances made by the Municipalities and other bodies. In all matters of this kind discretion must be used in the enforcement of the law and it does not aim at restricting a person in utilizing a building for purposes of advertising, but it does aim at preventing places used by the public as resorts referred to in section 2 from being disfigured by advertising matter.

HON. MR. (J.D.) RYAN—On the grounds referred to by the last speaker, if I owned a piece of land near Waterford Bridge with a boarded fence for a number of years, and people established a park alongside, then by this Act I would be prevented from earning $10, $30 or $50 per year by having any advertising placed there, because such might not look well in the eyes of the people going into the park. Who, I would ask, is going to compensate the people who owned such property? Would the Municipal authorities or the Governor in Council? If a law restricting the earning powers of such people be passed, it will cause unnecessary hardship, and while wishing to see the city surroundings look well, I do not like to see them so at the expense of the rights of the citizens.

HON. MR. ANGEL—This Bill is not to prohibit but to regulate advertisements and the class of advertisements and the manner in which they are to be put up in public palces. Abuses often followed the placing of these advertisements. For instance, we have often witnessed the destruction of trees because of nails having been driven into them. There is one question which occurs to me, and that is who are going to be the judges as to what may or may not mar the beauty of the landscape. Somebody should have jurisdiction in the regulation and restriction of such advertisements as set forth in section 2 of the Bill. The Council's jurisdiction would have to be defined if we have such a law passed. If the Municipal Council exceeded the limits of their authority and it could be shown that certain advertisements were not objectionable or interfered with public parks, then a higher authority than the Municipal Council should decide these matters. Restrictions were necessary, and should be in the hands of someone, and the Council is the proper authority and should be given ample powers so that a fair and impartial enforcement of the law might be assured.

HON. MR. McGRATH—This debate Mr. Chairman, curiously enough, follows on the consideration of a proposal the object of which was to advance the country industrially, but which we were told was too great a step for the Colony to take, because there was no need for it at this time. The present Bill however, asks us in the very next breath to go farther, from an aesthetic point of view, than any Bill of its kind anywhere else in the world.

in my opinion. It gives authority to the Municipal Council within five miles of St. John's and to the Governor in Council elsewhere, not alone to regulate and restrict, but to prevent altogether the exhibition of advertisements in any places outside of buildings. I disagree with the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill in his view that it does not apply to cases which are suggested by Hon. Mr. Ryan, where parties have board fences put up in their fields on which advertisements are exhibited or where such are painted on their buildings.

This Bill actually empowers the Municipal Council within the vicinity of St. John's to compel the removal of all such exhibits, whether in private grounds, on the sides of buildings or elsewhere, and the Governor in Council can do the same anywhere else in the Island. I can see that it might be undesirable to have unsightly or questionable advertiseemnts set up in open spaces where they would be visible from the Bowring Park or Victoria Park or Bannerman Park or Quidi Vidi grounds, but this Bill goes farther and includes every place whatever, so that it would be quite possible to prevent the exhibition of an advertisement at any place along the railway line from St. John's to Port aux Basques or the various branches or on any country road anywhere in the Island.

Now, I am not prepared to say that this is not a very proper enactment in its way, but I think it is going to be one extremely difficult to carry out in this Colony. I should like to know how the authorities are to judge as to what will injuriously affect a public park or destroy the natural beauty of a landscape. Any advertisement will do that, but are we aesthetic enough in this country to need an Act which gives power to wipe out all advertisements? I hardly think so. Of course, I know there are advertisements objectionable on various grounds, and I agree that these should be prohibited, but no country, so far as I know, has ever yet gone so far as to attempt to wipe away all of these public advertisements. I understand this Bill has been brought in because in the vicinity of Waterford Bridge advertisement boards have been erected that mar the beauty of the surroundings of the Bowring Park, and neither I nor anybody else would question a measure to end that sort of practice, but, even conceding this is it necessary to have such legislation with respect to the rest of the country? In my opinion it is not,and in my opinion too, the Act will be a dead letter because it will be impossible to carry it out.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my unqualified support to the Bill and express my regret that it does not go further than it does. As to the Bill being carried out, all I am afraid of is that the restrictions and regulations will not prove, sufficiently severe.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I don't follow the hon. member as to the difficulty of carrying out the Bill. There is nothing to carry out. It is impossible to say that the object of the Bill will be carried out until we know what rules and regulations are going to be made. I think the Bill is a very good one and I think it is well that somebody should have

the power to prevent anybody from disfiguring the country.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I think the Bill is a very good one. Of course it is in the discretion of the Municipal Council or Governor in Council to make rules and regulations, and I think it is very desirable to have some restriction upon the class of advertisements that are to be displayed. I have much pleasure in supporting the bill as it is.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Doesn't the penalty of six months for offending against this measure seem rather harsh? I would suggest three months as an outside limit.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I personally am of opinion that this legislation is in line with that which has been adopted by every city of any pretensions. For fifteen years back a great deal of agitation has been going on for the purpose of preventing the disfiguration of the landscape. Campaigns have been going on and tons of literature have been distributed against the erection of unsightly and objectionable advertisements and the result has been that laws have been passed restricting the class of advertisements that may be erected, and even the places where they may be erected. The same principle applies today to the erection of houses in certain localities. The Council have power to say to a man who wishes to build a house of wood in a certain locality: 'No, you must build of non-inflammable material' but they do not compensate him for his extra expense, any more than the Bill proposes to compensate the man who erects an advertisement contrary to the regulations of the Council. I feel sure that when the rules and regulations are made that they will suit the conditions. The question as to whether or not an advertisement injuriously affects a particular locality is one for the Court to decide.

HON. MR. McGRATH—This little discussion, Mr. Chairman, fails to answer the question as to how this Bill is going to be carried out. How is the Municipal Council going to make rules as to the sizes, shapes and forms of advertisements that are to be displayed in the vicinity of St. John's and how is the Governor in Council to deal with the matter in its larger aspect, namely, in relation to the country as a whole? Moreover what reason is there for having such a Bill applying to the whole country? If a man puts up an advertising board in some remote section, or paints an advertisement on a rock, why should he be debarred? Personally, I think this is only adding another to the number of bills littering the Statute Book and becoming mere legal junk. We are going to extremes with this matter. There is no city in this world that hasn't enormous advertisements nowadays from the pavements to the heavens, covering the roof tops and making midnight like unto day with electric lamps, and go where you will by railway trains all over the neighboring continent, and you will see vast stretches of fields displaying huge advertisements that those who run may read. Yet we here in this little Colony are providing regulations to make all this sort of thing illegal. That these regulations will ever become effective is a doubtful matter in my opinion, but because I favour the principle as regards the Bowring Park, and the sentiment of the House

is for the Bill, I am content with the opinion I have here expressed.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Dental Amendment Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be refered to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Hon. President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly acquainting the Council that they had passed the Bill relating to the Inspection of Foods, in which they requested the concurrence of the House.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gbbs, the Bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House adjourned till to-morrow at 4.30 p.m.

FRIDAY, Feby. 13th.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the Exhibiton of Advertisements Bill was read a third time, passed and sent to the Assembly, with a message informing them that this House had passed the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Patent amendment Act, Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Yesterday the Committee rose for the purpose of giving serious consideration to the amendments proposed by Hon. Mr. McGrath and also for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the Government in relation to the matter. While there is a good deal in the contention of the hon. member and it would be a most desirable condition of affairs to bring about the manufacture of patented articles in this country, still, as was pointed out by me yesterday, such is not possible, and instead of working to the advantage aimed at by the amendment of the hon. member, it would be quite the contrary.

The only industry in this country conducted on a large scale is the fishery, and, as it was pointed out to the Committee in every case, when applications are made for patents in relation to the fisheries, the Government has refused to grant the same, realizing that it may create a monopoly to persons in relation to the catch and cure of fish, or the mode in which the fishery may be carried on, would work to the detriment and disadvantage of the fishermen and consequently to the country as well. As we have no industry here organized upon a large scale, and as there will not be in the near future, to give a right to abrogate patents granted by the Colony after a certain period of time, may work a great deal of harm. Therefore, for these reasons, and those already stated, the Government are unable to see their way clear to accept the amendment of the hon. member.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I find no reason in the hon. gentleman's argument, why this amendment should be withdrawn or why this House should not adopt it. If the principle he expounds were to be recognized, namely, that because there is no prospect of this proposal being brought into effect today and no lo-

cal industries likely to be inaugurated, we should not move in the matter, then my answer is that if the same views had animated our predecessors in regard to local industries the country would be much more backward than it is. If none amongst us had the courage to grapple with this great problem of industrial devlopment in the past and set on foot industries, however small, where would our country be today? Every member of this chamber is more or less actively indentified with industries established amongst us the past twenty-five years. Cold water was thrown on these when originally started and if there were no people with courage and faith enough in the country to invest their money in these projects we now possess and which Hon. Mr. Anderson in his speech at the opening of the session said represented an outlay of $2,000,000 per year in labor alone, local industries would have been unknown.

My hon. friend says that no industry can be affected by this proposition of mine, except the fisheries. There is one industry at least that might be developed here that would not injuriously affect any other and that could not be but beneficial to the country's material interests; but that may be renedered impossible if this amendment is not adopted. This is the peat industry. We have abundance of peat in this country if authorities are to be believed. All that is necessary to make a peat industry of great advantage to ourselves and the world at large, is some patent process by which it can be converted into fuel. It is quite conceivable that some man, with such a process, will come in here some day, sooner or later, and secure a patent for it, and then at the end of two years, when required by the existing Patent Law, to bring it into operation, may charge a million dollars as a royalty for the right to use it here. I will anticipate the objection that may be advanced, namely, that if the industry is as profitable as that, he will go into the manufacture here himself. But that will not necessarily follow, because it may be that the people who will control this patent will prefer not to work it here and in that case the colony would be powerless to turn a great natural resource to advantage. In these days with trusts and combines everywhere, I do not think I am overstating the matter when I say that it is within the knowledge of every hon. member here that the practice which I suggest is by no means infrequent that monopolists in other countries tie up and prevent the manufacture of certain articles to gain greater profits for themselves by limitng the number of plants producing such articles. In Canada two years ago a cement combine was formed and half the cement factories in the Dominion were shut down, the result being that the Trust put up the price of cement until eventually it became such a scandal that the Borden Government had to reduce the duties on American cement so that it could be imported at a price to compete with the local article, and force down the cost of this. Therefore it is not unreasonable to suggest that some day we may want our peat areas utilized and find ourselves tied up and their working rendered impossible by a similar pro-

ceeding. I beg to move, therefore, that the amendment I now propose and which has been drafted by the law clerk, shall stand as Section 3 of the Bill.

'3—(1) At any time no less than 'two years after the date of a patent 'and not less than one year after the 'passing of this Act, any person may 'apply to the Governor in Council 'for revocation of a patent on the 'ground that the patented article or 'process was manufactured or carried 'on exclusively or mainly outside the 'Colony. (2) The Governor in 'Council shall consider the applica- 'tion, and if, after enquiry, he is 'satisfied that the allegations con- 'tained therein are correct then, sub- 'ject to the provisions of this section, 'and unless the patentee proves that 'the patented article or process is 'not so manufactured or carried on 'to an adequate extent in the Colony 'or gives satisfactory reasons why the 'article or process is not so manu- 'factured or carried on, the Governor 'in Council may make an order re- 'voking the patent either forthwith 'or after such reasonable interval 'as may be specified in the order, 'unless in the meantime it is shown 'to his satisfaction that the patented 'articles or process is manufactured 'or carried on within the Colony 'to an adequate extent.

'4—Section 12 of said Chapter 109 'of Consolidated Statutes, 2nd series 'is hereby repealed.'

This amendment repeals the present section in Consolidated Statutes under which patentees claim that by publishing a notice that they are ready to bring their patents into operation in the Colony by leasing to parties the right to make or use same they comply with provisions of the Act; and it provides that such patentees must manufacture the article or else lose their patent rights, when the Governor in Council is satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect of the manufacture being carried on here profitably. I regret that the Government has not seen its way clear to accept this proposal, and I am at a loss to understand why their decision has been reached. I know of no local interest likely to be injured by the amendment, nor can I conceive how the country's enterprise can be hurt by our endorsing this principle. With all due respect to my hon. friend, I cannot recognize that he has established a valid case for declining to accept the amendment, and I must therefore, submit it to the House to pass judgment upon according to its merits and on the case that has been made out for and against it.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I rise to say one or two words in favour of the amendment, but before doing so I also want to say that I do not follow the leader of the Government as regards patents upon inventions relating to the fishery. One can understand that a patent relative to the fishery might be abused and cost the Colony more than it was worth. But suppose one of our fishermen were to invent some new appliance, such as an invisible net, or a new method of treating bait, surely we should encourage him. He can go to any other country and patent that invention, and he may thereby create an enormous source of wealth to the fishermen of this and other countries. I cannot see the

wisdom of the argument that he should have no right to get a patent here. However, that is beside the question now before us. Hon. Mr. McGrath's amendment, as I understand it, is really for the purpose of making quite clear the intention of the present Act, which fails to carry itself out. The present Act defeats its own end because it is not clearly expressed. The present amendment will simply enable the Government of the Colony to live up to the true intent of the law already on the Statute Book, and therefore I can see no reason why the amendment which only emphasizes and clarifies the law as it now stands should not be passed by the House In listening further to his ideas as to the possibility of new patents being started which might enable new industries to be inaugurated here, there are many lines, in addition to the one he has suggested, viz: peat, which at first sight occur to me as being possible future industries of the Colony, merely awaiting new discoveries and processes. Take the question of the manufacture of barrels. Barrels of all kinds are becoming harder and harder to get and consequently the cost is getting higher and higher, and the time will come soon when the fishing business will be sadly handicapped by the difficulty of getting barrels. Indeed, today we are very much handicapped in competition with Halifax by the high cost of packages, and this cost is going up year after year. It is quite on the cards, and in fact, I know personally, of new methods of making barrels by the utilization of wood pulp and sawdust, which may eventually supplant the ordinary stave barrel we have to use today. Such may have to be used and will be a better preserving barrel than a stave-made package and may eventually become of great value to the country and the trade in which it would be so largely used. In this connection I may also refer to the effect upon this Colony of discoveries in metallurgy. We all know that there are large possibilities here connected with the use of sulphur, and we know that the country is full of low grade sulphur-bearing ores. There are many known deposits; both iron and pyrites here, and any day a process may be discovered which would enable us to procure all the sulphur required in the local manufacture of sulphite pulp. Any new process which will enable low grade copper ore to be handled, so that the sulphur can be recovered from it, would be of very great importance to this country and might be expected to create a huge industry in a very short time. It might interest a patentee who was interested in similar ores elsewhere to prevent the use of the process here, or to permit only the export trade of our crude ore, to be treated abroad. We also have large deposits of magnetic iron ore on the West Coast, which only await an efficient process for extracting the titanium to be utilized on an enormous scale. Under the present methods the furnaces will not stand in the treatment of this ore. Any day the problem may be solved and the solution, perhaps, take the form of an electric process, in which water power would be useful. In fact, conditons should favor treatment of these ores in Newfoundland. Now, consider that a process were discov-

ered and were controlled, as it probably would be, by the great Sydney companies, do we want to see that ore exported crude to Sydney like our iron ore from Bell Island, as might well happen if we divest ourselves of all control over the patent we have created. For these cogent reasons I strongly favour the amendment which indeed, only carries out the intention of the Act and I am quite at a loss to see any objection to it.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—If the population of Newfoundland were ten or even five millions, the proposed amendment might be worthy of serious consideration, though in its present form it is likely to do no good and possibly considerable harm. If it pass in its present form it will prove inoperative; simply resulting in the transfer of a patent from one who has not worked it,to another who may be equally inactive. If some section were added to remedy this; the amendment would I think; be more worthy of consideration. If at the end of section (1) of the original Act some such clause as this were added: 'Giving at the same time such guarantees as may be necessary, that within a period of one or two years, he is prepared to establish the manufacture of the patent' then I could see some advantage in the amendment. In its present form it will be ineffectual and only serve to render confusion worse confounded.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The remarks of the hon. gentleman who has preceded the last speaker apply to a condition of affairs which do not exist in this country. Hon. Mr. Harvey refers to the treatment of sulphur ores and low grade copper ores There is no industry of that kind in the country to-day. Sulphur is used in the manufacture of wood pulp, but the industry is not carried on on such a scale as would warrant any man considering for a moment the establishing of a factory for utilising sulphide pulp. The same applies to magnetic iron. For years scientists have been experimenting for a process for extracting titanium from magnetic iron,but have not been able to discover any, and as I have pointed out the amendment applies to a condition of affairs which does not, nor is likely to exist here for a number of years. Hon. Mr. McGrath refers to the fact that no local industries have been brought about by the granting of patents in Newfoundland but that is not the fault of the present Act. As it was pointed out by Hon. Mr.Angel,if it will pay people to engage in any particular form of manufacturing they will do so. Local industries are started because there is a demand for the article to be manufactured, but if there is no demand there will be no industry. The manufacture of boots and shoes or tobacco is because there is a local demand for these articles, and the effect of granting a patent for the manufacture of an article, has no bearing, whether or not it will be manufactured.

I can well imagine a case such as Hon. Mr. McGrath instances, when our people might be using machinery which had been patented and be compelled to pay large royalties. This would be a palpable hardship on the people. That is why the English Government took steps to compel the manufacture of patented ar-

ticles in England, in order to keep in the country the thousands of pounds which were going out of England annually to the Germans and Americans. The hon. member says that the peat industry may be developed. Well, they have been a long time trying to discover a process, and when he says that we have to pay large sums because some invention may be found for utilizing our peat areas he is anticipating a condition of affairs which does not exist, and it will be time enough to deal with that question, if ever it arises. My hon. friend also referred to the Cement Trust of Canada but that was brought about through various cement industries being placed under control of a few individuals, so that the output was controlled by a trust. It was not the result of any flaw in the Canadian Patent Laws. I have no doubt that some of the members of this House made money through that. Where any such condition of affairs exists, viz: where a number of financiers seek to control the output of any article the Government should step in, and, in the interest of the consumer, prevent it.

The question is asked what interests are going to be affected by the amendment. It may not affect any interest, but there is no object in passing laws which do not achieve any purpose. The object of the law as it now exists is that a person who obtains a patent must within two years bring it into operation. By this amendment, as proposed it must be here in actual use in the country. Under it we may give the right to any person to have the rights of a patentee forfeited if his invention is not manufactured here, but I venture to say within the past twenty years there has not been a patent granted in this country for any article that can be manufactured here.

It is quite possible that those who framed the Patent Law may have foreseen the condition of affairs which we are discussing today, but we have not yet arrived at the time when it will pay any individual to manufacture patented articles here. I venture to say that we have scarcely any peat in this country capable of being manufactured. We have men in this country who have had the peat analyzed, and found that it is not the kind which can be cheaply manufactured. But suppose for the sake of argument that it were, then I say the Government would be very remiss in its duty were it to permit any individual to obtain a patent of this kind and control the manufacture of our peat. Today we can get the best patented articles in this country, and why go to work and open the door to fraud and misrepresentation. The Government is only desirous to do all than can be done to develop local industries, but we must use common sense and prudence, and not put laws in the Statute Book which have no meaning or force.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to take up too much of the time of the House, but I must say I differ with the hon. gentleman as to the rather trivial way he regards the manufacture of sulphur in this country. At the present time I think I am right when I say that the imports of sulphur amount to 3500 tons a year and it would take nearly thirty thousand tons of ore to produce that amount of sulphur. I would also like to say that

it is surely fairer to put our terms down on the table now than to wait till a man comes here to get a patent and then make the law. That appears to me to be the position taken by the hon. gentleman.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I do not quite follow Hon. Mr. Gibbs when he claims that this is a case for exercising common sense and that we should not fill the Statute Books with Acts that have no meaning or force. If those of us who advocate this amendment today are lacking in common sense, then the men who put the original Act on the Statute Book must have been equally lax, because they included a provision requiring men to bring their patents into operation within two years or lose the protection the patent laws offered; and as for our only enacting laws that are necessary why, the Statute Book teems with needless acts. Again my hon. friend says that this amendment will be no use. My reply is to retort that it will be at least as much use as the clause in the present Bill that has been there for twenty five years and never been acted on. He seems to be uncertain as to what is meant by bringing it into operation, and when I said that this implies an obligation to manufacture he interjected that that was 'nonsense.' Perhaps he will tell us instead what it really does mean if it has any other meaning. I fail to see what else it can mean, because if it does not mean that, why did the patentees advertise their willingness to sell other people the right to bring into operation under a royalty. It cannot mean that they are offering the right to sell it here, because anybody can sell it, as a matter of business and my proposal simply means that they are required to manufacture, only in cases, remember, where the Governor-in-Council is satisfied that the article can be manufactured with reasonable prospect of profit. My hon. friend next went on to argue that the question of local industries had no bearing on that of manufactures, and that local industries were started here because there was a market. I dispute that contention entirely. In most cases the people who started local industries had to create their own market. In other words, they set their own industries on foot to try and overcome outside competition, and usually it took them years before they got on a paying basis. Then they expanded slowly but surely, creating and enlarging their own market and in nearly every instance getting protection from the Colony to assist them. That is the idea of the patent law, to give a man protection, but there is an implied obligation on the other hand that he should manufacture, and the existing section in the Patent Law provides for that by the clause which I now propose to repeal, as it is being evaded and to substitute this new one for it. The hon. gentleman next advances the startling assertion that we have scarcely any peat in this country capable of being manufactured. I should be sorry to suppose that this claim was well founded, for I am not aware of any pronouncement on this point, and I do not think anybody can say today that some process may not be devised next by which our peat, even if it is as poor as the hon. member claims it is, may not be converted into a commercial commodity, and in that case we would be unable, without an

amendment somewhat like mine, to avail of the process, for which a patent was secured, or to see it practically worked in the Colony, and this local peat converted into an article of fuel. I think we should not stand for this, but take the precaution to protect our people and try to promote new industries.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Might I suggest that this lengthy amendment be printed and the matter stand until next sitting.

This being agreed to, the Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

The House went into Committee on the Dental Amendment Bill.

HON. MR. J. D. RYAN took the chair.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few explanatory remarks as to the attitude I took on this matter when it came up for its second reading. Last session an Act was passed for a very distinct purpose, and I think that purpose was not clearly apprehended by some of the members when it was being discussed the other day. It is a matter of common knowledge that in Newfoundland we are woefully lacking in Dental practitioners. With one exception, outside of the city, we have no place where there is a resident dental practitioner. It was felt that dentistry had become a close corporation and in order to open the doors more widely an Act was introduced and received the sanction of the Legislature. The object of that Act was not to secure necessarily the very highest professional services that the world offered—much as we should like to do so—but to secure competent dental services, and to enable men, who were sufficiently qualified to establish practices in the various outports and in the city as well. The Bill was very carefuly discussed at the several metings of the Select Committee formed to consider it, and as a result the Act 3 Geo. V. Cap. 3 was passed. Now, if you look at that first section, which it is now proposed to amend, you will observe that under sub section (a) of section 1 every person shall be entitled to have his name registered on the Dental Register who can produce a certificate that he has passed the examination of the Dominion Dental Council of Canada. That is the supreme dental council in the Dominion, but we went further and under sub section (b) we admitted to practice dentists with credentials from any of the Provincial Boards of Canada. Now if we pass this amendment it means that we refuse the qualifications of the Dental Colleges of England which are surely as high as those of the Dental Colleges of Nova Scotia and the various Provinces of the Dominion.

There were in 1902 twelve dental colleges in England. How many there are today I do not know. Under the old Act we admitted those who possessed a diploma entitling to the examination, but did not ask them to take the examination. Under this Bill we propose that they possess a diploma entitling them to registration. That, sir, would practically bar out any of our young men who went home to study in the Dental Colleges and did not cover the wider course with its many additional expenses. However, I am not going to introduce any Amendment, and my reasons are two fold, first because, and I am sorry to admit it,

British dentistry is not any further advanced than Canadian dentistry, and I question whether it is so far advanced as in the United States. Moreover, for reasons of distance, it would be more desirable that our students should go to Canada or the United States than across to the Old Country, so that it makes very little difference whether we ask for a higher test in the Old Country or not. Another reason is that this Bill has been introduced here at the request of the Colonial Office, and there sems to be some vague uncertainty as to whether or not it means reciprocity. Personally, I believe it does not; but others take the view that if this Bill passes, dentists from here would have the right to practice in England. I think that view is erroneous, for it would offer a backdoor for people not qualified according, to English demands to practice there. Under this interpretation of the Bill a man who has a Provincial diploma can register in Newfoundland and then as of right claim registration in Britain, thus discriminating between Newfoundland and the Provinces. To pass the Bill cannot do much harm, even though it may do no good. But whereas before, we were asking for a minimum qualification in order to induce men to come to the outports to practice, now so far as the Mother Country is concerned, we are introducing a maximum qualification which will prohibit many who might otherwse come in here.

The Committee rose and reported progress.

INSPECTION OF FOODS.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg leave to move the second reading of the bill relating to the Inspection of Foods and in so doing may observe that almost every country in the world during recent years has been engaged in the work of conserving the health of its people. Modern industrial development aims at production on a very large scale, and demands increasing care and attention on the part of employees. Until recent years the aim of Government was to develop the trade and commerce of countries, and little or no attention was paid to the health and welfare of those who played the most important part in the work, namely the industrial operatives.

What competitive industry between nations and peoples demands and exacts, as before pointed out, is increased production, and then again there is the desire of man to accumulate wealth by various devices, and some of these employed in the acquisition of wealth have been the adulteration of foods and the selling of foodstuffs that were unfit for man. Now the increasing number of manufactories and the many distributing points for foodstuffs of all kinds impressed upon authorities in different parts of the world the necessity for inspection, supervision cleanliness on the part of those handling, and the inspection of factories where the food is prepared, in order that the consumer may have the maximum of protection in the articles which come into his home for consumption. While industries were organized on a large scale, and points for distribution and sale were few, the same necessity did not exist, because very many procured their foodstuffs from their farms or gardens. The first section of the Bill empowers the Medical Health Officer or other person who

may be appointed by the Governor in Council to enter any premises at a reasonable hour and inspect and examine articles of food which may be offered for sale, or be in course of preparation for sale and intended for the food of man. Sub section 1 of the Act provides that if there be found on the premises articles of the kind raised in Section 1, and that the articles or any of them are unsound, unwholesome or unfit for food of man, it is incumbent upon the person having them there or exposing them for sale, to show that they are not intended for consumption or sale, and not exposed to sale: and also gives power to the officer to seize and carry away the articles found there which are unfit for food.

Sub-section 2 of the Act provides that when the articles found there are unfit for food, and there for the purpose of sale, that the person having them for sale shall be liable to a penalty prescribed in the Act.

Sub-section 3 is for the purpose of protecting the consumer who unknowingly purchases articles unfit for food, because it may so happen that the officer appointed may visit the house of some person and find in his house some article contrary to the provisions of this Act.

Section 2 then deals with any person who may obstruct the officer in his duty. Section 3 provides for the inspection of cattle, meats, fish and vegetables intended for food or offered or exposed for sale. We all know that in the past, and even up to the present, that the care and attention which should be given to the inspection of cattle and meats is not given. It was only during the past Christmas season that I went on certain premises in this city for the purpose of purchasing meats and to my utter astonishment found there a very large quantity of meats offered for sale which were totally unfit for food. I followed the matter closely and afterwards saw the same meat cut up in small pieces and exposed for sale on an auctioneering premises. Then we have cattle coming into the country of which there is no inspection or examination. We pay a very good price for food of that kind, and it is only right that some provision be made for inspection in order that we may get good and wholesome food.

Section 4 is a very necessary section because, unfortunately for us all, there are, and have been in the past, articles of the kind offered for sale which did not come up to the requirements of the Pure Food Law. The next section, 5, is a very necessary one because it has been a very common practice in the past for a majority of vendors to put articles outside exposed in places where the dust of the street blows on them, and there is no covering whatever over them to protect them from the dust and dirt of the street, especially when the wind blows, and I think that legislation of this kind will commend itself to every hon. member.

Section 6 provides for the manner of vehicle used for the conveyance of food, and that when articles such as meat, bread and milk are transported through the streets, they shall be properly protected by coverings so as to prevent contamination by dirt and flies. It is well known that the greatest carrier of disease is the fly. In this country until recently we did not bestow any attention to the protection of food from flies. Section 7 is also a very necessary section because it makes it incumbent upon persons carrying on factories where articles of food are prepared that the factory, appliances, receptacles, shelves, tools,

etc., shall be kept in a clean condition. Then again there is a provision in section 8, which commends itself to us all in relation to inspection of factories and work shops where food is prepared or shall be kept, giving power to the Medical Health Officer to inspect them. Then follow various sub sections regarding space, light etc. There are industries carried on where there is not adequate space or ventilation which is necessary to protect the health of the employees The other sub-sections deal with how the walls and ceilings shall be kept, and also make provision, where, persons of both sexes are employed, for sufficient water closets and sanitary conveniences. Section 1 provides for the taking of samples because it may happen it would not be possible for the Health Officer to see by cursory examination of food stuffs whether they are fit or unfit for human food. They may be enclosed in cases, this will enable him in such cases to take samples and subject them to analysis in order to find out whether they are in conformity with the law. I think the House will agree with me that this is a step in the right direction, and we should have had legislation of the character many years ago,. Anyway we are only following along the lines of regulations of this kind in other countries where people give this matter serious consideration.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—Before the Bill passes its second reading I would like to say a few words. I think the Bill is a highly necessary one and is calculated to do much good. It is in my recollection that in the past St. John's was made the dumping ground for the sale of food unfit for human consumption and the same thing applies to a certain extent today. There were then several auctioneer houses in existence,whose chief business was the sale of unmerchantable food, but things have materially altered and now you cannot get the ready sale for these goods which you could in those days. This Bill has the title 'An Act relating to the Inspection of Foods in the City of St. John's.' Now, I know of no reason why the people in the outports cannot appreciate good foods just as much as the people of St. John's. I would like to see the last six words eliminated and let the bill read so as to cover the people in the outports also. The argument against that doubtless would be the difficulty of seeing that the Act is carried out, but I don't think these difficulties ought to prevent our passing it to apply to the outports, and we could have the magistrates attend to the work of the inspection. At any rate the people in the outports selling bad food should be amenable to the law as well as the people in St. John's. It would be a protection to them. I think the hon. introducer of the Bill should consider that there is another point. Supposing we pass this Bill applying only to St. John's, a merchant might endeavour to place articles of food which were unfit for consumption here in some outport and dispose of it there. I entirely agree with the principle of this Bill. We must keep up to date with other countries and see that only food fit for human consumption is allowed to be sold. We shall have an opportunity to discuss the Bill section by section when it comes to the Committee stage, meanwhile I will content myself with these few remarks. and hope the Bill will be made to include the outports.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I want to add a word congratulating the Government on bringing in this measure. Like the hon. gentleman on my left the only thing I regret is that it was not done long ago. These matters were discussed by the A.P.C. and the Commission on Public Health to which I have frequently referred, recommended the introduction of some such bill as this, particularly as regards the inspection of imported cattle; and that emphasizes the remarks of Hon. Mr. Goodridge, in as much as cattle come in elsewhere besides St. John's. It is a fact that the country has been, and I believe is today, a dumping ground for unfit food, for I am quite convinced that the shippers in the neighboring provinces when they get a sheep or old cow that is in such a condition that it can't be shipped to any other market in the world ship it to St. John's where there is no restriction.

Now, this matter was brought before the authorities again and again. Dr. Wakefield representing the Commission on Public Health the year before last made a long report on the examination of cattle offered for sale as they were landed from the ships, and I think his report although a private one, was somewhat of an eye opener. He produced photographs of some of them and it was manifest that they were totally unfit to be killed for human food. Another consideration is the fact that our own cattle as found by them are almost entirely free from tuberculosis. The Tuberculin test to which to their great credit some neighboring farmers voluntarily submitted their cattle proved that tuberculosis is comparatively rare amongst our cattle. Now there is not the least doubt that an enormous number of the cattle coming in here are afflicted with tuberculosis. I hope that when this Bill is passed a thorough inspection of cattle coming here not only to St. John's but by way of Port aux Basques, where a certain number come in, will be made.

I entirely agree with the suggestion of Hon. Mr. Goodridge, which is on all fours with that made by the Public Health Commission; inspectors should be appointed in the outports. They should be medical men, and this ought to be one of several things to which they could attend, such as watching the medical inspection, physical condition of the school, infectious diseases, general public health conditions, regular reports on all such matters, for all of which they should be paid a moderate annual stipend and be endowed with certain legal powers.

There is another section in the Bill to which reference was not made, and which gives me great satisfaction, and I think the whole House will feel likewise.

This is the section which makes it a penal offence for workingmen to spit on the floors of the factories where food is being prepared. It will be recollected that two years ago, this House passed a Bill to make spitting on the floors of public conveyances and halls and various other places a penal offense. It went down to the Lower House and met the fate of several good bills which have in my time passed this House and were lost there; it was thrown out, although it was I believe, supported by the Premier, Colonial Sec-

retary, Mr. Squires who introduced it, and others. It is a great pleasure and satisfaction to me to see that the seed sown, then was not entirely wasted, and that we have got here a penal act, limited it is true, but at the same time an educative act which makes it penal for any workingman to spit on the floor of a factory where food is prepared. I am entirely glad to say that I consider it a practical result of the A.P.C. agitation. and I think it will have a good effect and help our people to appreciate the dangers of the spread of tuberculosis so largely due to the prevalent curse of spitting.

The whole act is on the lines of prevention. It is a public health act based upon the policy of prevention, and as I said here at the opening of the House the only Public Health Policy which can be permanently effective as a matter of public policy is a preventive policy and I repeat it is for that reason a source of very great pleasure to me to see this Act before the House.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I should like to add a word in endorsement of this Bill, which I consider an admirable one of its kind, and with regard to which I have only one regret, namely, that it does not go far enough. The Bill provides machinery by which an intelligent and efficient oversight of the handling and selling of human food is created and it certainly comes none to soon. I find as a result of inquiries about the matter, that up to the present the Medical Health Officer in this city has no authority whatever to interfere with regard to the exposure for sale of the most injurious or poisonous compounds, described as human food, except that he may call upon the meat inspector to condemn any article, though the meat inspector, on his part, is not obliged to intervene unless he is called upon to do so, while even he, when he is requisitioned and goes to inspect meat, that he considers unfit for human food. is unable to condemn it himself. but has to take it before a justice of the peace. give evidence as to its condition, and secure an order from the J.P. ordering its condemnation. Such is the condition of affairs to-day, one that may well dismay us and one that speaks more eloquently as to the need of the present measure than anything we may say in this House.

This new Bill is quite in line with the up to date laws of other countries in regard to health inspection and gives the authorities powers to similarly seize and condemn, on view articles unfit for human food without requiring to call into operation the complicated machinery hitherto necessary. I think, with hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, that it is a pity it is not considered possible by the Government to extend the scope of this measure to the outports, or at any rate to the principal outports. With the cross country trains running daily, many articles of food are imported that never reach St John's, but are consumed in various parts of the country, and if we cannot today see our way clear to make this Bill effective in other parts of the Island, the time must soon come when we shall have to do so. I regret moreover, that the Bill only deals with foods when fresh or chilled, or otherwise preserved in that fashion, and does not apply to the adulteration of

foods, which is a very serious matter, and one which, likewise, must be considered, but I understand that to provide for this it will be necessary to create a laboratory and appoint a public analyst. At the present time gentlemen are employed for analytical work,and receive about six or seven hundred dollars a year from the Departments concerned — that of Crown Lands, as to analyzing soils, etc., and the police, as to analyzing spirituous liquors. I am told that an addition of a thousand or twelve hundred dollars a year would enable an analyst to be provided, but no doubt that will come later, and when a proposal of that nature is made. I should think the House would be very glad to give it a very hearty support.

Another feature of health reform which I think ought to be in the Bill, is that providing for a more general inspection of factories. This only applies to factories where articles of food are produced, and there is no provision for the inspection of other factories, and for ascertaining whether lavatories and other requisites for the use of employees are provided, and I hope that as soon as this Bill is in actual operation and its value is seen, additional machinery will be provided to enable the inspectors appointed under the Act to deal with factories generally in this regard.

The problem of pure food as we find it in this Colony today, is not singular to us alone. This morning, in looking through my newspaper mail, I found a report of a meeting in Toronto last week of the Dairymen's Association when Prof. Grisdale of the Dominion Experimental Farm at Ottawa, with which Prof. Robertson was associated some years ago, made a speech in which he charged that 75 per cent. of the milk offered for sale in Ottawa was unfit for human food. If this prevails there in spite of the great advance which has been made in the matter of pure food regulation, we can readily realize that it emphasizes the need for us taking every precaution that is possible, in view of our circumstances to ensure that our people are provided with reasonably pure food. It is gratifying to know from Hon. Mr. Harvey's information that there is virtually no tuberculosis in our local cattle, and if we can stamp out other qualities of impure food, the result cannot but be beneficial. I found this morning, too, another item in a Montreal paper, summarizing a report of the Department of Inland Revenue of Canada, giving the result of an analysis of various kinds of food the past year, and telling the adulterants, some of them absolutely poisonous, which were used in 'doctoring' these articles. There can be no doubt that we are getting more or less of this food in Newfoundland and the steps we are taking today, while only the first of the many that may be needed, should have their own beneficial results.

Before I sit down I would like to call the attention of the hon. member in charge of the Bill to one anomaly which exists and which I think should be promptly ended. The penalty provided in this Bill for selling an article unfit for human consumption is only twenty five dollars with the alternative of a month's imprisonment whereas yesterday we

passed a Bill to regulate the exhibition of advertisements which carried with it a provision that a man offending against these regulations was liable to a similar fine or to imprisonment for a term up to six months. I pointed out at the time that this seemed a needlessly severe penalty and I would emphasize today the absurdity of the situation which is here created, namely, that a man can be imprisoned for six months who sets up an advertisement that mars the beauty of a landscape, whereas the most we can do to him for selling bad food and poisoning a whole community is to send him to jail for 30 days.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN—I am glad to see such a bill introduced but it would seem that the introducer of it proposed to overlook the health of 200,000 people and protect that of 30,000 only, for the Bill relates to St. John's alone. I agree with Hon. Mr. Goodridge that the Bill should take in the outports and do not see why it was not taken into account before because the outport people represent the great majority of the country. It is strange to see a Bill formed for the benefit of St. John's forgetting the other 200,000. I agree with the Bill in every other respect but it is going to give the people in St. John's a great opportunity to dump any food that may be about to be condemned, into the outports. This is a serious matter and I have no doubt the Government will find it hard to enforce the law even in St. John's, but I think they will find it as easy to enforce it in the outports as in St. John's. I would like to see the Bill so amended that the outports would be included for we are tired of bad meat, butter, fruit, etc.

The Bill was read a second time on motion and was referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday.

MONDAY- Feb. 16th.

The House met at 4 o'clock pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Mr. President since this House last met the Angel of Death has visited the home of one of the hon. members, Hon. Dr. Skelton, and taken his aged wife. The loss to the hon. member must indeed be very great, more especially at his advanced age, and I am sure he has the sympathy of every hon. member of this Council in his bereavement. I would therefore beg to move the following resolutions.

'The Council having learned of the recent death of Mrs. Skelton wife of the Hon. George Skelton, a member of this House.

'RESOLVED, That the Council hereby sincerely condoles with the Hon. Dr. Skelton on the loss he has sustained by the death of his estimable and amiable wife:

'RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the Hon. Dr. Skelton as a mark of sympathy with him in his bereavement.'

On motions of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Dental Amendment Bill was read a third time, passed, and sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing them that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Patents Amendment Bill.

Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—On Friday last when this Bill came up for

discussion I pointed out that the Amendment introduced by my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. McGrath) failed in its object and in order to carry it into effect it would be necessary to add certain words so that the proposal might be made workable. Those words the hon. gentleman very courteously embodied in his Amendment. Since Friday I have given this Bill very careful consideration, with the result that I find myself wholly unable to support it and shall consequently be compelled to register my vote against it. The amendment I regard as wrong in principle and not necessarily right even from the consideration of expediency. It is wrong in principle in that it provides a method for the infringement of patents, and also endangers private rights. Moreover, it is an injustice to subject inventors to a decision by the Governor in Council, which must necessarily be more or less arbitrary. It is unreasonable to expect inventors to work their discoveries without the hope of reward, and so small a market as Newfoundland offers can afford no inducement. Nor is the establishment of local manufacture of articles in itself necessary, however desirable it may be. If patents are workable they will be surely manufactured in the largest markets, and manufactured there most cheaply. It is only for us to open our doors to obtain the full benefit of these patents, even though the tariff bars must first be removed. Having suggested the addition to Mr. McGrath's amendment it might appear as though I since changed my views. Those words were, however, suggested with the sole view of making the amendment in itself possible of operation. I again say that I regret I cannot support the amendment,as it is in my opinion both wrong in principle and of doubtful advantage from the standpoint of expediency.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I do not think, Mr. Chairman, there is need for very much more discussion on this matter except to point out to the hon. member who has just sat down that the words of the present Act require inventors to bring their patents into operation within two years, otherwise they will become void. That must mean that the inventor, if he does not make use of his patent within two years is denied by this colony any further privileges. That seems to me to dispose conclusively of the argument that any injustice is being done by this amendment, because apart from the question of the verbiage of the clause proposed its object is merely to make more clear the present law, and end a fraud perpetrated at the present time by people who secure patents and do not bring them into operation. If 'bring into operation' means bringing into operation in other countries why did the Legislature consider it necessary to warn patentees that if they did not bring their patents into operation they would be void?

This amendment gives the Governor in Council the power to pass on the merits of every patent, and if, in his opinion, it is impossible for the patented article to be manufactured here than the patentee retains his patent. The hon. member also says that any patented article worth manufacturing may not be worth manufacturing here, but surely the

reason why a man gets a patent here, is to prevent any other man from manufacturing his article. Now we give him a patent and say if you don't operate this in two years your patent will be void. Hon. Mr. Gibbs told us the other day that the Courts had not adjudicated upon the meaning of these words 'bring into operation.' That may be so. All I know is, that today all that is done to get over that obligation is simply for the patentee to advertise that he is prepared to bring his patent into operation or to license the use of the same, and I say that a principle which has been found to be effective in the old country, and which has provided a substantial stimulus to the trade of the old country can do no harm if introduced into our Act.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Mr. Chairman I would also point out, confirming what the hon. gentleman has said under this clause the party who applies for the revocation of a patent at the same time warrants the manufacture of the patented article. Surely that is desirable.

I also think that to have on the Statute Book an Act the meaning of which is not clear, as in the present case, is unpardonable, and I think it ought to be fixed so that it is clear.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I don't wish to prolong this debate. There are some points discussed by the hon. gentleman which require explanation. The very reason why we should not enact regulations which are not necessary has been answered by the hon. gentleman, when he says that he does not know that any advantage will be derived from them. We enact laws because they are necessary. Another point referred to by my hon. friend is that the object of a person making application for a patent is to prevent the fraudulent manufacture of it in this country. Surely that is, to say at least, very far fetched. What market or demand can there be in this country for a patented article. Further, for the Governor in Council to pass on the merits of a patent is, I submit, unfair, or to pass on the question, as to what would be capable of being manufactured here, because we have no industrial development to any extent in this country.

'Bring into operation' must have some meaning. At the convention of Patents held at Madrid in 1890 that very point was discussed. No rules were agreed upon or definition as to what was the meaning of compulsory operation. It was left to each country to define what it meant having regard to facts and circumstances, peculiar to each, so that even at that convention of an international character they refused to lay down a binding rule but left the matter to the people of each particular country.

My hon. friend Mr. McGrath, refers to what has been done in England as a justification for the passing of this amendment. In England they were faced with a most peculiar condition of affairs. The patent laws were a hindrance to the development of English industry. Germans and others were obtaining patent rights in England after having secured them in their own country. In one industry, the woollen industry, certain articles were patented and they refused to allow the articles to be used in England, in the carrying on

of that industry, while it was being used in Germany to destroy the English industries. Foreign patentees when selling patents in England in other trades would impose an obligation upon the English manufacturer that he agree to use this particular piece of machinery or process for a period of ten or twenty years and no other. The result was that improvements were made in the machinery in perhaps two or three years or there was some new development in the process of manufacture but the English manufacturer could not take advantage of it because he was bound down by agreements or a lease which he had previously signed. These things were done for the purpose of destroying English industrial development, and it became necessary in the interests of the trade of England that patented goods, those which were crippling English industries, should be manufactured there. That was the object of the amendment to the Act in 1907. Another thing the English inventor found himself confronted with was this. that the Germans and others organized patent syndicates and in making application for patents, the terms and descriptions were so vague hat if the Englishman improved upon the patent and made it more profitable for trade and commerce and applied for a patent on such improvement and obtained one, he found himself engaged in a costly lawsuit with this trust or syndicate, who would fight the case in different courts. In many cases he abandoned the case or sold out to this trust, and in this manner many patents, valuable to British industry were placed in the hands of others.

To remedy this state of affairs was the object aimed at in the passing of the amendments to the Imperial Act in 1907. In passing a law it must have some practical principle or purpose in view. Now what purpose or principle is there in an amendment of this character?

It is in the dim and distant future. None of us can point to a single industry today that will be started in six or ten months, or two or ten years from now if we pass this amendment. Now are we going to pass laws that have no binding force in view? That is what we are doing. Laws arise from necessity, we pass them when they become necessary, and if we enact unnecessary laws they reflect upon the common sense and intelligence of this House. There was a regulation of the Board of Trade in England which came into effect in 1883 by which patentees could be compelled to grant licenses to people in the United Kingdom to work patents. From 1883 to 1897 there were but three applications under that particular law to compel foreigners owning patents to work them in the United Kingdom. Just to show you how the patents of England were affecting some of these industries, in 1905 there were 15,280 patentees and 6632 were foreigners; Germans were 2516, United States 2819, Austria Hungary 344; Switzerland 200; Australian Commonwealth 166; Belgium 159; Canada 155; Sweden 139, and Italy 134, all of which directly or indirectly affected some trade or industry carried on in England, very few of which did not affect the great trades which England has in all parts of the world. And the condi-

tion of affairs described by me made it imperative in the interests of British trade and industry that a law something on the lines of this amendment be enacted.

Looking at the patent laws of other countries the Australian Government reserves to itself the right to acquire the patent rights of any person, and Canada has a law like our ows, that the patent is void unless it be worked; it may be licensed. In New Zealand which is perhaps one of the most radical countries regarding legislation, there is no provision regarding compulsory working. In the Argentine Republic, one of the most prosperous countries today, there is neither compulsory working nor the prevention of importing patented articles. In Australia it is similar to our own, compulsory working, and in Denmark that the State can acquire the rights of the patentee. In France there is no law as to patents, except where a person deliberately keeps a patented article out of use to the detriment of the republic. Even in Germany, which is regarded as one of the greatest industrial countries in the world, there is only compulsory working, and if the patentee can show that he has done all necessary to bring that about, his rights are protected. There is no such thing as the compulsory manufacturing of the article in Germany. In Japan there is provision like our own; the article must be worked within three years.

HON. MR. HARVEY—What do you mean by compulsory working?

HON. MR. GIBBS—In the case of an industry carried on and patentees refusing to sell to that industry. there arises the question of compulsory working. In other words, a patentee need not work his patent unless compelled to do so. This amendment aims at depriving a man of his patent unless he works it. It also provides for the manufacture of the article in this country. Surely it cannot be argued for half a second that there is any patent, now, or likely to be in the future which anyone can hope can be reasonably manufactured here at a profit. Now in Norway which is one of the most progressive countries in the world, they have the same thing there, compulsory working, and if the working be discontinued the person forfeits his rights.

France has no compulsory working nor have the States and the only inference we can draw from that is that Norway must have suffered in the same manner because of patentees withholding the operation of their patents in the country, and it became necessary to protect some industries and compel the patentee to bring into operation in the country the patented article, and when he did not do so he had to forfeit his right to the patent. The United States, the neighboring Republic of gigantic size and wonderful natural resources and wealth, has no compulsory working of patents in the country. Any man can take out a patent in that country and there is no obligation to bring it into use. There is no obligation to manufacture there, except a compliance with the law as regards 'the novelty of the invention.'

HON. MR. McGRATH—What does that mean?

HON. MR. GIBBS—It means that the machine, process or article has never been used before in the coun-

try. This is the theory of every patent. The United States does not require the compulsory working or leasing of the patents applied for there. As I pointed out, at the International Convention of Patentees at Madrid, a definition of what compulsory working means could not be agreed upon, because this would to a large extent, depend upon the circumstances or business and trade in the countries concerned. You can't have a definition to apply to all countries because different circumstances and conditions would compel alterations in these laws. Possibly a definition which may suit Norway or France, for instance may not suit the United States or England. But the object of all laws is, of course, to regulate the conduct of all individuals to each other, protect the rights of property, and when necessity requires that certain industries be protected, that the interest of trade be fostered and protected, we pass laws for that purpose. But we do not sit down to anticipate what is apparently in view. That is not the object of law at all. If we were to engage in a passing of laws of that character a great deal of our work would go for naught. I regret that as representative of the Government I cannot see my way clear to accept the amendment of the Hon. Mr. McGrath.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I can well imagine that the House is somewhat tired of a debate so prolonged, but I cannot refrain from observing that what the hon gentleman who preceded me has said furnishes the strongest argument in favor of the amendment. I called his attention while he was talking to certain processes for various manufactures and he is of opinion that nothing of this sort is likely to arise, which will be affected by this amendment. Now I entirely disagree with him. As I pointed out during the last debate on the Bill in Committee, there might be a half a dozen things which are extremely to be affected by it and any one of these may be easily materialized in the near future. Take the question of metallurgy, as an example. New processes are being developed every day in connection with this science. The hon. gentleman refers to Germany, and cites the case of Germans taking out patents in England on the woollen industry, utilizing these patents to their own benefit, and shutting out the English makers from participation in the industry, thus greatly injuring that country. Suppose tomorrow that patents were taken out for the refining of metalic ores; under these circumstances would we want to see opposition companies interested in deposits elsewhere, sit down and refuse to permit the application of a process, for which the colony has granted a patent, to the iron ores of Bay St. George. The chances are that they might prefer to tie up their process, and would not allow anyone else to come in and use it until they were ready. I submit that such a situation is not chimerical; it is a complete answer to the statement that such a condition is not likely to arise and is impracticable. It may any time arise and the condition should be provided for. I entirely differ with the further proposition that we ought only to legislate when the conditions we wish to prevent have ac-

tually arisen. Legislation is being constantly enacted to deal with conditions which have not arisen. We must legislate for eventualities which are likely to occur, and such conditions as I have alluded to are liable to occur at any minute. Processes for the manufacture of wood products, such as packages of all sorts, may be perfected, and we do not know the day when a patent may be sought for packages manufactured from pulp and sawdust; when a man from Norway may take out this patent and say we will exclude Newfoundland. Surely the Government ought to be in a position to say he must manufacture this article in Newfoundland.

The hon. gentleman criticizes also the suggestion as to compulsory working and quotes a large number of countries, nearly all progressive, but on his own showing they nearly all insist upon compulsory working. He then goes on to say that in these various conferences no definition could be given of the meaning of 'compulsory working' of patents. As I said some time ago, I think our law should be clear on that point, and when a patentee takes out a patent here with a liability for the compulsory working of the same under certain conditions, he ought to know what he has to do. At present he does not know it. My own impression was that when the law now in the Statute Book was passed compulsory working of a patent meant just what Hon. Mr. McGrath's amendment does, but it is not clear what it means. The law on the Statute Book says that a patentee has to do certain things, but nobody knows just what it means and it appears to be left to the sweet will of anybody to ask the court to say what it is, and the court does not know how to interpret the law. This question should be clearly defined. I think the entire argument delivered by Mr. Gibbs strongly and altogether in favor of the amendment.

HON. MR. JOB—I wish to ask a question in dealing with the Bill under discussion. A few days ago the hon. gentleman in charge of it made a statement to the effect that he did not believe the Government would under any circumstances recognize any patent which would affect the fisheries. Is that so?

HON. MR. GIBBS—Any patent that would increase the cost of any article to the fishermen.

HON. MR. JOB—Nothing wants more improvement than the method of catching fish in this country and if it got abroad that patentees received no protection here, it would be very detrimental to the fishing industry here.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I believe with regard to Hon. Mr. Job's question, that the position of all Governments has been that they considered each of these fishing patents on its merits, and if any patent was of such a character that it was likely to injure the operation of the fisheries or make them harder to prosecute, then they would refuse the granting of such patent. There is nothing in the Statute Book applying to such cases, but each Government takes its own method in dealing with the matter.

In dealing with this very vexed question I do not intend to occupy much more of the time of the House but I must say I can hardly believe the hon. member in charge of the Bill is serious when he lays down the proposition that we should not

legislate unless there is a need or call for such, I say the Statute Book is full of Bills passed year after year which are never heard of again. To begin with, I instance the Fog Free Zone Bill. This was passed by the Legislature but never had any practical effect. My hon. friend says it was an election kite, but whether it was or not, it was a Bill brought into the Legislature and passed without there being any apparent great need of it. Then again, there was another Bill, passed by another Government providing that people might secure 5,000 acres of bog land to enable them to manufacture peat. That was never availed of and I might go on and quote at least thirty or forty Bills which have been put on the Statute Book the past ten or fifteen years and then become dead letters. This is an answer to my hon. friend who says we should not legislate without there being a need ,for such enactments shown.

He next tries to question my argument that a man gets a patent here to prevent people from fraudulently manufacturing, but does not tell us if that is not the correct reason what is the reason why a man secures a patent here. I ask now what is the explanation of this? I do not know of any reason why a man comes here and obtains a patent and pays his money out to secure his papers unless to prevent other people from manufacturing his patent. This contention is unassailable I think.

Then he has described the position in England, telling us how matters were in 1883 and we know that England drifted along in that position until 1907 when Lloyd George compelled patentees to manufacture but I would point out, to employ his own argument, that if the British Legislature had been as alert as the German, and had passed the laws in 1883 which they did in 1907, the British industries would be vastly better off.

My hon. friend says that the British Patent Act was altered to cover cases of process and patent contracts, but that is not the whole story. I know, as a matter of fact, that in the case of printing presses, before the Lloyd George Act was passed, they were mostly imported from America, but after that the makers had to establish factories in England, as they could not continue to send machines from America to be sold in the British Isles, but were required to actually manufacture in order to maintain their rights. He next asks what principle is to compel holders of patent rights to live up to their obligations.

The Patent Act, as I have argued provides that unless a man brings his patent into operation in two years, it will be void. The clause was put in the Statutes 25 years ago in the Legislature, and that answers the hon. gentleman's argument as to what practical benefit occurs or why should we legislate beforehand. We legislated to that effect 25 years ago, and we have found since that the legislation was inoperative. It is a phrase often heard: "a man can drive a coach and four through a bill," and if ever that was true, it is true of this Patent Law.

HON. MR. GIBBS—There has been no case before the courts, to say for certain, what is the definition of this.

HON. MR. McGRATH—That is quite true, as my hon. friend has stated, and the fact only shows how the situation is muddled up. My point, however, is this, that the Legislature when enacting this statute had in its mind that men who failed to give effect to their patents in this Colony within two years, should forfeit the protection they enjoyed. That could be the only possible meaning of the requirement that they "bring into operation"

within two years, the patent granted.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The Madrid Convention of 1880 refused to define what "bringing into operation" means and there is no international agreement and no Courts can deal with it My hon. friend, I think, misapprehends the situation.

HON. MR. McGRATH—The information that the hon. gentleman has given us has probably been secured from some book or encyclopaedia and I would like to go into it further. The Convention at Madrid in 1880 must have been held for the purpose of affecting an international agreement with regard to a Patent Law.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Oh no.

HON. MR. McGRATH—And what was its object?

HON. MR. GIBBS—I should say it was to stimulate interest in patents.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Has the hon. member any authority for that statement? If so, I should like him to quote it. In my opinion the Convention was to consider how patents in foreign countries can be made effective, and for providing an international agreement with respect to patents and this Bill with which we are dealing today, proves that there is some international agreement on the subject, because it provides machinery whereby original patents in foreign countries could be made effective here by filing copies of the plants, and to make that possible there must be some international compact. The nations of the world do not call together international conferences of this sort, and send delegates to them and go into large expenditures without having some definite object in view, and 1 maintain that that could only be to arrange for an International Patent Law. Then my hon. friend is in error with regard to the courts. If this conference at Madrid or any succeeding conferences framed such an international agreement respecting patents and the delegates for the several countries signed it, they would then report to their own countries and the Parliaments of these countries would in due time enact laws bringing such a convention into effect, and thereupon it would become the law of the land and the judges would have to give decisions respecting it in conformity with the provisions of the Convention.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I had not the pleasure of being in the House for two sessions and am rather at sea as to what is under discussion. Am I to understand that section 3 is the amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr. McGrath? I have also come to the conclusion that Hon. Mr. Gibbs is opposed to the amendment. I think the last time the matter was before the House I spoke against the amendment because it must surround patentees with difficulties which were likely to prevent them from entering into the manufacture of their patents at all because the output is limited in many things. But some are not limited in application or operation. With patents generally in this country, the market for the articles is so limited, that it is not in the interest of anyone to manufacture here. Now upon reconsideration of the matter I am inclined to think well of this amendment and that if passed it well do no harm. It provides that if a party takes out a patent for any purpose and no steps are taken to operate it locally, then anyone who is prepared so to operate, may ask the Governor in Council to revoke the patent, and thereupon obtain permission to manufacture in Newfoundland. This is about all it does. There is no harm in a section of that kind. This provides that the man who has a patent and is holding it off for

the purpose of possible sale to the highest bidder and simply prevents others that may work it from doing so will lose his patent.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The power is already there.

HON. MR. ANGEL—Then why make acts confusing each other. We should know if the law is already on the Statute Book and the position we bear in relation to it. If there is such a law and a man does not use the privilege received or holds it over for speculation, he is not doing the country justice and he ought to lose his patent. It appears to me that this is a very reasonable provision.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—It seems to me we are arguing in a circle. Section 12 of Chapter 109 of the Consolidated Statutes reads "Any letters patent which may be taken out under or by virtue of the chapter, and which shall not have been brought into operation within two years next ensuing from and after the date thereof, shall at the expiration of the said period of two years, be void." Hon. Mr. McGrath introduced this matter with the idea of making section 12 operative. The Hon. Leader of the Government told us, or I understood him to say, that it was not operative, and to-day I understand him to say the question was never brought up before any court. As I read the section I cannot see anything more clear or distinct.

On the amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. McGrath being put by the Chairman, a division was called for, those voting for the amendment being Hons. Messrs. McGrath, Harvey, Goodridge, Templeman, Winter, J. D. Ryan (6); and those voting against Hons. the President, Messrs. Ayre, Robinson, Gibbs, Job and Power (6); whereupon the Chairman gave his casting vote against the amendment.

The committee then rose and reported the Bill with an amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Inspection of Foods Bill.

HON. J. D. RYAN took the Chair.

HON. PRESIDENT—Mr. Chairman, I think the Government deserves special commendation for bringing in the class of legislation that is contained in this Bill. It seems, however, that this legislation has been introduced rather late in the day, for the reason that the quality of food for man offered for sale in this town, and indeed in the whole island at the present time, is as good, if not better, than that which is being offered for sale in countries of very much more importance than this Island. Now, when I say that this legislation has been introduced rather late in the day, I mean that a Pure Food Bill should have been introduced into the House of Assembly forty or fifty years ago, when there would have been considerable reason for it. The seeds of disease implanted in the system of those who have gone before us were due to a great extent, I think, to impure and unwholesome food that was sold here some fifty years. Nobody in this House has a better knowledge than I have of the class of food that has been imported into this country during the past 25 or 30 years. I have been in close touch with the importation and handling of food stuffs and therefore have had opportunities for acquiring a little knowledge of what was going on here during these years. Steamers would arrive week after week from New York bringing consignments from various shippers of from ten to one hundred barrels of more or less unwholesome food.

This country was looked upon as being the dumping ground for the refuse food products of the United States and especially of New York, and it was not unusual to see advertisements in our papers announcing the sale of "sour prime mess pork" or of "salt beef slightly unsound." This condition of affairs went on without any special attention being paid to it, and was looked upon as a matter of course. The time did not appear to be ripe for legislation, and I think that if a Bill such as the one now before us had been introduced at that time, it would have given rise to a miniature revolution. Of course I do not mean to say that all food that was consumed at that time was bad, because that would be a palpable absurdity, but I know that a large percentage of it was unfit for food. I know, of course, where food had to be sent to the country as manure, but these cases fortunately were rare. Previous to the time that I refer to, and possibly before I was born, I understand that it was quite the usual thing to receive shipments from Hamburg containing food that to-day would not be permitted to be landed. At present I think there is little unsound food put up in United States, Canada, or Great Britain. Competition has become so keen and the margin of profit so small, that it does not pay the packers to have any of their food product defective. In most countries to-day the large firms employ highly paid chemists in connection with their business whose duty it is to examine everything that is put up for human consumption and leave nothing to chance, so that I think it is only in rare cases that unwholesome food is being put up by any of these large establishments. I think if the full benefits are to be reaped from the Bill that it will be necessary that the services of a competent chemist should be secured by the Government; otherwise I think the Bill will be very difficult to carry out. Apropos of this question, yesterday I accidently came across an article in an English publication, dealing with the work of the Government Chemist in England, which if it will not weary the House, I should like to read. It is as follows:—

"A big White Paper from a Government department, containing twenty pages of print and costing tnreepence, lies on the Editor's desk Most people would pass it by as being hopelessly dull, but it is interesting as many a novel, and far more instructive. It is the report of the Government chemist,and tells us the story of the extraordinary detective work that he and his staff of scientific experts have been doing during the past year.

"You can never tell where you are to meet this Government chemist and his men. He is looking after the food we buy; he is testing the food and drink sent to our battleships; he is testing the carbide in the lamps of the mail-vans and the tyres for the bicycles our postmen ride. The mackintosh clothing worn by the telegraph boy has been through his hands the telegram that brings us good tidings comes through a battery he has investigated. He has inspected our tea and coffee and cocoa; he has had our butter under his searching inspection; he has been sampling the horrible liquor chocolates, and finds that some of them contain as much as 27 per cent of pure spirit—a vile sweetmeat to give to a child, or to any body, doing infinite harm. Certain drinks sold by manufacturers prove very fraudulent when taken in hand by our Government chemist, who

tells us that some drinks described as "sparkling cider" or "champagne cider" are simply solutions of sugar which have been aerated, flavoured, and coloured. Cider, we must remember, is not a temperance drink, but contains as much alcohol as a bottle of beer.

"Perhaps the most romantic work of the Government chemist is that done for the Old Age Pension Commissioner. The Old Age Pensior cannot be obtained until the applicant is seventy, and the proper way to prove this is to produce a certificate. But this cannot always be done, so some other evidence has to be brought forward. In many cases this evidence consists of entries in old family Bibles and Prayer Books, which in the days of our grandparents were the family records. But it is found that many people under seventy, have not scrupled to make false entries in these Bibles. They have either made the entries recently, or altered the dates which had been entered. "There it is—the date in black and white," they say. But the Government chemist tests the ink in which the entries are written, and is able to prove whether the dates and names were written seventy years or seventy hours before!

"This wonderful chemist, as we have seen, is everywhere. Fishermen seek his aid. Fish were dying in great numbers in certain rivers and the remains of some were sent to the chemist. In one case he found that the fish had swallowed zinc and small quantities of lead and copper, and it was not difficult to trace the poison to its source. It came from a copper-mine which was discharging into the river. In a second case the fish was found to be dying from the result of an acid which was finding its way into the stream from a tin-plate works. The solution of the puzzle was easy to the chemist, but it was profoundly puzzling to the good people in the neighborhood of the river, who love to see the handsome fish sporting in its waters.

"The Government chemist does a great deal of work for the Post Office. He not only looks after their clothes and bicycles, their lamps and instruments, but he tests the water they drink and the very air they breathe. Nor does that exhaust the list of his services. It was found that letters were being stolen from certain pillar-boxes, and the chemist soon found out how it was done. He examined the envelopes of the stolen letters, and found certain sticky little dabs of bird-lime on them. The thief had placed bird-lime on a pad attached to a string, and let the pad down into the inside of the pillar-boxes to catch letters as men catch fish.

"These are some of the little romances that strike us as we glance over the pages of this wonderful document. We rarely hear of the Government chemist, yet his department is as important as an army. He guards the health of the nation and helps to preserve the Empire. He is not too busy to turn back 75,000 pounds of tea from our ports as unfit for human consumption; to pounce upon the French dairymen who send us butter containing dangerous "preservatives:" to see that pottery described as being made with "leadless glaze" is really free from the lead which slays so many people in the Potteries; to tell a steel manufacture that the metal bed in which his files are cut contains 75 per cent. of deadly lead in place of the maximum five per cent which the law allows. He tests our stamps to keep them free from im-

purities; he detects the rascal who tries to use stamps which have been used before. There is a romance of civilization in this report of the clever Government chemist."

I think that the services of the Government chemist will be very necessary here, as soon as this Bill comes into operation, and I think he would earn his salary. He could make plenty of work for himself by preventing the sale of bad food, as well as by giving our people much needed instruction in the care and handling of foods, such as fish etc.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I agree with the Hon. President that the Government deserves a good deal of credit for this Bill,and it seems to me to cover the ground pretty thoroughly. I quite agree with the remarks of Hon. President as to what occurred in the past, and I realize how desirable it is in the interests of the people generally that nobody should be allowed to sell improper food. I do hope that the hon, leader of the Government will see his way clear to do away with the monopoly of good food in St. John's, by altering the date and the reading of the Bill so as to make it applicable to the whole Island. This Bill ought to have been passed a long time ago when conditions were as bad as has been described by the previous speaker, when the people had to put up with improper food for want of means to get better. There would appear to be little difficulty in making this Bill applicable to the whole Island. There are only a few industrial centres here, where the Bill would be most desirable. There are, of course, a large number of outports where it would not be necessary but there are places where there is a large consumption of food where I think it desirable that this Bill should be put into effect as well as in St. John's. To do so would only need a few amendments which I think could be easily done. Sections 9 and 11 would require to be amended to give the power of inspection to outport magistrates or doctors. I hope that the hon, leader of the Government will consider this.

HON. MR. POWER—I wish to say a few words on this Bill which I think is a most important one,and it is very necessary that careful attention should be paid to it. Nothing is of so much importance as the health of the people, both in St. John's and outports and I think if it is possible this Bill should extend to the outports or to the principal places outside St. John's. I do not think it would necessitate very great expenditure for this purpose. In any event if unwholesome food is allowed either in St. John's or the outports it may entail far more expenditure by causing an epidemic of some contagious disease that would cost the Government ten times as much as it would cost to make provision for the carrying out of this Bill all over the Island and do away with the adulterated article. I am in accord, therefore, with the suggestion that the Bill be made applicable to the outports as well.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Might I suggest that in the first clause in Section 1, after the words "mustard" the word "or any other article" be inserted. It seems to me it would be as well to have the Bill as comprehensive as possible. I might point out that there is one article of food which is being more generally used here and it is very notorious as a cause of illness when not in good condition. I refer to the oyster These often cause ptomaine poisoning. There is no mention of it there.

The Committee rose and reported

having made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

HON. PRESIDENT read a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills entitled respectively, An Act to Amend Chaps. 40 and 41, Cons. Statutes. Second Series respecting the Storage and Carrying of Gunpowder and other explosives, and an Act for the protection of the growth of Partridge Berries, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of HON. MR. GIBBS these Bills were then read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of HON. MR. GIBBS the House then adjourned until to-morrow at 4 o'clock p.m.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17th.

The House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Patent Amendment 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.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Cruelty to Animals Bill was deferred.

Committee on Inspection of Foods Bill, Hon. J.D. Ryan in the chair.

HON. J. D. RYAN—There appears to me to be an important omission in this Bill. There is one article used by nearly everybody; salt. Of course, common coarse salt is not so much used for food purposes, but I refer to the manufactured which comes to us in tins, bags and packages of various kinds,and the question is—Is it pure? I suggest that it be added to the Bill.

HON. PRESIDENT—Mr. Chairman in making my remarks yesterday on this Bill I said I thought that the importations of food at present were of a wholesome and sound kind. I referred to salted meats, canned meats and meats and foods of that description; I did not refer to cattle on the hoof as fresh meats. If the stories that I have heard from persons who I think know what they are talking about are true, a lot of cattle on the hoof that are arriving now are reeking with tuberculosis, and so far as I know there is absolutely no inspection. Anything that may come in through the Narrows or over the railway line can be sold here without any inspection, and in any condition, and I do not remember having heard of a head of cattle or sheep being condemned as being tuberculous.

We have also recently had a fresh meat refrigerating company started here. I do not know anything whatever about their meat. It looks perfect and may be so, but the burden of my complaint is about cattle on the hoof. I think that these cattle ought to be rigidly inspected and condemned if found to be infested with tuberculosis,or otherwise unwholesome. I wish to make these few remarks so that it will not be thought that all foods imported are pure and wholesome.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In regard to the suggestion made by Hon. Mr. Goodridge that this Bill should be one relating to the inspection of food in the whole Island, I may say that there is an Act at present on the Statute Book relating to the inspection of food in the whole Island. Under it similar powers are conferred and penalties provided for persons selling or exposing for sale ar-

ticles of food unwholesome and in a manner unfit for food. The penalties provided are somewhat similar to those now in this Act. For a first offence there is imposed a penalty not exceeding $25 or one month's imprisonment and for a second, a fine not exceeding $100 or imprisonment not exceeding two months. Should there be no person appointed as Inspector under the Act any person may make complaint to any J.P. wherever he may be, that the articles are on sale or exposed for sale in any locality and the J.P. has power to summon the party before him, and if he is found guilty to fine him, according to the provisions of the Act. There is also provision in this general Act similar to this in the Bill under discussion which makes it an offence for any person to obstruct an officer or constable who may enter any place for the purpose of inspecting food etc., and there is power also given any J.P. to issue a warrant upon complaint being made empowering a police constable to enter any premises where he has reason to believe that there is stored any food unfit for consumption. Then in the absence of any person appointed under the Act, the Superintendent of Police has power on his own motion to direct the police to any part of the Island to perform any act of duty under this general law.

The Bill which is now before the House goes further than this general law, which applies to the whole Island, because of course it aims at the inspection of premises where food is maufactured n or prepared, and also where it is offered for sale This general law is almost similar to this Bill relating to the inspection of food in St. John's, and all that is necessary is for the superintendent of Police in the absence of the Inspector in any locality to order the police under his control without any further authority to inspect food and make complaints and have them disposed of before a proper tribunal whenever the need exists. Take, for instance the places referred to by my hon. friend, Grand Falls, Bishop Falls, Millertown or Port aux Basques. In all of these places there are police constables, the greater number of them men of a high order of intelligence, who have served in the constabulary for years, and are competent in many respects to carry out the duties and obligations under this Inspection of Food Act now in force. At P. A. B. I think there are two or three, and in Millertown, Grand Falls and Bishop Falls, policemen also, and the inspection of food can be carried out effectively in these places just the same to a certain extent, as in St. John's under the bill now before this House.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—It is satisfactory to know that to some extent the outports are protected, but if it is necessary that the law be amended to suit the necessities of St. John's the same should apply to the outports. There would not seem to be much difficulty in carrying out this law in the outports as the hon. member says there are police constables in all these places. There is no reason that I can see why there should be more stringent rules for St. John's than the outports.

HON. MR. McGRATH—In other words, perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what is the particular

difficulty with regard to applying this Bill to the outports? Speaking after more than twenty years' experience as a newspaper man, I cannot recall an instance where a police constable or anyone else ever took action against anybody in the outports for a breach of a Food Inspection Bill, and in St. John's the cases taken could be counted on the fingers of one hand. I understand that this Bill is the result of the Medical Health officer, Dr. Brehm being unable, under the present Act to prevent improper food being sold in St. John's, so that he had to ask for and be invested with larger powers, and if this Act is necessary in the city, I should think that, unless there is some exceedingly strong reason to the contrary, it ought to be extended to the whole Island.

Of course, I recognize that at the outset it may not be easy to put it into force in the smaller places, but provision might be made whereby the same powers could be given to somebody in the larger towns, as the Medical Health Officer has in St. John's. To be sure, some sections, such as number 8, which deals with factories where food is manufactured apply principally to St. John's but in Harbor Grace, Carbonear, Bell Island, Grand Falls, Bonavista and such places, there are doubtless slaughter houses, small bakeries and similar concerns, and that being so the same law ought to apply as in the city. It may be argued that it may be too costly to provide this machinery, but surely the senior police officers in these places might be commissioned as inspectors under this act.

HON. MR. GIBBS—We have that provision now. The Act already in force reads:

'The Superintendent of Police shall have authority, upon the request of the officer appointed under this Chapter, or, where there is no such officer, of his own motion, from time to time, to direct such members of the Police Force as may be deemed necessary to do all such acts and perform all such duties as are authorized by this Chapter for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions thereof.'

Until recently the principal distributing centre for all points was St. John's. Now Port aux Basques has become one, and other places are going up where the same thing occurs. Consequently, it will be necessary to invoke the provisions of that Act now in force, and for the superintendent of the Constabulary to appoint the Police Officer to carry out its provisions. The Government very carefully considered the question of applying the Bill to the whole Island, but it is legislation of a character one has to go slowly with. The difficulty is we have such an extensive territory and such a scattered population, so we have to go slowly, for to enforce this Bill over the whole Island may cost a very large sum. Under this law, therefore it will be seen that inspection could not be had outside the city of St. John's as well as in the city, and no better person could be had in the outports than the policeman to carry out this inspection. Hon. members will say it may be difficult to get persons to carry out this inspection. Some will say: 'Appoint the doctor as he has to travel around;' but he

will not do it without being paid. You can appoint the magistrate, but he may have to adjudicate upon a breach of the Act and could not try a complaint of his own, so that the person who can best carry it out will be the policeman, and under the general law now in force he may be appointed by the superintendent of police to inspect where it may be necessary to do so.

HON. MR. HARVEY—If I understand the matter, our chief difficulty is to ascertain what is the difference between the present Bill and the old Act. If I understand it aright, the main difference between them is that this Act enjoins the medical officer to act, while the old Act enjoins the police officer to act. This is a great improvement. The medical officer is a man who is watching this sort of thing constantly, and he has naturally much more interest in the subject of public health. The old Act has been a dead letter up to the present time for want of knowledge on the part of the police, and so far as I am aware no action has ever been taken by them.

HON. MR. McGRATH—As I am advised, it is Mr. Cook the meat inspector, who has the authority in St. John's and not the police.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Outside of St. John's the police have had authority, and no action has been taken. Now I am interested in this matter because I think it emphasizes the recommendation of the Commission on Public Health, that this matter of food inspection might be among the various duties of the medical men in the outports. There are a very large number of other duties which come in the natural course of a doctor's work in which he would naturally be interested. I very much regret that the Act does not authorize the Medical Health Officer to appoint delegates wherever he thinks fit. There are a great many services which medical men should be authorized to do, particularly to watch over the schools and undertake medical inspection of scholars and control infectious diseases, for which a moderate stipend should be paid him. Now there is one thing I would very much like among the articles dealt with, and that is the whole range of patent medicines. Perhaps they can hardly be regarded as articles of food, but they are almost in that category here, and our people are spending an enormous amount of money on them, and doing themselves very considerable harm by using them to excess, for there are enormous quantities used in this country.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that if the Medical Health Officer were empowered to delegate his authority to medical men in the outports, the Act would not become as much a dead letter as is the present Act.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—On glancing hurriedly through the Bill there appears to be no reference to St. John's except in the preamble. Now it is very desirable that this Bill should be made operative in at least some of the outports. Why not cut out the words St. John's and make it "An Act relating to the Inspection of Foods"; then if a necessity should arise in any of the outports it could be taken into consideration. On the other hand there are some clauses in the Bill which cannot possibly be carried out in the outports. Take Section 8 for example. Would it be

fair to make that section operative in a place like Joe Batt's Arm? But if Joe Batt's Arm should ever become a large centre for manufacturing then the Bill ought to be applicable to it. This could easily be done by striking out the words 'St. John's,' in the preamble, and thereby give the Medical Officer the power to delegate his authority, whenever and wherever necessary.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I would draw the attention of the House to the law now on the Statute Book, Section 1 reads:—Any officer specially appointed by the Governor-in-Council or Municipal Inspector appointed under the St. John's Municipal Act 1892 for the purpose of this chapter, or any Police Constable, may at all reasonable times, and shall upon the representation of any member of the Board of Health, Health Officer, Municipal Supervisor or Inspector, inspect and examine any animal carcase, meat, poultry, game, flesh, fruit, fish and etc. exposed for sale, and for the food of man. And if any such animal carcase, meat etc. appears to such officer, inspector, or constable to be diseased or unfit for food of man, he may seize and carry away the same himself, or by his assistant in order to have the same dealt with by a Justice within two hours."

Now this Act has been on the Statute Book for many years, and applies to the whole Island. True, the Act has not been enforced, but it is there nevertheless, and applies to the whole country, so that there is no necessity to amend the Bill now before us to make it apply to the outports. There are certain provisions in the Bill mostly taken from the Manitoba and Canadian Acts which can only apply to St. John's, but the greater portion of this Bill is already on the Statute Book and applies to the whole country.

HON. MR. McGRATH—There is a still more important difference, and it is this—and it creates an absurd anomaly—namely, that the Medical Health Officer in St. John's, or one of his inspectors is invested with power to seize and condemn articles of food that are unfit for human consumption, whereas in all places outside of St. John's, the seizing officer has no power himself to condemn anything, but must take the article complained of before a Justice of the Peace and secure such authority from that official. This, surely, is an absurd position. For instance, you have in St. John's, Health Inspector O'Brien, a most capable officer, but a man who was very many years a member of the Police Force, and he can enter any store in this city where he sees or is informed that food stuffs are exposed for sale which, in his opinion, are unfit for human food, and can have them destroyed, whereas another Police Officer in an outport as long in the police service and as capable generally as Mr. O'Brien has no such power, but has to go before some J.P. who is in very many cases probably not nearly so well fitted to discharge this duty as the constable is, to get authority to condemn the material in question.

HON. MR. GIBBS—It merely rested with a Health Officer to show the Court that the food was bad before a constable or other person appointed by law could destroy or dispose of it.

HON. MR. McGRATH—According to the section read by my hon. friend there is in the first place a division of authority with regard to outport inspection, between the superintendent of police in St. John's and the sergeant or constable in an outport. In other words the outport policeman cannot act of his own motion. He must

either report conditions to the Inspector-General in St. John's and get authority from him to act or the Governor-in-Council must give the outport man authority by commissioning him as an inspector, under the terms of the measure now on the Statute Book. Hence there is a division of authority, as I say and as neither is directly responsible, neither acts.

Now turning to the city, we have a different situation altogether. We have the medical health officer or one of his inspectors who may be a police officer, enjoying power to condemn any articles of food if satisfied they are not fit for human food.

HON. MR. GIBBS—My hon. friend is mistaken as to that. The inspectors have to have authority from the magistrates as before.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I do not so read the section. The clause seems to me to be quite clear. It sets out that the officer may enter any such store and seize, and condemn the material.

HON. MR. GIBBS—If my hon. friend would read the next sub-section he would find provision for the imposition of fines and penalties.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I am aware of that, but would point out that that section applies to an entirely different matter. That refers to a prosecution subsequently initiated by the Health Officer to have the offender punished for selling such goods.

HON. MR. GIBBS—But the magistrate must first condemn the goods.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I do not think so under this section. The modern practice elsewhere is for health officers, and they are usually medical men, or others similiarly trained, to condemn bad food stuffs on views. They are very much more competent for this work than even magistrates, and the purpose of this section appears to be to have this Act conform with the trend of legislation elsewhere in respect to pure food. If I read the section aright the first sub-section gives the Inspector full power to seize, condemn and destroy the articles, and the second sub-section provides the machinery by which the offender may be punished for having sold or tried to sell such articles. I would point out to my hon. friend also that there is absolutely no reference in the section at all or to a magistrate.

While I am on my feet I would again call the attention of the hon. member in charge of the Bill to the fact that, as I pointed out yesterday, it is absurd to have a man liable to be sent to jail for six months for defacing the natural beauty of a landscape by erecting an advertising board in defiance of some municipal regulation whereas under this bill a man may poison a whole family or a whole community by selling them bad food and yet the severest penalty you could inflict upon him would be 30 day in jail. Surely this ought to be remedied.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I would point out to the hon. member that there are more penalties attached than the penalty of the Court. There is the confiscation of the offender's goods, and then the loss of the offender's reputation. If it was known that a man offered food for sale unfit for consumption, it would seriously affect his business; so that the greatest penalty really is the loss of his reputation, and these losses, coupled with the penalty prescribed by law, is much greater than the penalty imposed for exposing objectionable advertisements.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I propose as an amendment to sub-section (2) of section (8) the addition of the following words: "except in a suitable receptacle to be provided for the purpose."

The section as amended was passed.

HON. MR. McGRATH—In section 16 is it not an unfair obligation to impose upon a person who wishes to appeal from the judgment of a magistrate that he shall give notice within the day.

HON. MR. GIBBS—That is a misprint. It should read within seven days.

Committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

SECOND READING OF PARTRIDGE BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In moving the second reading of this bill, I beg to point out that the object of it is to regulate when partridge berries may be picked and the prescribing of a penalty for violation. This industry has but recently attracted attention from a commercial standpoint and it bids fair to become in the very near future a very profitable source of industrial wealth and now is the time to throw around those necessary safeguards to prevent abuses; like all other natural products it needs the parent hand of legislation to protect and stimulate its growth. That it is capable of great development can be judged from the growth of the cranberry industry of Cape Cod. Forty years ago this industry was in its infancy, but a few thousand barrels were handled yearly but according to statistics issued in 1913 there were 6,577 acres of land under cranberry cultivation and the yield is nearly 500,000 barrels annually. There are many industries developing from it, evaporation of those berries is now carried on, thus enabling them to be kept throughout the year. There is no reason why it should not be carried on in the very near future in relation to our partridge berry. Several parties started the canning of them here last year and there is no reason why we should not make a success of it. Up to the present the mode of preserving them is in small wooden barrels of twenty gallons each.

In Cape Cod the industry has become of sufficient importance as to cause a college to be established there for the purpose of teaching the best mode of cultivation. Thousands of people leave Boston and other large cities of the United States every year and go to the cranberry bogs of Cape Cod and find profitable work and find enjoyment picking the berries. We have a splendid source of potential wealth in our wild fruits and some day industries upon a large scale will be established in connection with them.

The banana industry was but little known until recent years. Fifty years ago the export of them from Jamaica did not amount to $3,000. Now the industry is worth to that Island upwards of $6,000,000. It is estimated that the United States consume yearly about 6,000,000,000 of bananas. The fruit has a future even more glorious, commercially as well as edibly, and it is suggested that the banana will one day be a rival to the potato in the production of alcohol for motive power and other uses.

It is estimated that the value of the world's output of cocoanut products exceed $350,000,000 and many are of opinion that we are only on the fringe of gigantic development in the industry. It is only of late years that this fruit and the products made from it attained the wealth and prominence they have.

In our partridge and other berries we have a vast storehouse of wealth which only awaits the enterprising brain of some person to develop it. I beg leave to move that the bill be read a second time.

HON. MR. JOB—Mr. President, I would like to say a few words on this

bill for the benefit of members who may not have understood the origin of it. The following extract from a petition to the Premier from 2,000 people in Bay de Verde District explains the necessity for the Bill:—

"These berries are not properly ripe until after the first week in September, but it is now common occurrence to find many women and children picking them in the month of August, and by trampling over the Berry Grounds to obtain a few berries that partially red they spoil and detach from the vines many thousand dollars worth of berries being thus lost irretrievably. As you are probably aware, these berries are preserved in water for shipment to foreign countries, but those picked before they are ripe turn rotten in the water, and therefore create trouble and loss to the buyers.'

New industries, however small can not fail to be of interest to all and indeed, they are so scarce that we cannot afford to neglect them when they present themselves.

This partridge berry growth, if it can be possibly made use of, is indeed attractive, as there is no labor involved in tilling the ground, fertilizing or sowing it, and if we compare it with the apple industry which requires years of waiting, pruning and attention, or the strawberry industry which needs constant care and waiting, we can see at the outset what an advantage we have to start with.

The average export of Berries for the past five years has been 5200 barrels, worth $6.15 per barrel, a total value of $31,000,00, this I must admit is not a very large sum, but this is certainly an industry that is capable of large developments.

Mr. Hickman, the member for Bay de Verde, at whose instigation this Bill was brought in stated in his speech, that he believed that there was enough berries in the District of Bay de Verde to maintain the whole district, which shows what might be done. We should note that Sir Edward Morris in giving it government support has once more risen above party politics in favor of a measure that helps the country's common interests. In attempting to gauge the value of the crop to the country, we must figure out how many berries can be marketed at a fair price and make an attempt to develop markets for this quantity. The chief part of the export goes to Chicago, where it is used by the Scandanavian population as they use it in their homeland in Norway and Sweden, where the jam made from this berry is to be found on the table at every meal,just as we have butter on our tables here. It is also capable of being used for sauces, and if properly pushed its sale could be immensely increased.

If Chicago can use 500 Barrels, why cannot the people in Boston, New York and Philadelphia, and other American Cities take a quantity too? You may depend upon it, that they can, and it only wants a little enterprize to make a market elsewhere than Chicago.

The bulk of the export appears to have come from Bay de Verde district, but the Bonavista Peninsula. Musgrave Harbour and Belleoram likewise contribute to the export. The Bays of Placentia and St. Mary's, and the Southern Shore can yield large quantities of these berries, as people like myself and others, who have wasted time Partridge Shooting every Fall well know.

And, what about the people most interested in the affair, the pickers. It is computed, that a woman or a young girl can pick 7 gallons per day at 20c. a gallon a return of $1.40 a day, this certainly is not bad pay. seeing that it can all be looked upon as "overtime" money. How many Pianos, Gramaphones, Carpets, and other articles of furniture will the Government collect duty, on, if this thing can be made to prosper? The people would thus add something extra to their small incomes, and therefore no trouble should be spared by the authorities to help to bring matters to a successful issue.

I have a special reason for mentioning these facts here to-day, and would not have troubled you with the details that I have mentioned, had it not been, that there is a matter of importance connected with the undertaking that I believe has been omitted.

When this business was started some years ago, you can imagine how the inexperience of Pickers and Exporters would seriously affect the quality of the article. Ripe berries were shipped with unripe ones, and leaves and stalks were found in the barrels, with the result, that in several cases on arrival at their destination, instead of being paid for by the purchaser they were thrown away. This was the state of affairs that was found by the Board of Trade just after they were formed, and they made up their minds to try and correct it some how, and inspired the forming of the Berry Association, which has now been working for some years, with great results. The Berry Association is formed of the chief shippers, who appoint an inspector for every barrel that leaves the country, the result being that a good and increasing market has been found for all the berries that come along,and the price has been advanced from $4.00 to $8.00 a barrel. As the industry increases it is important to include everyone in this Association, and it is clearly now time for the Government to step in and render assistance to those interested by saying "thou shalt not."

There are many things that people shipping berries should not do:— They should not ship them unripe; they should not ship them in bad barrels, and they should not ship them short-weight, but unless some such edict is passed it will be done, and the industry will suffer therefrom. It is hard to say who suffers, and if the industry goes down we all suffer somewhat, as the extra money earned by these people go to all branches of trade. The contents of this Bill are good as far as they go, but to safeguard the enterprise we want a strong Export Inspection Clause, and without it I can only liken the Bill to the play of Hamlet, with "Hamlet" left out. When the Committee stage arrives I may have an amendment to offer.

The Bill was read a second time. and on motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs ordered to be sent to a Committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

Second Reading of Explosives Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to move the second reading of this Bill, and in doing so would explain that the Act extends the right to ships or vessels of war belonging to His Majesty or to any foreign State,or to any vessel employed in the services of the Government, to have explosives on board, and this Bill now before us gives the same right to merchant vessels armed for self-defence. As hon. members are aware, under certain rules and regulations of the Admiralty, some of the ocean liners are armed, and it is for the purpose of

extending the Bill to them that this amendment is made. The Bill also provides that ships other than ships of war entering port with explosives on board shall fly a red flag by day and in the night show a red light. There is no regulation now, and consequenttly ships may come into port with a large quantity of explosives on board, and other vessels not know of it. It is for the purpose of notifying them that these regulations are provided.

Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the House then adjourned until Friday next at 4 o'clock p.m.

FRIDAY, Feb. 20th.

The House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

The President read the following letter from Hon. Dr. Skelton:—

The Hon. the President and Members of the Legislative Council.

Gentlemen:—I am deeply touched by the Resolution of Condolence passed by the Council and by the expression of their sympathy with me in my bereavement which they have so kindly forwarded to me. Kindly accept my heartfelt thanks for the same.

GEO. SKELTON, M. L. C.
Piacenza, King's Bridge Road.
Feb. 17th, 1914.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House resolved itself into a Committe of the Whole on the Explosives Bill, Hon. Mr. Angel in the Chair.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I would call attention to Sec. 3 of this Bill. It requires ships loading gunpowder or other explosives in the port to show a red flag by day and a red light by night, but it makes no provision for ships that are unloading such materials. The absence of any provision as to unloading is so strange that it seems to me that there must be some reason for it and I would suggest, if the hon. gentleman in charge of the measure is not familiar with the circumstances, that the Committee rise, and he ascertain from the Custom House why this is so. Otherwise, I think we ought to amend the Bill as it certainly should be essential for ships unloading gunpowder to show such a signal as well and those that are loading it.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

HON. THE PRESIDENT—I beg to inform the House that I am in receipt of a message from the House of Assembly intimating that they have passed the amendments sent down in and upon the Bill An Act to amend Chapter 109 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled "of patents" without amendment.

I also beg leave to inform the House that I am in receipt of a message from the House of Assembly stating that a Select Committee has been appointed on the subject of the Fishery Resolutions herewith accompanying, consisting of the following—Rt. Hon. the Premier, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Finance and Customs, Messrs. Kent, Moulton, Hickman and the Speaker and requesting that this Chamber appoint a Select Committee to co-operate with those of the House of Assembly on this subject. The following is the Resolution which I will read for the benefit of Hon. members:—

RESOLVED, that it is the opinion of this Committee that it is desirable

that an enquiry should be made forthwith, and evidence taken on oath, if necessary, to ascertain the best means of

(a) Encouraging the cure of fish, whether by establishing a cull or standard in the purchase of the same, or otherwise:

(b) Standardizing or branding of all fish when exported from Newfoundland or Labrador.

(c) Protection and propagation of lobsters:

(d) Protection of the Seal Fishery by the establishment of a close season, if found necessary, or otherwise;

(e) Conserving our bait fishes;

(f) Ascertaining if the prosecution of the whale fishery tends to injure the fishery;

(g) Preserving for our fishermen bait fishes.

RESOLVED, that it is the opinion of this Committee that the matters referred to in the foregoing resolution be referred to a joint Select Committee of this House, and the Honourable the Legis'ative Council.

HON. MR. GIBBS,—I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to co-operate with those appointed by the Assembly with regard to the matters referred to in the Resolutions.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Before that motion is put I think that in connection with this commission it would be better if it had a paid Secretary and was able to sit out of session.

MR. McGRATH—I might say with regard to Hon. Mr. Harvey's suggestion that the committee be empowered to sit out of session, that the Lower House certainly has no power to authorize its committees to work when it is not in session itself, and I think the position with regard to this House is the same. I greatly doubt if a Joint Select Committee can accomplish much in a matter of such magnitude as embraced in these resolutions in the limited time available between now and the close of the present session, but it may be that the committee, after organizing and deciding upon a line of action, may recommend the appointment of a commission to sit out of session and deal with the whole problem during the next twelve months, presenting its report early in the next session. That would, perhaps, be a more feasible way of making real progress than to expect to cope with this task in a few weeks. It will obviously be impossible to elicit sufficient testimony with respect to all of these subjects in the next month and the other scheme is the one that seems to me likely to render the present movement of any real permanent value. While I am on my feet, may I say that I personally regret that the hon. gentlemen in this House connected with the fisheries are not giving us their views on the matter before it goes through.

HON. MR. GIBBS—We have no right to speak on this motion at all.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I cannot agree with my hon. friend as to that. We have the right to speak as fully as we wish on this or any other motion that comes before us. If the Lower House had the right to consider and discuss exhaustively these resolutions, surely we have the right to say whether we will or will not cooperate with them therein. The hon. member has moved that we concur in this invitation to appoint a committee from this House. Surely that is debatable. We might, for instance, be unwilling to do so, and the only way in which hon. members could place themselves on record would be by their speeches in which they would give their reasons for such refusal. In the same way, even if we favored the proposition we surely ought to have the right to give our

reasons for so doing, though as to whether we should exercise that right is a matter for the individual members of the House. I have no personal desire to speak on this question. The suggestion I threw out was that hon. gentlemen around me, who were actively interested in the fisheries, might like to state their views to the House and to the country, as I think they might with very great propriety do, on a matter of such importance as this.

HON. MR. GIBBS--I think, Mr President, that as the majority of hon. members may wish to speak on these Resolutions, the proper way would be for me to give notice that I will move that a select committee be appointed; the hon members may be desirous of giving their views on this very important subject, and much valuable information may be got in this way. I therefore withdraw my motion.

HON. MR. JOB—I think Mr. President, that it would be needless for us to speak on these resolutions at present. Their object has been fully stated in the discussion in the Lower House and hon. gentlemen there have informed the country very fully as to the matter. The time is even now very short for getting through the work which is proposed and for myself, and, I think, for others in this House, I can say that I am prepared to waive any speech which I might like to make on the matter in order to expedite the Committee getting to work.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would ask whether it is not possible to amend this proposal. This, I take it, is a committee to sit in session and the most we can get out of a Committee is a boiled-down opinion of the members forming that committee, which opinion has already been formed. If any information is to be got of any value, it is essential that the Committee should sit out of session. Any of the subjects proposed to be dealt with is as much as a committee is going to get through during the remaining days we shall be here this year. There will probably be a great deal of debate on these questions and a lot of evidence will have to be obtained. I think that it is very desirable to have a commission out of session and if possible, we should amend and appoint a committee to sit out of session with a paid secretary and give them power to take evidence.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I quite agree with Hon. Mr. Harvey and I take it that the Joint Committee will have power to appoint a paid secretary for the work and to take such evidence as they think necessary. Their duty will be, to go into the subject very fully and report to the Legislature, and if they cannot do so before the end of the session they will ask permission to sit out of session. I think you will find precedent for this if you look up the records.

HON MR. McGRATH—I am clear on the point that a committee of the Lower House has no power to sit out of session and I think it will be found that the same is true of this chamber. There is no reason why, however the Government should not, at the close of this session, appoint the very same gentlemen who will make up the Select Committee as the commissioners to continue the work for the next twelve months.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I would point out to the House that this is a request that the Legislative Council will appoint a Select Committee to co-operate with one from the House of Assembly. Of course that is a matter for hon. members to say whether they will or will not. If the House desires to concur in this request it remains for them to do so. I beg to

move that a Select Committee be appointed by this House to co operate with that of the House of Assembly on these Fishery Resolutions.

The motion having passed, the following committee was appointed:—Hon. President, Hon. Mr. Winter, Hon. Mr. Harvey, Hon. Mr. McGrath, Hon. Mr. Goodridge, Hon. Mr. Templeman, Hon. Mr. Job, Hon. Mr. Jas. Ryan.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing them that this House had agreed, as to their request to form a Select Committee to co-operate with theirs on these Resolutions.

The House then adjourned till Tuesday at 4 p.m.

TUESDAY, Feby. 24th.

The House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the House went into Committee on the Cruelty to Animals Bill.

..HON. MR. MILLEY took the chair.

The first six sections were passed after verbal alterations, proposed by Hon. Mr. Gibbs, had been made.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Section 7 raises a question as to whether it should not limit the amount chargeable for veterinary treatment. In the Lower House a few nights ago quite a lot of complaint was made about the charges of medical men in outports. This makes no provision as to the amount which a veterinary surgeon may charge for tending to an animal. It seems to me that some provision should be made for that.

HON. MR. HARVEY—There is another point I am unable to understand about this section. I can't find anything in this Act punishable without the option of a fine, and this section says that the constable can only arrest a person who he has reason to believe is guilty of some offence punishable by imprisonment only.

At the request of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, this section was allowed to stand over.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I think the words "two wheeled" ought to be inserted before the word "cart" and the words "and loaded" after the word stationary. I don't think it is necessary to put down the pritchet unless the cart is loaded.

This section as amended was passed.

HON. MR. McGRATH—With regard to section 11, which provides that no animals shall be killed within sight or hearing of other animals awaiting slaughter, it seems to me that this is a section imposing a needless hardship on butchers and others, and I suggest that the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill allow it to stand until he first consult with those at whose instance the Bill was introduced so that an alteration may be made

This section was allowed to stand over.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I think section 12 ought to come out. I do not see why a poor man who owns a sick or debilitated horse should not be allowed to dispose of it to the owners of a fox farm for food for foxes. There would be nothing cruel in that.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I quite agree with the hon. member. In the old country. I believe it is the custom to kill old horses and use them for feeding dogs on. There can be no cruelty in that.

On motion being put, the section was struck out.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I am going to move an amendment to section 13, that after the words "doing damage" there be inserted the words "or causing unreasonable annoyance." I have in my mind the visits of cats and barking dogs at night. I think peopie should be allowed to deal with these animals on such occasions in a sum-

mary manner, particularly when there are sick people about.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I strongly oppose that amendment. It is too elastic altogether. Supposing at night time you have retired. A dog in some way gets its paw or its tail jammed by the slamming of a door. Its howls make night hideous, whereupon under this proposed privilege you shoot that dog. I think that would be an act of unpardonable cruelty.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I don't think a case such as the hon. member has cited is likely to occur, whereas what I have said very often does occur. I have known very many cases where sick people have been subjected to great annoyance by these animals howling at night. While the phrase is perhaps a little elastic, we have to allow that a community is going to be at least decent.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I have in my mind a circumstance that happened last summer where a valuable dog was shot because it was howling at night. After all, howling is peculiar to certain breeds of dogs. I think the person who was annoyed should first have gone to the owner of the dog and said that he was going to kill the dog, if it wasn't kept somewhere where its howling would not be a nuisance. I don't think it would be wise to permit the killing of animals at large unless they are actually doing damage.

The amendment was lost.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I object to the principle of section 17. Any man who is honest and decent enough will give such information as he may have, not for the sake of making money, but for the sake of doing his duty. Any man who will do so on any score certainly does not deserve to be paid half the fine. I don't think any method of disposing of fines should be made law which would give the major portion of the fine to the informer, except in very special cases. I would suggest as an amendment that the penalties be paid over "one-half to the Society for Protection of Animals, and the other half to the Minister of Finance and Customs."

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I heartily support the amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. Harvey. I remember a Bill in which there was a similar section upon which I took a similar stand. I desire to say now that I regard the payment of informers --I care not whether in connection with Liquor Acts or any other Acts—as a detestable one. Moreover, I take it that those who generally get these fees are those whose duty it is to carry the law into effect, and why a person should be paid to do his duty I cannot understand.

The section as amended was passed.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Should not section 20, which obliges railway employees to kill cattle fatally hurt by trains, apply to automobiles also? They can do as much damage as locomotives.

HON. MR. WINTER—I agree with the hon. member that this section should be made to apply to motor cars also. The animals that suffer most from these cars are dogs and I am personally aware of several cases where cars have run over dogs and the drivers have not taken any steps whatever to stop the sufferings of these animals. I know of a car that ran over a dog and broke its legs, and about a year afterwards the same car ran over the same dog and killed it, and in neither case did the driver who happened to be the owner, take the slightst notice of the howls of the poor brute he had run over. I think it should be the duty of parties driving cars to take the necessary steps to alleviate the sufferings of any animals they may happen to injure.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I will have an amendment to this Bill drafted for to-morrow if the section is allowed to stand.

The Committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Inspection of Foods Bill.

Hon. Mr. J. D. Ryan took the chair.

HON. MR. McGRATH—When this section (5) was last before the House I suggested that the word "fish" be added to the articles which are prohibited from being exhibited in open doorways unless properly covered, or that the word "fish" be struck out of section 6, which requires foodstuffs to be covered while being carted through the streets.

HON. MR. GIBBS—No doubt hon. members have noticed from personal observation that fish is exhibited for sale in the coves and stores, and is not handled in the same way as bread, or cake etc. That is why it was not included in section 5.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Then how can we provide for it in section 6. Fish is just as likely to be contaminated by dirt and dust when exposed for sale in an open doorway, as when it is being carted through the streets.

HON. MR. HARVEY—As I understand the matter the fish need not be covered when exposed for sale on the streets, but if we buy it and carry it home we must cover it.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN—I don't feel quite satisfied with this Bill and I think it should apply to the outports as well as St. John's. I don't see why the members of the Lower House should want to take care of 30,000 people in St. John's and at the expense of the other 200,000 in the outports. How are the people outside the city going to view this action of the members of the Assembly? I am sorry I have to record my vote against the Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS—All that is necessary is to put the law as it stands today in force. As I pointed out to hon. members yesterday there has been a law on the Statute Book for years, applying to the whole Island,whereas the greater part of this applies only to St. John's where food is manufactured. This Act must be read in conjunction with the old act which applies to the the whole Island. I think if hon. members will leave the matter in the hands of the Government they will have no cause for complaint.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I have strong sympathy with Hon. Mr. Templeman in his views. I spoke against the second reading of the Bill on similar grounds. If, as has been stated there is an Act on the Statute Book applying to the whole Island the Government should enforce it. I don't intend to move an amendment of the new Bill. We can give it a trial in St. John's and if necessary extend it to the outports next year. I think the Bill is of such a nature that it would be a pity to interfere with it in any way.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I move that the word fish be struck out of Section 6. We do not require a shopkeeper to cover the fish he shows in his doorway, we should only make ourselves ridiculous by obliging a man to cover a fish he is carrying home.

The motion was carried and the word "fish" was omitted from Section 6.

Some verbal amendments to section 7 and 8 were proposed and adopted, after which the Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendments.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the

Bill for the protection of Partridge Berries.

HON. MR. ANGEL in the chair.

HON. MR. JOB—The amendment to this Bill which I spoke of when we last met reads as follows:—"It shall be lawful for the Board of Trade to make rules and regulations and provide penalties for breaches of the same, in respect to the inspection and exportation of partridge berries. Such rules and regulations shall be published in the Royal Gazette and shall have the force of law." I have nothing more to say on the subject except to remind the House that owing to the efforts of the Board of Trade and this very Committee, the price for berries has been practically raised from seven cents to forty cents. I think the House will be well advised in supporting this measure.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I submit, Mr. President, that the House ought not to pass that amendment in its present form. I do not think we should endow the Board of Trade or any other organization with the right to make laws for the people of this country, under which they may be fined or imprisoned. That is really what the section proposed by my hon. friend amounts to. I freely admit that he does not intend that, but the principle remains and it is a pernicious principle, one that I think the House should never tolerate. There should be only one law making body in this Colony, the Legislature. I see no reason why the Board of Trade may not make regulations which, on being submitted to the Governor-in-Council for approval, and receiving that approval should become law; but I certainly do not think that the Board of Trade should be able to sit down, frame regulations, publish them in the Royal Gazette and make our people thereby liable to them without having any say in the matter.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I agree with Hon Mr. McGrath, and think we ought to have more time for consideration. I would suggest that this amendment stand over for a day or two.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN—I beg to support that also. I think that the Committee should have time to consider. There is no great hurry about it.

The Committee rose and reported having made some progress, and asked leave to sit again which report was received.

HON. MR. GIBBS moved the House into Committee on the Explosives Bill.

HON. MR. ANGEL in the chair.

HON. MR. JOB—I think the words "and sealing steamer" should be inserted in the first section.

HON. MR. McGRATH—With reference to Section 3, I suggested yesterday it should stand over until the hon. member in charge of the Bill could learn something more regarding it from the Customs authorities. I might say that I had a talk with a Customs official on this matter to-day and I understood from him that the idea was to apply the section, requiring ships that were loading explosives to fly a red flag by day and show a red light by night to steamers taking gun powder or dynamite from other ships. For instance the Furness liners often bring explosives here for Bell Island for the iron mines and these explosives are transferred in the harbor to smaller ships, like the Baleine, to be taken around into Conception Bay; and my informant thought that the purpose of this clause was to require the smaller vessels, when loading, to show a danger signal.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I would suggest the insertion of the words "or having on board" after the word

"loading" in section 3 and the words "so loaded" instead of "when loaded."

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

HON. PRESIDENT—Informed the House that he had received a message from the Assembly acquainting this House that they had passed the following Bills in which they requested the concurrence of the Council, viz: —An Act to amend 55 Vict. Capt. 2, entitled an Act to regulate the prosecution of the seal fishery; an Act to apply to this Colony the law of England as to the suppression of what is known as the "White Slave Traffic"; and an Act to amend the law relating to Representatives in the House of Assembly.

On motion these Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House then adjourned till Thursday next at 4 p.m.

THURSDAY, Feb. 26th.

The House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, Inspection of Food Bill was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with some amendments.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House resolved into Committee of the Whole on the Cruelty to Animals Bill.

Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

Section 7 which was allowed to stand over from the last Committee on the Bill was passed.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I beg to move that section 11 be stricken out of the bill, for the reason which I pointed out at the last session. It seems to me to be a most unreasonable obligation put on any man trying to do a legitimate business, such as a butcher, to provide that they cannot slaughter an animal within sight or hearing of another animal. If a butcher has his slaughter house in the country and has a dozen animals to kill, he is obliged to remove the animal he is about to kill a long distance to be out of sight and hearing of the others, or to remove those others from his abattoir. It is, I think, a very unnecessary hardship to impose. While it is desirable to enact laws to prevent cruelty to animals, there is such a thing as going too far and this is a case where I think we are going too far. I therefore move that this section be stricken out of the Bill.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I certainly agree with the contention of Hon. Mr. McGrath. Under any circumstances this would entail hardship and especially so if butchers had to remove cattle long distances, in a spurt of severe weather like that which prevails at present. They would require to have immense premises. It appears to me also that that this is going a little too far.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Is it the intention of Hon. Mr. McGrath to take out the whole section or only the word "hearing?" It is easy to remove the animal out of sight.

HON. MR. McGRATH—In travelling the United States I have seen them kill hogs within sight and hearing of other animals. It is unfair to carry out the provisions of this Act against our butchers. when we consider that no such law is enforced in other countries.

On motion the amendment was put and on division carried, and section 11 was ordered to be stricken out.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments. On motion the Bill

was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Partridge Berries Bill.

Hon. Mr. Angel in the Chair.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I am glad to see that my hon. friend has adopted the suggestion advanced by me the other day that the rules and regulations to be made by the Board of Trade should receive the sanction of the Governor-in-Council. It would be a most objectionable principle, from the point of view of the Legislature, however desirable from a Board of Trade standpoint, to recognize that there should be anybody except the Legislature with the power to make regulations to impose penalties and enact laws for the people of the country, which should be effective by being published in the Royal Gazette.

HON. J. D. RYAN—Before passing the bill there is one portion in section 1 which requires more consideration, namely, that if you have an early season the berries may be ripe before the 5th of September. Are the berries allowed to remain and rot on the bushes for want of picking. The time for picking these berries in an average year is about the middle of September, but in the event of a dry summer and consequent early season, it would be a hardship on the people, if they find that they are not permitted to gather these berries before the first week in September. I would suggest to have the section so amended that it would embrace an early season.

HON. MR. JOB—The decision as to these dates is left to the magistrates in the smaller outharbors. I believe the matter was very fully discussed in the Lower House and the first of September was fixed as being the most suitable date to allow these berries to be picked.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to point out to hon. members that the object of this bill is to prevent these berries from being picked before they are ripe, for I don't believe the partridge berry is ever ripe much before the 5th of September.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I think it will be better to leave the Bill as it is. These berries don't spoil in a week or even in a month. The main object of the Bill is to prevent the destruction of the berries by their being walked upon.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Before the motion is put I would like to suggest to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill whether it would not be worth while making representations to the Government with a view to getting down a specialist from the Cranberry College in Massachusetts, where the cultivation of these berries is now pursued on so large a scale. It ought not to be difficult or expensive to procure the services of one of these gentlemen during the summer vacation, and he could advise the Government as to the possibility of our developing the cultivation of partridge berries on a large scale. In his interesting speech on this measure in the Lower House, Mr. Hickman pointed out the great possibilities in the way of this industry, and how a better knowledge of conditions would operate to our advantage in regard to it. It may appear that we are making too much of this industry, but I have here a clipping kindly handed me by Mr. W. A. Munn, from a Boston paper, telling of the death of the man who was foremost in starting this cranberry industry, and which during his lifetime has advanced from virtually nothing to more than three million dollars a year. Even if we could never hope to obtain anything

like such a result in Newfoundland, the fact that we have, remote as we are, created an industry worth thirty to forty thousand dollars in its export value, out of partridge berries, ought to be a reason why we should invest a small sum to learn if it is not possible to do much more on these lines. Within the lifetime of men, not very old, the cranberry, as we know, has developed into an important industrial asset in Massachusetts; the banana has come to attain a world-wide vogue and to form the basis of an industry of enormous proportions; the tomato has been developed into an article of food for millions, and so with many others of the vegetable kingdom. Prof. Fernald, of Harvard University, who was here two or three years ago, and who developed an interesting theory as to Newfoundland having at one time been part of the American continent, had equally interesting views with regard to our partridge berries. His opinion was that they were really the grapes which the Norsemen claimed to have seen in their voyages into the unknown western waters nearly a thousand years ago. Their red color in the autumn, as they hung on the bushes, would give this impression. His view, too, was that they are really an upland form of the latter, which grow most profusely in the bogs. He pointed out that they are not much known on the West Coast, where the soil is limestone, but on the eastern seaboard, where there is an acid in the soil, they grow in great profusion. I think, therefore, that we might do worse than invest a few hundred dollars in obtaining the services of one of these authorities to go into this matter and advise the Government as to what are the possibilities in the direction I have stated.

HON. MR. J. D. RYAN—I disagree with my hon. friend. I do not think we need have any more of these so-called experts coming here. If we have to go into particulars we would find they don't know very much, and even if they could tell about cranberry cultivation, they may not know much about partridge berries. I think this proposal would cost the Government a lot and would not be worth it.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN—I thought the date for picking these berries was to be left with the magistrates, who were to put up advertisements when the berries could be picked. These berries may not ripen at the same time in all places, and I think the local magistrate would be the best person to determine the date for picking.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the Committee rose and reported the Bill with an amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the House went into Committee on the Explosives Bill, Hon. Mr. Angel in the Chair.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I don't wish to take up the time of the House needlessly, but I should like to point out to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, that I think we made a mistake in adopting the amendment to section 3 as it stands. I would suggest that it ought to go in the previous section. Section 3 is designed to apply to small steamers or lighters that may load explosives from these large steamers for the purpose of carrying them elsewhere. My point is that in section 2 provision is made that vessels coming into port must fly a red flag. I suggest that we add to that section a provision that they must do this whether in the stream, or at the wharf while they have gunpowder on board.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Committee rose, reported the Bill with an amendment, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

SECOND READING OF SEALFISHERY BILL.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—Before the Bill is read a second time I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman in charge of it that we have appointed a Select Committee of this Branch of the Legislature to act in concert with a committee of the other branch for the purpose of enquiring and taking evidence on questions of importance in connection with our fisheries and to report thereon, and I think therefore, that it would be well to defer the second reading of this Bill. In any legislation tending to change the law as to this or any other important branch of our fishery, we should have the fullest particulars we can get before us.

HON. MR. JOB—In reply to the hon. member's remarks, I would point out that the matter to come before the committee to which he refers is distinctly stated to be the question of a close season. The matter was mentioned in the Lower House and when the question of a close season came up the Premier stated that the committee to be formed would deal with that matter, but no reference was made to the matters contained in this Bill. I will therefore have no alternative but to proceed with the second reading of the Bill.

There has been, Mr. President, no Sealing Legislation for some years and while great progress has been made in other directions the laws concerning this industry have been at a standstil there, I think most people interested will welcome the present Bill which suggests several advantages to both owners and men. The contents of the Bill are chiefly the result of negotiations between the representatives of the men and the owners and in carrying out same I may say, the "spirit of give and take" has been observed on both sides. It was stated in the Lower House that the owñers signed these agreements, but never had any intention of carrying them out, which I now beg to deny, and think that the men as a whole will agree that the agreements have all been carried out in spirit, if not exactly in letter, in every item. The time has now come to make these agreements law, and there can be no doubt that this is the best way of dealing with them in the interests of all concerned.

By an oversight one clause of the compact enforced by agreement the past three or four years has been omitted from this Bill. It was that which was arranged by Sir Edward Morris on behalf of the men in 1908, a provision whereby the owners of sealing steamers undertook in case the crews did not make a "bill" sufficiently large to enable them to pay their way home that they would provide an amount for this purpose up to $4 per man. When the Bill is in Committee I shall move that this clause be inserted.

The first section of the Bill deals chiefly with the comfort of the men on board the ships and is no more than is fair to them. The owners are desirous of making this industry popular and particularly wish to eliminate the element of hardship that for years, no doubt, was an accompaniment of the sealing trip. Clause G. of this section, you will notice prohibits the use of rifles for the steel ships, and in dealing with this clause, I would point out that those interested in the Seal Fishery have had two problems to deal with in the conservation of the fishery. The first is the prevention of annihil-

ation of the herd by killing the old and bedlamers and the second the fixing of the date for killing the young seals so as to obtain the maximum weight.

The prohibition now enforced of the use of rifles by the steel ships has two reasons to commend it.

Firstly, because the owners say that it does not pay to keep the larger boats out after young seals are killed on the off chance of shooting old seals, a very uncertain proposition at the best; and secondly because the extra speed of these larger ships enable them to hurry and destroy more old seals than is desirable. The fact of the matter is that shooting of the old seals is generally condemned as being injurious to the fishery as, apart from the obvious evil of shooting a number of mother seals, many are fatally wounded and go off to die. However, the old style of wooden sealer is still in evidence and in the interest of the men as well as the owners, it was considered inadvisable to prohibit the use of rifles by these boats.

The House can see it must be noted in connection with this that the chance of the wooden ships getting their share of the young seals in competition with the more powerful boats is poor, and so in order to protect these boats and help the crews and owners to secure enough to make the voyage pay, this concession has been made. However, I look forward to the day when the shooting of old seals will be done away with altogether.

Now in this connection I must refer you to the clause 7. The number of men required for killing young is more than twice that of those who follow the old and in order to allow captains of steamers to land part of their crews after the young seals are cut up, this clause is asked for. It is purely optional on the part of the crew or captain whether this clause will be availed of. Many men object to stopping out after the young seals are cut, and if the crew is halved those remaining out will of course make double the wages than they would if the whole crew remained on board. This clause is entirely in the interests of the men.

Section 2 deals with the improved feeding of the crew, which, while it satisfies the hardy sealer, does not materially affect the cost of the outfit. This scheme of the authorities for fixing the rations of the men on board the ships is an old one and the English Board of Trade regulations called for it years ago, and I think, in the men's interests at any rate, it is the duty of the authorities to see that they are properly fed. The last clause of this section has been a matter of discussion in the Lower House and some contend that while the rush of taking seals is on, the cooks should leave the galley and work at hoisting seals, running the winches, etc. This custom has prevailed ever since the ships went out and great objections have come from the captains on this point.

I would like to say here that I am of opinion that this cooking department has been sadly neglected, and while there has been an abundance of good food on board most of the ships it has been either spoiled by careless cooking, or else not cooked at all. But the demand is now come for improvement in this line and the owners are anxious to meet the demand. In the original agreement made betwen the owners of the ships and Mr. Coaker dated January 9th, 1912, this clause about the cooks was agreed to, and was supposed to have been carried out since then, and why there should be such a fuss about so insignificant a matter, I fail to see. The view I take of it is that to begin

with, for the first few days of the rush, when every man does about three days work in one day, it is very poor economy to neglect his food, and five or six cooks have all they can do with the present dietry scale to look after the other 250 men properly. Secondly, I argue that as every ship is compelled to keep her cooks cooking, no crew has the advantage over a competitor, and if the ships do take a little longer they derive a benefit by seals growing larger.

The sailing date has been a matter of contention for some time and owners made a careful study of this position with the help of captains and masters of watch. The old sailing date of 10th March was relinquished and the present sailing date of 12th March for the wooden and 13th for the steel boats adopted. The present bill provides for this sailing date, but goes further, and prevents the killing of any seals before 15th March, as per clause No. 9. It might be asked by those not intimately acquainted with this industry why this precise selection of dates has been made? Well, sir, the weight of a well nourished young seal from 17th of March onwards, increases about 10 percent. per day, so you can realize the importance of getting even one day's extra growth out of the 300 000 seals. At say 4 pounds per day this would be equal to 600 tons per day at $4.50 per cwt.—$54,000 a day, a good load for a steamer. This simple little calculation should be understood by every person interested in the sealing legislation, and is a difficult one to dispute. I am not aware of any opposition at present to these sailing dates, though I remember there was a great deal at the time we altered the date from the 10th.

Following on this I beg to refer you to clause 9, as it is closely allied with the sailing date. This killing date of 15th of March has varied from time to time, but this date seems to be one that suits most parties concerned. Personally, I would put it three days later, as the seals will, of course be of a larger size then. The agreement against deferring it past 15th is that if ships lie amongst the seals they drive the mothers away, and so instead of getting larger the young would decrease in size. I also have heard sealers plead that if they sailed later than 13th they might not have time to locate the patch before the seals get out to sea. The other sections of the bill are so obviously fair they need no comment from me.

There are two matters not in the Bill which I wish to refer to briefly. The first is in connection with the little spot of hood seals that lies to the eastward of the harps. There was originally a clause in this Bill providing for a close season for them, but for some reason this has been cut out. A reference to figures shows that there is an average take on East Coast of 12.500 young and 5,000 old hoods for the past five years (1909 to 1913, the steel ship period), and 1,300 young and 3,000 old hoods for the five years previous, which shows that the steel boats are more easily able to get at this patch, but the point I wish to make in connection therewith is that out of a total of 86,000 hoods there are no less than 25,000 old ones and 61,000 young have been brought in the past five years. Now, sir, of these 25,000 old seals I am sure 70 per cent were females, so it is not hard to judge how long this patch will last if something is not done to prevent the killing of the females who stick by their young and are an easy prey to the hunter. The owners agreed to this in the agreement of Jan. 9th, 1912, but some have altered their opinion since.

The essence of the future Legislation for this fishery should be to prevent waste and make the best of our opportunities. In the same year the average weight of young harps has been 35 to 38 pounds as against 45 to 48 pounds in other years. What we want to get is the 45 pound seals instead of 35 pound seals every year. A difference of 10 pounds in weight on a full catch of 300,000 seals is 1340 tons which valued at $4.50 per cwt. gives $120,600. I admit that this is not so easy as it looks as weights vary in different seasons, but by making a close study of conditions in most years, a date of killing can be made which will apply. Sir Edward Morris at a meeting of the Fishery Committee now sitting, has suggested that a list of questions be put to captains each year, which would supply data for this House to work on while considering the matter. At present the man outside the trade has little to work on and were it not for an occasional valuable report such as that by Capt. Kean, the Napoleon of the sealfishery, very little light would be shed on the subject. In Captain Kean's report he refers to a close season for all seals, which while I do not consider it, absolutely necessary as long as the present number of steamers are not increased, I think it would certainly replenish the stock.

There is one other clause I should like to see inserted in this Bill. I hope another year it may find its way there, that is a regulation doing away with property in panned seatls, and I give the reasons for this. First, many seals are panned by steamers earliest in the patch, which are never got except by sharks, (sea sharks I mean, and don't refer to captains who take other ship's seals) these seals are swept away. Second, if every ship had to kill and take on board the day's killing the seals would remain alive for days longer and the increase in weight would be much larger and I look upon the scheme as a good one for increasing the weight of the voyage.

I trust that the House will feel that I have established a case for the second reading of the Bill, and though there may be changes made in committee I trust that the general principles of the measure will be endorsed. I have much pleasure now in moving that the Bill be read a second time.

Before closing, I think, I ought to say, in presenting my views here. I am not expressing those of the owners as a whole, but merely my individual opinions.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I rise to support the Bill. I do so for several reasons. First, because of the fact that a very great deal of what is in it is the result, as the hon. introducer has remarked, of give and take, long-time negotiations between the men, or their representatives, and the owners. I also support it, and gladly, because I recognize it to be a Bill that comes from the F.P.U., and I think that, whatever attitude individuals make take towards the political objects and activities of the F. P. U., I do not think any will question the fact that the F. P. U. has been a great educational factor all through the Colony, and has done more, perhaps, to make the people, or a major portion of them, take a live interest in matters of public policy, in broad questions far removed from that of the local ferry,the public wharf, or the village pump—than anything else we have had in this country for many years, and I believe that the F.P.U. and the interest it has aroused in the country, are in the long run, going to do this Colony a great deal of good. I am glad, therefore, to be able to

support the Bill, partly on that account.

But when I say I support the Bill, I do not for a minute say I support it in toto. It is, of course, the privilege and one of the real functions of this body to revise and consider in detail all legislation that comes before it from below. I think we may fairly say that very few Bills that come before this House do not receive very close scrutiny, and do not leave this House in very much better shape than when they came to us. In this particular Bill there are a number of clauses to be considered and discussed, which, in my opinion, need revision, which require that we shall attempt to put them into such shape as will make them fairer and more workable than they are in their present form. There are several broad questions involved, to which I must refer, introducing principles which are, in my view, not justifiable.

I would point out to hon. members, first of all, that there is absolutely no right of appeal from any of the penalties that are enforcible under this Act. Any sealing captain may be hailed without notice before a Magistrate and fined $4,000 with no right of appeal. I am informed of that on the very best legal authority which I consulted on that subject. That, obviously is unfair, and I think the introducer must admit that it is unfair. Then there is no option in the majority of principal fines imposed, for the Magistrate to vary the fine. Everyone must see that that is not fair; it is not British justice. A captain who for reasons which he possibly has no control over, or which may be due to unintentional oversight, or even due to insubordination among his crew, may be guilty of a trifling breach of these provisions. The Court has no option. It must fine him $4,000.

Then there is the principle which I objected to most decidedly when dealing with the Bill for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and which I trust will never be adopted in this House, and that is the principle that the informant should pocket the entire fine. That I shall always object to most strenuously, unless it is necessary to apply it in exceptional cases. To give the legal right to any Tom, Dick or Harry, on the street who has no interest whatever in the matter, without notice or time limit to bring a master before a Magistrate and because of some trifling or technical breach of the Act, to recover a fine of as much as $4,000 and put it in his pocket, I think is nothing short of encouraging dishonest suits and putting a premium on rascality and false swearing; and in addition to this, the fine having been imposed (the Magistrate being obliged to obey the law) a man has not the right of appeal. As I said, there is no notice required, no time-limit given, and the suit may be taken years after the offence occurs.

These are some of the things which I think must be altered in this Act as it stands. Under any Bill such principles are indefensible. Nearly every one of these points refers to the question of penalties, and no one can seriously think of the Act, consider these penalties, and say that they are true to his ideas of British fair play or British justice. When the Bill comes before the Committee I shall have a series of amendments to bring forward, not for the purpose of turning down clauses, but for the sake of amending them on the lines that this House has always adopted in dealing with Bills coming here, viz: on the lines of common sense and decency. With the indulgence of the House I will refer to one or two details in the Bill. In section 1, clause (b), all decks not permanently sheath-

ed must be sheathed for the voyage with three inch plank. Well, it is obvious that a sheathing of 3-inch plank is unnecessary in ships which already have 3-inch wooden decks laid, and as a matter of fact most of the ships have these already. It is necessary to amend this section, and I say, Sir, that this very first section shows how carelessly and hurriedly the Bill has been drawn, notwithstanding the interest and amount of discussion it has aroused. Take the Stephano or Florizel, the steamers of Job Bros. and Co., or the 'Bel.' and 'Bon.' They have wooden decks already. What is the object of sheathing these wooden decks with wooden planks? There are one or two steamers with iron decks, and to these steamers the section rightly applies. But the fact is, that under the provisions of the Bill every ship which has wooden decks already must sheath them again with 3-inch plank. This, of course, is not meant. Take sub-sections (c) and (e). These two matters—the portable iron frame beds and the heating of the sleeping quarters by steam pipes—I do not for a moment object to; but I do want to say this, that those two sections require partial amendments. For instance, the Adventure having been the first experimental steel ship did not have steam pipes in all parts of the 'tween decks, nor was she fitted with iron-framed beds, and in one small portion of her accomodation only, she is heated with stoves, though in the major portion with steam pipes. Though I do not speak for the owners of the Adventure, I believe they have no objection to meeting the requirments of this section, but they must be allowed a reasonable time, and it is impossible if the Bill goes through this session to get steam pipes into this small portion of the sleeping quarters before the sailing day. Captain and owners, though, are liable to heavy fines, which is unreasonable and quite obviously time must be given as regards this.

I will not deal with the food clause. It is questionable to me whether it is worth the men's while to insist on an unalterable menu of this kind. I think myself that these things may be easily varied to their own advantage. However, if they prefer it themselves, nobody else will object. Now I come to the very vexed question of cooks. Hon. Mr. Job says he would like to have more cooks. There seems no reason why, if the present number of cooks is thought insufficient, there should not be more cooks shipped. If it is thought that the crews are too large, why not insert a provision in the Bill to reduce the number of men carried.

But, as I understood the hon. member, he stated that the matter was of small importance, because in any case cooks are now only asked to do other work for perhaps a few days during the voyage and that consequently whether they did any other work or not during those few days it did not make much difference to anyone. I confess I fail to follow him in this, for practically the entire success or failure of a sealing voyage may, and does more often than not, depend upon a few days' work and the presence of a few men to do necessary jobs during this strenuous time makes all the difference between great success and poor success. While I greatly dislike the whole principle of the clause and would infinitely prefer to see it eliminated altogether, for it undoubtedly affects the master's control in his own domain, yet I hesitate personally to take the responsibility of moving for its deletion, it having come up unanimously recommended by the House

of Assembly, I think it must be modified so as not to prohibit a cook from doing what both he and the crew may desire him to do, and I propose to ask the House to substitute the following for this clause, which in reality is meant to cover exactly what I fancy the party who drew the clause really wanted to cover. I propose to say that "no person employed as a cook shall be required by the captain to do any other work except such as is incidental to the work of cooking, (a) if he shall personally object to performing the work, or (b) if any two of the members of the crew shall so object." Without knowing the circumstances that may exist at any particular time are we to say to the cooks, it is under all circumstances except when there is actual danger, illegal for you to go to a winch or set a ladder or touch a line? And if a cook does it against the law is the captain to be held responsible? Under the literal English of this clause it seems open to question whether a cook can wash his own pans. The section does not refer to work incidental to cooking but makes it illegal for him to do anything but cook. This is, of course, an extreme position, but I see no reason why an objectionable cook should not approximately take it and refuse to do many things which it is his business to do. But apart from this, to say that on a day when perhaps seals are scarce, and when the crew are scattered all about, looking for seals, when the captain, who is expecting bad weather, hauls alongside a pan, with 6 or 7 idle men about the deck who may be as anxious as the captain to take seals on board, when there may be but a small amount of time to spare before the crew must be picked up, when half an hour may secure these seals, to say that by law some of the cooks shall not be allowed to do this, even if they want to do it, is, to say the least. ridiculous and this section, before it leaves the House must be, if it is to be retained at all, placed at least in less absurd form.

Coming now to Section 4 we find a section wherein any person whomsoever who shall sue for this fine before a magistrate, provided that it be proven that complaint was made to the Master at the time, shall be able to recover the penalty. Any person, a drunken, good-for-nothing on the street, may take a vexatious suit against the captain. He need not give him notice, though a complaint must have been made some time or other on the ship, he gives no notice of suit and he summarily recovers the whole of the fine. I think any person taking such a suit as that should be a member of the crew at least. I propose to ask the House to substitute there for the words 'any person,' the words 'any member of the crew of such steamer,' and to add, 'provided that written notice of such suit shall be given to the said Owner or Master, within 7 days after the arrival of such steamer at the port of discharge,' and I propose to ask the House, also, to add, instead of allowing informers to put in their pockets the whole of the fine, that one-half shall be paid over to the person or persons taking the suit and one-half to the Minister of Finance and Customs. It is objectionable, I think, to give anything to the informer, but it may be possibly advisable to allow something. There, again, I beg leave to point out, there is no right of appeal and that right ought to be provided.

Now, I take section 6. This section, in my opinion, is an iniquity as it now stands. I do not suppose that it is intended to have the effect which it actually has. This clause demands

that if a ship sails before the legal date. mind, including the precise hour and minute, the captain or owner shall be liable to an invariable penalty of $4,000; and again I would point out that the Magistrate has no option to render this less stringent, he must make it $4,000, and it is to be recovered in a summary manner by such person as may sue for it. Imagine a case, gentlemen, of a captain's time being wrong, or his being a little over-excited, and without malice or evil intent, or even with a full intention of complying with the Act, he gets off Chain Rock a few minutes before 8, he may be sued by a casual spectator, and the lucky man who gets there first, will be able, under this clause as it stands, to pocket $4,000 if the skipper could pay it, and the latter would have no appeal. This is certainly carrying things to a ridiculous extreme, and I reiterate that it is unjust and unBritish. But I can cite a case from my own personal experience, a case which is exceedingly likely to occur again, under which, with absolutely no blame attaching to anyone, it becomes practically impossible to carry out the provisions of the Act, and yet the unfortunate skipper could have no redress, but would most unjustly be mulcted for the $4,000.

I cannot recall at the moment the precise year, but it was a good many years ago. I went out in the "Newfoundland." Captain Farquhar was anxious to clear from Seldom-Come-By. We left Bay Roberts two days before the legal date of sailing, bound for Seldom. The Captain, as a Canadian coming here, was naturally entirely determined to comply with our laws, and so was I myself anxious that he should, having some interest in the ship, and every possible effort was made to get to a port of clearance. The wind, however, went east, and it became impossible to make any port whatever, as the ship became helpless for some days in the ice, and every port that we had any chance of making was completely blocked. It was quite impossible to clear according to law. If such a thing happened under such a section as this the captain could have been sued by any adventurer. by any man on the street, and the Court would presumably have had to impose a fine of $4,000 or defy the Statute. The whole amount would go into the pocket of any person who might go out of his way to take such suit, and the captain and owner have no appeal. This section then, if we have any sense of fair play, must be altered, and I propose to ask the House to put in that section after the word 'penalty' the following words 'not exceeding four thousand dollars, to be recovered in a summary manner by any master, master-watch, or other officer of any sealing steamer, or by any three members acting together of the crew of any sealing steamer, suing for the same before a stipendiary Magistrate,' and then to add at the end of the section the words 'provided that written notice of such suit shall be given to the accused party within 40 days of the arrival of the offending ship at the port of discharge; and one quarter of any fine imposed here-under shall be paid over to the person or persons taking the suit, and three quarters to the Minister of Finance for the use of the Colony,' and a right of appeal must also be provided.

I now come to section 9 which says 'no seals shall be killed before the 15th March, nor shall seals so killed be brought to port under a penalty of $4,000 to be recovered from the master or owner of the ship.' This clause as it stands, is a good brother to clause 6. Its injustice is on a par

with the other. That same year, when I was at the sealfishery, a seal or two were killed by some of the crew prior to the date when they were permitted to do so. The captain was not responsible and was in fact not necessarily cognizant of it at all. But under this clause a seal or two killed in this way, against orders even, would make the captain or owner liable to pay a perfectly ridiculous fine of $4,000. No notice of suit is recuired to be given by this section and the whole $4,000 is put into the hands of any man who takes the suit. I was quite interested in listening to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Job, on my left, and I agree with many of his conclusions. I was particularly interested in his statement as to Capt. Barbour's position on the 'Nascopie', when he said that Capt. Barbour's crew got out of hand, so that he could do nothing with them, and that they broke the law without his being able to prevent it. Does not that emphasize the need for care? The captain might be unable to prevent the killing of a few seals a day or two before the legal time, so would the owner. Why then, should these people be mulcted in these extraordinarily heavy fines without the option of appeal and without notice in connection with trivial breaches and perhaps which they might be most anxious to prevent. I would ask that the House do insert a similar amendment to this section, after the words 'penalty' the words 'not exceeding $4,000' suit to be taken by any master, master watch or three members of the crew acting together of any sealing steamer, and provided that written notice be given the owner or master within 40 days after the arrival of such steamer at the port of discharge, one quarter of the fine to be paid to the person taking such suit, and three quarters to the Minister of Finance and Customs for the use of the Colony.'

So much, gentlemen, for the Bill as it appears here, and which, as I have stated I do not wish to oppose, but rather to improve and to render practicable, fair and workable. I would like to refer to Hon. Mr. Job's position as regards 'panning.' He may be right in what he says. It is, of course, a very difficult question. If you have 200 men out taking seals, seals very plenty, you must pan them. They must be cooled for one thing, and no great quantity can be handled on deck in such circumstances. What is going to happen then if another empty ship with another 200 men comes by? Are the first lot going to let this lot take their pans? If there is no law of ownership then my belief is that there will be bloodshed out there sooner or later.

HON. MR. JOB—There is no law on the subject now.

HON. MR. HARVEY—There is a mutually recognized right, and if this right is taken away, I think things will get dangerous.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Harvey, the debate was adjourned until next sitting.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the House then adjourned until to-morrow.

FRIDAY, Feb. 27th,

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

The Cruelty to Animals Bill, the Partridge Berries Bill and the Explosives Bills were read a third time, passed and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the Assembly.

SECOND READING OF SEAL FISHERY BILL.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—Before proceeding with the second reading of the Bill I wish to say that I regret that Hon. Mr. Job has not seen his way clear to accede to my request to defer further consideration of the Bill. I am more confirmed in my opinion that it is desirable that it should be deferred until the Joint Select Committee now sitting and considering the preservation of the seal fishery, more especially the question of a close season, shall be heard from. The position taken by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill is untenable, and I think it is a reflection upon the self-respect of members of that Joint Select Committee, if we pass legislation which the Committee are specially appointed to take evidence on before we receive any report from them. They have been only a few days appointed and are meeting daily to consider the subjects referred to them and have made good progress on the Lobster question, and will, no doubt, in a short time be able to report on this subject.

It is in my opinion almost unprecedented for a Legislative body to appoint a Select Committee to enquire into and take evidence upon any measure, and to proceed with legislation without their report, more especially when they have been only a few days appointed. In the very interesting and admirable address of Hon. Mr. Harvey, he has dealt with the matter of the necessity for the Bill. There are, no doubt, some parts of this Bill which are commendable; and such as are faulty will eventually I hope, be put into proper shape, so as to make this Bill the best possible for the preservation of this most important industry, if we only take the time to get all the evidence possible, which we would be able to do in the course of a day or two. Mr. Job himself, it seems to me, has shown the necessity for remodelling the Bill, as he has moved the amendments, and discussed one very important matter. that dealing with the right of property in panned seals and this is a matter which requires the taking of all the evidence procurable before we go further. Hon. Mr. Harvey has criticized the Bill, section by section, and his remarks show its inadequacy to meet present conditions. I do not intend at present to make any remarks on the sections of the Bill as it stands, but I am referring generally to the principle of the Act. Should it be considered desirable to go on with the second reading, I have only to submit, and I will defer any further remarks I may wish to make, for the committee stage. If we go slowly in the matter and give it the earnest deliberation it is entitled to, I have no doubt that we will make a good workable measure of it, and would therefore move that further consideration be deferred for the present until we get the report of the Joint Select Committee.

HON. MR. JOB—I have, Mr. President, only once more to protest against further delay in putting the Bill through. The matter has been discussed for many years and the facts in connection with it are threadbare, so that I think further delay would be but a waste of time, and if we are to wait to get further evidence in the matter nothing will be done. The understanding in the other House was that the clause regarding the close season would be deferred for another year and the Commission appointed will take evidence therein and for that reason I can't agree to the request of my hon. friend Mr. Goodridge.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I feel, Mr. President that I must support Hon. Mr. Goodridge in his motion to defer fur-

ther consideration of the Bill. The discussion already evoked shows the necessity there is for amendments to some of the sections. For instance, there is no time limit in bringing suit, which may be done immediately or in five years; no arrangement is made as to the distribution of the fine of $4,000. I would like to ask the Leader of the Government whether there is a law in the Statute Book which would bear on the matter. It is an inducement for any man to bring an action against a captain. I consider it iniquitous and calling for an amendment. Hon. Mr. Job says that the Bill has been thrashed out for a number of years, and if this is so, judging from the strictures, we have heard here on it, it seems to me that those who have thrashed it out have allowed some very important matters to slip by. As to the sheathing of steel ships with wood it must be remembered that with the first of this class of ships it was not deemed necessary to have them sheathed. The wooden ships, of course, were so sheathed with at least 3 inch plank and when it was found necessary the same was done with the steel ships, but I don't know why 3 inch plank is required. As regards the furnishing of iron frame beds, I want to point out that these were attended to before we had the law in the Statute Book. This boarding of hatchways also was provided for. When I was in business we placed in the Bellaventure and Bonaventure iron beds and boarded up the hatchways. It was not found necessary on the smaller ships or the necessity of boarding the hatchways was not so great as in the large boats, with hatchways 35 feet long and 15 feet wide. Steam pipes have now become necessary, but there was a time when stoves were placed in limited spaces on the ships, when hatchways were not attended to, and when the men generally lived on board under unhealthy conditions. Like the Hon. Mr. Harvey I think the sections in the Bill which provides no time limit and no method by which fines are to be distributed require to be amended. I therefore agree with my hon. friend Mr. Goodridge, and think his motion to be well taken.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I rise, Mr. President, to say that to defer the Bill is to make a serious mistake. There may be an apparent difficulty in connection with the questions confronting us in this Bill. To my mind it would be an act of discourtesy on our part to shelve this Bill—for to defer it till the Joint Committee reports would amount to that. This session is drawing to a close, and there can be little hope that the commission will report for a long time to come. Personally I have very little expectation of seeing a report of that Committee during the present session of this legislature. I am willing to admit that there are sections of this Bill that require to be amended ,but these can be discussed in Committee. Some years ago it was customary to have a Sealing Bill brought up before the Legislature every year. It was the 'hardy annual' of legislation. About fourteen or fifteen years ago the Sealing Bill disappeared and the Education Bill took its place. This year, having no Education Bill on the programme, I suppose the Sealing Bill has taken its place. But is it fair that a Bill which has been sponsored, not only by the sealers, but also by the owners should be so summarily dealt with? If the House can be assured that the report of the Commission will be presented here before the expiry of the present session and ample time will be offered for discussing it, then by all means defer the Bill, but the seal fishery commences in a fortnight, and if the requirements of the Bill

are to be carried into effect, it will have to be made known in a week's time. But in any case, if we can afford, year after year, to be introducing amendments to the Sealing Bill, why cannot we experiment with this Bill out of deference to those who are interested in it and understand it, for if anybody can be expected to understand the requirements of the seal fishery, surely it is those who go to the ice, and those who own the ships.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I entirely agree with the speaker who has just sat down. I think it would be an act of discourtesy and utmost impropriety to turn this Bill down. I would also point out that there is nothing in this Bill that will come before the Commission except, possibly, the date for sailing and killing seals. These are the only two things that the Commission may possibly be asked to consider. It only carries into force the present agreement between owners and men, and it would never do to throw it out.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I did not make a motion to throw the Bill out, but to await the report of the Joint Select Committee on Fishery Resolutions.

HON. MR. McGRATH—It seems to me that if for no other reason than that of fixing the sailing and killing dates, we ought to hesitate about sending this Bill to the Fisheries Committee at the present time. We ought to copper-fasten these two matters instead of leaving them, as in the past two or three years, to be effected by an agreement between the owners. If we send this Bill to the Fisheries Committee we merely substitute for an enactment of the Legislature a similar agreeement to that made in the past years, and if any of the owners should not accept the proposition we would then have steamers sailing on the 10th of March, the present legal date, and the others remaining back, with consequent possibilities of trouble both here and at the icefields. For the same reason as I advanced yesterday with regard to the Partridge Berry Bill, I do not think we ought to have in this matter legislation by private agreement. I suggest, therefore, to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Goodridge, that we allow the second reading of the Bill to go through and take it into Committee,and if, then, it is found that it would be better to send it to the Fisheries Committee, we should do so.

I do not agree with the hon. gentleman opposite, Mr. Job, that because this Bill comes from so many of the fishermen, or my hon. friend Mr. Harvey, that because it is endorsed by the F. P. U. these facts ought to weigh with us unduly, if we are of opinion that it is undesirable to pass the Bill in its present form or with amendments. I remember when this House systematically rejected for four years a Bill to prevent the prosecution of the Labrador Fishery by steamers, although scores of petitions calling for the enactment of such measure were presented to the Legislature every session from the very same fisherfolk as we are now told are behind this Bill. This House did not hesitate then to reject that measure and that it came from the fishermen did not weigh with the legislators here to any extent, if at all. Moreover, if tomorrow a large number of petitions were presented to the Assembly asking for the enactment of a Bill by which sealers would get 'half their hand,' as it is commonly termed, or one half the proceeds of their catch, would this House pass that Bill merely because the sealers demanded it? I am sure we would not, and I submit that it is no reason to advance here, to ask us to accept a measure, namely, that it

comes from the fisherman, because if that argument is to apply in all cases then we should be deprived of all right of independent judgment. On the other hand, I do not contend nor would I act on the principle because certain elements in the country are opposed to the present Government a Bill brought in by these elements should be rejected. I, personally, am prepared to consider every Bill on its merits, no matter who brings it in, and to vote for or against it as my judgment leads me to do after a study of the Bill and hearing the arguments for and against it. I suggest to my hon. friend that we allow the second reading to pass.

HON. MR. J. D. RYAN—I support the second reading of the Bill, as I think if we wait till we have the report of the Commission, it would be too late for this season's operations. The Bill has received the support of both sides of the other Chamber, and I think when a Bill comes to us with the support of the representatives of the people in the other Chamber, it would be unwise for us to refuse the second reading of the Bill. I would strongly support the second reading of this Bill out of deference to the other Chamber.

Mr. Goodridge's motion to defer the Bill was put and lost.

HON. MR. HARVEY—At the risk of wearying the House I want to refer to the Seal Fishery generally, and more particularly to the most interesting and admirable report which Captain Kean has presented and which I suppose hon. members have read. Capt. Kean speaks with an authority equalled by perhaps no one else in the Colony in connection with present day sealing matters, and if one criticizes some of his conclusions, as I am inclined to do, one does it with a considerable sense of temerity. However, I am quite sure that Capt. Kean himself will welcome such criticism as may be fairly directed to ascertaining the true position, which is, after all, the real aim of his own investigations and thought. In his view as the result of his study of the published statistics, and on the observations which he has made, he finally recommends that there should be a complete close season, one year or more apparently, during which the fishery would be stopped altogether and that there might perhaps also be three years restriction as regards bedlamers. I do not, as regards the need of an entire close season, agree with Capt. Kean, if I may say so with modesty; and regarding the opinion expressed by Hon. Mr. Job, that it would be perhaps desirable that the sailing date of the fleet be still further advanced beyond that at present fixed, my opinion is that this would be undesirable. The sailing date is late enough. I do not think, for reasons which I will give, that there is any need, for a completely close season, that is to say, either for one year or for a series of years. I do think there ought to be perhaps an earlier return from the ice, than at present, and I most certainly think, if the fishery is to be preserved, that guns ought to be done away with. I am quite certain they ought to be done away with immediately and in toto, in the sole interests of the fishery considered by itself. As however, the general view may be that this would be too hard upon our old friends, the wooden ships, it may be possible to temper the blow to them, by a progressive shortening up of the season at its end until after a year or two of notice the guns shall be finally forbidden. It would be better, however, to do away with them at once and this I believe to be the main thing needed to preserve and perpetuate the fishery. With one con-

sideration of Capt. Kean's I do unhesitatingly agree and that is the exceeding importance of the protection of the bedlamers. These future breeders, upon whom the perpetuation of the herd depends, ought to be fully protected, and thus, as he says, a vigorous body of young mothers be secured. I also agree with Capt. Kean that a close season for female hoods is absolutely essential if the hoods are to be a factor in the future of the seal fishery. But I entirely disagree with Capt. Kean when he expresses the view, that on the whole, there has been, since steam came in, no decline in the seals and also to his proposition, that it is the young seals rather than the old, which we ought to protec. He bases that conclusion partly upon the proposition already stated, that the seals have not been reduced since 1863, when the first steamer appeared on the scene. I believe he is wrong regarding both these points. He refers to the necessity in artificial breeding in other directions, to the necessity of killing off old animals and keeping the young. But the fact is that no general proposition in regard to this matter can be laid down which will be applicable to cover all species. Methods for breeding depend upon the type of animal and the conditions, and I think that the broad fact which has been lost sight of by Capt. Kean and others who argue for killing the old and protecting the young is this, that there is all the difference in the world between a species that comes to maturity and can breed within twelve months, and another which requires several years. In the first the old breeder is not so important to the race, in the second it is the young that is not so important. In the seal species, an animal, as far as our present knowledge goes,takes four and perhaps five years to mature, and obviously, when it has attained that age it is at its highest value to the species and to the fishery; and the least valuable age is its first or last year, from this point of view. If it became a reproducing animal at the end of the first year it would be different, but being an animal which 'pups' only at four or five years old and then only produces one pup generally and supposing that it continues producing young for seven or eight years, or longer, it is surely essential to protect its life much more than to protect those of one or two years growth always supposing that a moderate number of these latter escape to fill up the gaps caused by those old ones which die or cease to be productive.

But there are other reasons for thinking that Capt. Kean has drawn a wrong conclusion, reasons based upon the published figures to which he himself refers and to which I intend referring later. I think the question which the country has to consider is not so much whether the seals have decreased since 1863 as whether they have declined within the past fifteen or twenty years. I consider that the method of calculation adopted in the report to which I am referring is erroneous for this reason, viz: that he bases all his calculations upon the combined figures of the Gulf and Eastern fisheries, and mixes together young and old Hoods and Harps. Unfortunately what is really definitely known about the seals, even by the most experienced men, is not very much. It is regrettable that we have not more information upon this interesting subject. For instance, I will take one commonplace thing, and it is remarkable how difficult it would be to get a reliable definition of it today which would be based upon actual knowledge. I will take the question "what is a bedlamer" and "how old is a seal

when it passes out of the bedlamer class?" I should myself define a bedlamer as a seal over one year old but which has not yet attained the dignity of being permitted to join the herds of breeding seals. But whether a seal is a bedlamer at three years old or at four years old, or whether it ceases to be one in its fourth or in its fifth year, that is to say whether it produces its first pup in its third, fourth or fifth year, on this point there is much divergence of opinion among the sealing skippers to whom I have spoken, and there is no certainty.

Then, again, the question of the true relation of the Gulf fishery is one which has never been clearly elucidated or studied. Thus, are the herds of seals that find their way into the Gulf through the Straits of Belle Isle a portion of the same herds as frequent the front? or are they a different species? or are they the same species but differently localized in their habits? Do the seals which come from the Banks and Sable Island, through the Cabot Strait, into the Gulf in the early Spring to breed, go first on to the Banks with the main body of Eastern seals? or are they the same seals which break off from the main body at the Straits of Belle Isle in the fall, and do they traverse the Gulf, and go out to the Banks via the Cabot Straits and return by the same? Is it the tides, or the weather or the food supply, which draws every year a certain percentage of the seals in through the Belle Isle Straits, and away from the main body, with which they seem to travel south from the region of Baffin's Bay as far as the Straits of Belle Isle? or are they a separate species, localized as to a portion of their lives, in the Gulf? These are matters which nobody is really informed about, and about which it would not be easy to get any large amount of detailed scientific information, but the broad facts ought to be more or less certainly known, for unless we do know something of the general facts, it is impossible to deduct with certainty from the figures of the seal fishery, what is really taking place. My own belief is that we may fairly say that the Gulf herds are entirely distinct and localized, as against the Eastern bodies, and that an increase or decrease in one probably has little or no effect upon the other. There seems no doubt but that the typical Gulf harp is a stouter and shorter form of seal than the Eastern harp, and most probably belongs to a different species or variation. I think the general opinion among the sealing masters is that the two lots of seals are localized, more or less. Occasionally a small body of seals has been taken somewhat to the eastward of Belle Isle which have apparently driven through the Straits and are recognizable as Gulf seals. This idea of the localization through part of the year at least, of the Gulf seal is certainly the opinion of Capt. Robinson, R.N., who has written a pamphlet on the seals, which is the only attempt I have ever seen to treat the subject in any intelligently scientific way. He compiled most of his information from some of our own sealing skippers, but more from the sealing skippers of Dundee, and probably also from personal observation and study.

However, the point which I want to emphasize is that no reliable conclusions can be drawn statistically, by lumping together a series of figures which have no relation to one another, and that is what Capt. Kean has done, for he has based his recommendations largely upon statistical results obtained by adding together the totals of the Front and the Gulf, the young and the old, and the hoods and

the harps. What is wanted, as a matter of fact, is careful analysis to ascertain the progress of the two separate fisheries, and the various classes of seals, before any conclusions can be obtained. Having always been much interested in this question, I started some time ago making up such an analysis for my own information, and it seems to me that the tables are both interesting and instructive, and I therefore had them printed for the consideration of any one who cared to look over them. The table only shows the results, taken from Chafe's published records for nineteen years past. Details do not appear to be obtainable prior to 1895. Before I started making up these figures I was under the impression, which they have very greatly confirmed, that the number of the seals on the front of the country had been steadily reducing, and the table shows that while this is an undeniable fact, the production of seals in the Gulf has in contrast largely increased. It may be thought that the increase in the Gulf is due to the large number of steamers employed there in recent years, but I think there must have been a real increase, and indeed a great increase, in the number bred there. I think also that this table indicates the reason for this increase quite clearly, as the herds of Eastern harps constitute the main element in our seal fishery and are by odds the most important factor in the situation. I will first read the totals of the catch for the past fifteen years lumped into three periods to show the average tendency.

EASTERN FISHERY.

Catch of young harps in 3 year periods, for the past 15 years.

1899 to 1901 inclusive	.762,567
1902 to 1904 inclusive	.727,080
1905 to 1907 inclusive	618,692
1908 to 1910 inclusive	.593,574
1911 to 1913 inclusive	492,608

Fishery declining.

GULF.

Catch of young harps in 3 year periods, for the past 15 years:

1899 to 1901 inclusive	. 76,673
1902 to 1904 inclusive	40,437
1905 to 1907 inclusive	50,255
1908 to 1910 inclusive	.121,892
1911 to 1913 inclusive	..124,278

Showing a very substantial increase to have in this matter legislation by in recent years.

There can hardly be any question, in the face of these figures, but that the herds of harps on the front are being rapidly, and surely swept out of existence, and second, that for some reason the herds in the Gulf have considerably increased. The question is why does this contrast exist between the two fisheries? It will take a little time to go into this question, which, the statistics may help to answer, and I am sure they do help to answer it.

As the notes I have made with regard to this portion of my address upon seal fishery matters are somewhat lengthy, and are by no means exhausted yet, I do not know whether it would be well for me to go on and discuss the matter further at present or not. Our time is somewhat limited and the remarks which I shall make have in view the elucidation of the general problems of the seal fishery, and what ought to be legislation thereon, are not particularly based upon the detailed legislation proposed by the Bill now before us. That being so, I hardly know whether I should take up the time of the House or not, or whether hon. members desire to hear the facts I have assembled, and the conclusions I have reached regarding them.

(Some hon. members here expressed their desire that the hon. gentleman should continue.)

As some hon. gentlemen have been kind enough to say that they would like me to proceed with my remarks upon the general subject of the seal fishery, I need hardly say that I do so with pleasure. First of all, however, I should like to refer to a matter connected with this special bill, which I omitted to speak of when I was discussing its provisions yesterday, and that is that it seems entirely to ignore the legislation now on the Statute Book, some of which needs to be repealed to make it fit in with this Bill, another instance of the obviously ill-digested nature of this legislation; also, that it entirely departs from the principles followed in the legislation now upon the Statute Book, for some unknown reason. In the 1898 Act it is provided that "all "penalties incurred under the sections "of this Act may be sued for and re"covered, etc., and that one half of "the penalty shall go to the person "who shall sue for the same and shall "prosecute the offender to conviction "and the remainder to the Minister of "Finance." It also provides another clause, that if any person shall feel himself aggrieved by the action of the Magistrate he shall be at liberty to appeal therefrom to the next sitting of the Supreme Court. Now, why these two provisions should have been deliberately ignored in framing the present Act I do not know. I think, Mr. President, that those responsible for the present Bill should before proceeding to make it law, get a reliable legal man to make it thoroughly conformable to the legislation now in force and to repeal what is necessary in existing laws after careful study. So much for the new Act. I now propose to resume discussion of the general propositions contained in Captain Kean's report as being the only authoritative statement on the subject which has recently been put forward, and, more particularly I would go further into the question of whether it is correct that the seal fishery is holding its own. I have already given certain reasons which seemed to me to warrant the reconsideration and perhaps the questioning of the correctness of this deduction, and also of some other things in the report, and I am interested to gather from a statement just made by a speaker opposite on behalf of Captain Kean to the effect that his conclusions referred to, were, as I have pointed out, based upon a lumping together of the figures of the Gulf and the Front, and of all classes of seals, which is a practical admission that my position is really correct, for it must be quite evident that such premises are faulty and that useful conclusions cannot be drawn from mixing up such divergent considerations. I am very glad that Capt. Kean is himself present in the House, for I know that he will welcome a full discussion of the subject with which he has dealt in such an interesting way, and because a discussion and criticism is almost certain to bring out new views and facts of value to a solution of the problem, and I am sure he will appreciate that my only object in discussing the subject is to get at the facts. My present point is that the seals have in recent years very seriously decreased on the Front, and increased in the Gulf, and I criticise the possibility of drawing valid conclusions from lumping the figures given, for the reason that the two series are if not distinct in actual species, at least, entirely distinct and localized in their natural habitat.

Perhaps, Mr. President, I might be permitted to refer to something of what appears to be actually known or surmised of the life history of the seals. Fortunately for us, and unfor-

tunately for them, the seals, with some minor exceptions, appear to be slaves of habit and unable to learn wisdom by experience. The hair seal. which constitutes the main element and the all important one in our seal fishery, no doubt comes from the waters in and about Baffin's Bay and is doubtless indigenous to this part of the world. The herds, after summering in the North, begin their southern pilgrimage when the ice begins to make, and they travel always along the Western Shore, through Davis Strait and along the Labrador coastline to the Straits of Belle Isle, where the Gulf seals break away from the main body and proceed through the Straits into the Gulf, the Eastern seals meantime continuing along the Eastern Newfoundland waters on to the Banks. The hoods, on the other hand come across from the Southern point of Greenland, Cape Farewell, and for unknown reasons they appear, without ever mixing with the harps, to join the procession, stringing out, however always to the Eastward of them and in a parallel line, and accompanying them to the Banks, presumably to fish. There is a theory that while the harps are the true native seals of these waters, the hoods are not natives at all, but strangers here. It is thought that the hoods originally frequented the Northern parts of the East Coast of Greenland, on the other side of the North Atlantic. It is of course known that somewhere about the year 980 the Norsemen came across from Scandinavia and that they gave Greenland the descriptive name which it bears, no doubt partly on account of its pleasant appearance and climate. They planted a colony on the S.W. Coast but this Colony, probably owing to Esquimaux raids, entirely disappeared, and went out of existence, as anyone may read in my friend, Mr. Gosling's interesting History of Labrador. It is certainly probable that Greenland was a more habitable place in those days than it is today and it is thought that about 1400 the climate of Greenland had become very much more severe. The ice is supposed to have travelled further and further South, down the Eastern side of Greenland, and the hoods, coming with it, finally brought up about Cape Farewell, when attracted perhaps, by the habits of the harps coming down the Labrador and Newfoundland Coasts to the Banks, they contracted the same habit, and so joined our Newfoundland herds. It is curious, however, that they always appear to travel in a particular position in relation to the migrating harps and that on their return they ride the ice to the East of them also. Some of the hoods break from the larger procession and go into the Gulf, through the Belle Isle Straits with the Gulf harps. When the seals arrive in the latitudes of the Banks and Sable Island, they are apparently joined by a number of seals coming from the Gulf by way of the Cabot Straits. Whether these are seals which have come through the Straits of Belle Isle and down through the Gulf is not positively known. But they apparently find their way back again by the same route, through the Cabot Straits, to 'pup' in the Gulf. It is computed, and no doubt correctly, that in December there must be over a million seals in these Southern waters at one time. Having finished their feeding there, they begin to make their way back and the Eastern seals mount the ice at the end of February, or the beginning of March, generally somewhere to the Eastward of the Straits of Belle Isle, the hoods in their proper position somewhat East of the harps. It appears as if the bedlamer harps were also under

discipline and were not permitted to join the main bodies of the adult female harps at their whelping time They appear to hold a general position at this time to the S.W. of the main patch. One great natural difference between the Eastern harps and hoods is that the harps are ice-borers, while the hoods do not bore. There is, however, a small body of hoods said to frequent more or less fixed flat ice in the Gulf, which copy the harps' habit and actually do bore through the ice. The harps, speaking generally, are able to utilize large flat masses of ice because they can bore it, and thus get into the water, while the hoods, using more broken and rougher ice, rely upon scrambling over the edge.

In passing I was going to mention an interesting theory which has been suggested as to the history of the common word 'bedlamer' which I have been unable to find in the dictionary. The original Breton settlers in the Straits of Belle Isle observed the seals passing along the Straits at their period of migration, and inaugurated a net fishery there which was afterwards carried on for centuries, and they further noticed, that these seals recognized and were susceptible to musical sounds and especially that they would rise to the surface and play about in response to whistling, and they called them 'Badiner de la mer', the sporters or players of the sea. Their British successors finally adopted the French expression, corrupting it into 'bedlamer'.

Reverting to Capt. Kean's report, I would observe that Capt. Kean makes a very timely, and doubtless correct observation, when he points out that in thirteen of the years between 1830 and 1863 the enormous average of 500,000 seals per year were brought in by the sailing fleet,showing how enormous the fishery was in those days and how, although the totals have held pretty steady since that time, these enormous catches greatly affected the subsequent level of the herds. He points out how 230 sailing vessels disappeared between the years 1857 and 1866, or in nine years, and how ridiculous is the claim that steamers drove out sailing vessels, because during these nine years there were the greater part of the time, no steamers at all, the first steamer going out only in 1863, and the total number of seals taken by steamers up to and including 1866, being only 24,000 altogether. He says that from his practical experience it is certain that when sailing vessels in any year brought in 500,000 seals they would not have killed less than 150,000 old, of which probably 40,000 would be lost, and he, with unquestionable justice, refers the decline in the fishery at that time to these enormous catches the worst feature of which was, I believe, the destruction of the 150,000 old. It was that enormous slaughter, that took place at that time, when practically no restrictions existed, that was responsible for the cutting in two of the fishery. And the point that out of each 500,000 of these seals 150,000 were old, is the most important factor, and, in addition to other considerations, it certainly suggests that the view to which I have referred that we need not worry so much about the protection of the old seals, but that our attention should rather be directed to protection of the young, is an erroneous one.

But I shall give further reasons why I think we need not worry much about the young, but rather why legislation should mainly strive to protect the old and the bedlamers. I just notice, in running through the report which I am reviewing, that it states that the smallest number of old seals ever

brought in was during the past ten years. A glance at the analysis of the figures given will, however, show exactly the contrary. This statement is evidently a mistake. Thus, taking the figures for the past nine years as being, as will be seen by reference to the tables submitted, more convenient for the purpose than ten year periods, there were 61,500 old harps brought in against 48,-500 for the previous nine years—that is, on the Front; while in the Gulf 18,000 old harps have been brought in in the past nine years,as against 8,000 in the previous nine. The fact is that, however we take it, the catch of old in recent years has increased. Thus, if we take the old harps and bedlamers together during the last five years we find that as regards the Front, the take is considerably higher than for the six previous years taken together, while in the Gulf six times as many old and bedlamer harps together have been brought in during the past five years, as were brought in for the previous eight years. The idea, therefore, that fewer old and young bedlamers, whether taken separately or together, are being killed in recent years, is a mistaken one.

We come now to the, to me, most interesting item in the report, and that is the estimate which Captain Kean makes, and which he is in a good position, as an authority, to make, namely, as to the number of bedlamers, round our coast in the spring of 1913, and as to the total number of migratory seals of all kinds in our waters. The calculations of the latter is as follows:—There were 235,000 young harps brought in, and it is estimated that 50,000 young escaped on the Front, and 15,000 in the Gulf; consequently there were, in all, 300,000 young and 600,000 old (breeding seals, male and female) and, besides, there were, he estimates, certainly not under 500,000 bedlamers.

This shows a total of harps of 1,-400,000, of which, 1,100,000 are old and bedlamers. I hope this estimate of bedlamers is correct, and there is no reason to suppose it is not approximately correct, and in our present state of information we are no doubt justified in supposing that it is. There can be no doubt but that the rest of the estimate, namely, that there are at least 600,000 male and female harps of breeding age is within the mark, and I believe it is very far below the mark. It is, in fact, perfectly clear to me that if the estimate of 500,000 bedlamers is even approximately correct, the rest of the calculation must be incorrect, and that both the young and the old are much more numerous. Here, however, comes in the question which I raised before, as to what precisely is a bedlamer seal? Taking it, as before, that a bedlamer in its broad sense, as it is no doubt used by Capt. Kean, is a seal over one year old, which has not yet joined the breeding patch or patches, we want to know what age it is when it does join the patch; or, in other words, at what age does a seal become a regular producer? I find considerable divergence of opinion on this. I have in my pocket a letter from a Sealing Captain in which he says that he thinks it 'pups' in its third year. The more general opinion among Captains is that it 'pups' in its fourth year. Others, including Capt. Robinson, think it is in its fifth year, but whether it be in its third, fourth or fifth year, it is quite evident that this calculation is incorrect. If, for instance, it 'pups' in its fourth year, then a seal is only in the bedlamer class for two years, namely, its second and third year. On this basis the 500,000 bedlamers there would have to be an escape of young

seals amounting to 250,000 each year. There is no reason to suppose that there were more than an average number of bedlamers in 1913, but if there were 500,000 bedlamers then, the average quantity in recent years would almost certainly be not less than 500,000. But if that be so, the escape must be far in excess of the 65,000 which the Report estimates. If, on the other hand, a seal 'pups' at five years old, then it would be in the bedlamer class for three years, or, in other words, there would be an escape of 165,000 per average year in order to provide a bedlamer population of 500,000. In any case, I think it is clear—and it is a most satisfactory conclusion to be able to draw—that the escape is several times what Captain Kean estimates it at in this Report. One may go further and say that if there are even approximately 500,000 bedlamers, there is no need to worry about protecting the young. If there is an escape of 150,000 young each year on an average, it shows that there must have been 300,000 more old seals to produce them, and if a seal's reproductive period is seven years, and it is probably more, then if we add to the herd by the way of replenishment an average escape of 150,000 young, I think there is plenty of provision, so far as the young are concerned, for the maintenance and increase of the herds, always provided that we do not kill off too many of the old and bedlamers. If the old and bedlamers are conserved, we need not fear extermination, at the present rate of killing the young, and the fishery should be not only perpetuated but improved. At least, that is the way it looks to me after considerable study. The Report further estimates that there are about 100,000 hood seals in the Gulf, and about another 100,000 on the Front, and it recommends that the mother hoods should be rigidly protected. With this I entirely concur; otherwise, it is perfectly certain that we shall not have any hoods to protect. But, if it is necessary to protect the adult females among the hoods, is it not also necessary to protect them among the harps? It might be well to put a long close season on all hoods except perhaps the old 'dogs', and as the hood catch has been in recent years only about five per cent. of the fishery, no one would be much injured; and we can afford a more drastic experiment with them.

Now, I want to point out a most pertinent and important thing in relation to these figures; and that is that while there has been, as shown, a steady, progressive and lamentable reduction in the take of young harps on the Front, there has been simultaneously with it a very marked and encouraging increase in the Gulf. The table shows that in the last six years 236,000 young harps have been taken there against 90,000 in the previous six years, or two and a half times as many. Why should this contrast exist? I think the table shows very distinctly why it exists; and that it indicates clearly the direction which legislation should take. Of course, there has been an increase in the tonnage prosecuting the Gulf fishery, but I do not think that this accounts at all for the remarkable increase shown. It is an almost unavoidable inference that the Gulf harps have actually increased. The answer, I think, is contained in the records of the old and bedlamer seals taken for a number of years prior to this increase. A glance at the figures shows that for eight years prior to 1909 there were practically no old harps or bedlamers taken by our ships in the Gulf. The total quantity for those 8 years was only 3,800, an average, that is, of both

classes combined, of under 500 seals per year. As a result, we get a big increase in the catch of young. No such cessation in the slaughter of bedlamers and old has taken place on the front; rather the contrary, indeed and there we see only steady decline. This, therefore, seems to me to indicate the course which ought to be followed and the probabilities further seem to be full of promise for the future of the industry. I feel sure the fishery can be resuscitated and improved. It is this conclusion which appears to be clearly deducible from these facts and figures which I have been anxious to establish and for which I have ventured to take up so much of the time of the House. The fact is that what we have got to do at once is to protect the old and the bedlamers, and the young will take care of themselves. And the first thing needed is to abolish guns altogether, and if this, for other reasons, cannot be done immediately, then it can be done progressively by shortening up the season at its end and stopping the killing at an earlier date. The guns are not only destructive to the most valuable part of the herd, but they are wasteful, because so many seals are hit and lost, and, in addition to this, the late hunting disturbs the seals at their mating time, a most important consideration. The harps are supposed to begin mating at the end of March or early in April, and the sooner we can afford to let them alone after that the better for the fishery. I think there is no need to shorten the season at its beginning beyond the present date, March 15th, but if we do away with guns and shorten it up at the end, I believe we shall have done all that need be done to preserve the fishery and to increase it.

MON. MR. WINTER—I think we are very much indebted to the hon. member who has just sat down for the exhaustive and interesting speech which he has given us. At the same time I may observe that when he rose to speak yesterday, he said he did so with the intention of supporting the Bill, and I at once thought that he, like the hon. member who has introduced the Bill, had come under the hypnotic influence of the gentleman in the other House who is responsible for initiating this measure. If we can taken Hon. Mr. Harvey's speech for an example of how he supports a Bill, then I only hope that if ever I have the honor to introduce a Bill into this House, I will not have to ask him to support it. A more scathing criticism of the Bill it would be difficult to imagine, and it appears to me from the amendments he proposes to make, that by the time this Bill passes through the Committee stage, the father of the Bill in the Lower House won't recognize his own child.

We are told that the Bill has been brought in by the F. P. U. which constitutes a large percentage of our fishermen and sealers. I think that anything that comes from them should receive our earnest and careful attention, but I have reason to believe that this Bill does not emanate from the large number of fishermen we are led to believe it does. I believe it is more a personal Bill. The Bill as it stands, is unnecessary and objectionable, and were it not for one or two sections, I would like to see it read again six months hence.

Looking at the first and second sections, what are they for? They do not bring in any new rules but merely say that what we have been doing we must go on doing. I remember two or three years ago, when some trouble arose as to the food supplied to the men, it was not necessary to bring in legislation to

make the owners give the men improved food. All the men had to do was to ask for it and they got it. The President of the F. P. U. made application to the owners for an improved bill of fare for the men, and his application was acceded to without any hesitation. I think it would be very poor policy on the part of the ship-owners to send men out to the ice and treat them badly. I have been out to the seal fishery in the wooden ships and steel ships, and I have a personal knowledge of the conditions that exist on board these steamers, and this makes me feel that this Bill, with the exception of one or two sections, is not brought in for any good or necessary purpose. I am rather surprised that the gentleman in charge of the Bill has not put in some provision that the members of the crew be reduced to what they were a few years ago. I contend that at the present nearly all the steamers are overcrowded. Some ten or twelve years ago these steamers took out 300 men. The number was then reduced to 270, and after that the owners, without any legislation, mutually agreed to reduce the crews to 203. The result was that the men had more room, were more comfortable and made better bills than they did before. That went on for eight or ten years, until three or four years ago, one of the owners said he was going to send his steamers to the ice with the full number of men that the law allowed. The result was that everybody had to follow suit, and today we have crews of 270, when 200 would be quite sufficient, and these 270 men are uncomfortable and overcrowded. If we are here to look after the comfort of the men, that is one of the things that should receive our attention. I think this is a very important matter, and I am surprised that it is not embodied in this Bill.

There is one matter that seems to receive more consideration than anything else, and that is the question of the cooks. It seems to be a sore point with the owners and I think rightly so. As I have said, I have some knowledge of the conditions at the ice, and I say that that clause forbidding the cooks to do anything but cook is unfair and unjust. Not only does it interfere with the Captain in the discipline of his ship, but it injures the owners and the men. After the ships leave port the cooks have nothing else to do but cook, and it is only after the seals are panned and the crews are sent away to kill more, that the cooks are asked to do anything outside of cooking. Supposing the first day a steamer gets into the seals the crew kill and pan ten thousand. At daylight the next day the captain sends his crew off to kill more seals. These men go away sometimes for miles and remain away till evening. What are the cooks going to do in the meantime? There is no cooking to be done, as there is nobody to eat anything, and you would have 5 or 6 men idle about the decks sunning themselves all day. What is the captain doing while the men are away. He goes around and picks up the seals that were panned the previous day. He puts the cooks on the ice and picks up a pan and then starts off for another pan, and so on, and in the meantime, if the cooks have anything to do they can do it. If we carry out this Bill the result will be that instead of using these five cooks to help hoist the seals on board, you will have to keep five of the crew on board, and this will mean having ten idle men on the decks. If the steamer gets jammed there will be ten men on board doing nothing, while the rest of the crew are on the ice killing seals. No captain is fool enough to

take cooks away from their legitimate work and put them at the seals unless it is necessary, because he knows it will make his crew discontented. It is only when they have nothing else to do that he sets them to work and then not only do you see the cooks, but the engineers and stokers, all delighted to get over the side, when they are not wanted down below. I will defer anything else I have to say until the bill goes into Committee.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In giving this bill my support I beg to point out that there is nothing more essential to the proper development of a country than the protection of the health of its people. The success of every country, no matter how great or how small, depends solely upon the health of its population. Of what use are factories, workshops, or steamers, unless there be hands to turn the wheels to manufacture the products and man the steamers. They are without them huge scrap heaps, monuments as it were to man's skill and ingenuity, without that other necessary adjunct namely, the operatives, to give them life and productive power so to speak. In all forms of industrial activity the profits arising therefrom depend upon co-operation of capital and labor.

In this country we have been prosecuting an industry for many years which has been a source of wealth solely with the object in view of making it a success commercially, paying not as much attention as we should to those without whose aid the capital in it would be lost.

The successful carrying on of the sealing industry depends in the main upon the physical strength and endurance of the sealer, and it is only in keeping with the trend of modern thought and advancing civilization that he who is virtually a partner in an industry should state the terms and conditions under which he will engage in it; namely, his measure of compensation, and the mode in which his health is to be protected while at work. There are few forms of industrial life which expose the worker to a greater amount of risk and hardship than the sealing industry, and there are none in which men work under harder conditions. Consequently he who is engaged in it, and takes the risks attending it should see that they are minimized to as great an extent as possible. Some of the things necessary are proper and adequate food, and cooking, and suitable accomodation for sleeping. It is a fact beyond dispute, that less attention was given to these matters in the past, and partly because we were content to accept conditions as we found them, without questioning the means or methods by which they could be reformed. One of the results of the spread of education is that we have awakened to the fact that human rights are more sacred than those of property.

I remember over three years ago the delegate of the Firemen's Union in a letter published in the press over his own signature, drew the attention of steamer owners to the inadequate accomodation of sealers, the necessity of sheathing internally with wood the portion of the iron ships where men sleep, and also that the sleeping quarters should be properly heated. These and other matters set forth in this Bill were referred to by him. For the information of hon. members, I will read a portion of Mr. Wood's letter published in the Evening Chronicle of Feb. 25th, 1911.

"The question of increasing the number of men who are to go in certain ships to the seal fishery, seems to be a settled policy on the part of steamer owners, and the general public takes no further interest in the matter. All this is due to a certain

extent, to a want of political knowledge of the conditions under which the sealers live on board those steamers, while prosecuting the seal fishery. One would imagine that when the Florizel goes to the seal fishery that her steerage apartments are thrown open to certain members of the crew, which is not the case, neither her steerage apartments,nor any other apartments used in the passenger traffic are thrown open to the crew. At the present time there is not sufficient space on board the Florizel for even the number of men who prosecuted the seal fishery in her last year. The place where the men sleep is in No. 1 hold on the second deck. The deck is of iron, and there are three or four No. 7 stoves fitted up in the place referred to, and these stoves are used for various purposes, cooking, drying of clothes, etc. It does not take long for the iron floor where the men sleep to become saturated with water, littered with bread crusts, pieces of pork and various other kinds of food made use of by the men. At night time if it should be raining or snowing hard, there is scarcely any ventilation in this hold, with the result that the couple of hundred of men herded together are breathing a putrid and foul atmosphere. If it should be wet and snowing while the men are on the ice, the snow on their clothes and boots is brought down into their sleeping apartments, so that when the men get up in the morning they are either compelled to stand on their boxes or in the water on the iron deck for the purpose of putting on their clothes. If the iron deck was reguiar ly cleaned up it would not be so bad, but when that deck is covered with grease, seal fat, pork, bread, scraps and various other kinds of garbage, and that is left to rot from the time the men go out until the steamer arrives in port, don't you think it is time in the interest of humanity that a halt be called? There is not sufficient room provided for sealers on board the Florizel, nor is there sufficient room provided for sealers on board any of the other steamers leaving port. Some of them are a little better fitted than the Florizel. For instance on the Bellaventure, Bonaventure and Adventure the iron deck is covered with board where the men stand, but in every other respect conditions do not alter very materially. We have various philanthropic societies in the community who are desirous of protecting the public health, we have a public health offcer who is paid a large salary, we have a Mayor and Council who sometimes waste their time debating how one another shall be advertised in the press, but there is no attempt to protect the health and the lives of the thousands who prosecute the seal fishery. How can men expect to retain their vigor and strength when they have to live and eat under such conditions as I have described. I am not writing this from hearsay. I have prosecuted the seal fishery and I know from actual experience what men have to put up with. Now is the time to remedy this, or is there too much apathy or indifference on the part of everybody to see that simple justice and nothing more be done in protecting the lives of those who really produce the greater portion of the wealth of every country? Instead of the crews of the steamers being increased they should be decreased. Let there be an examination made by competent persons of the sleeping apartments, the number of cubic feet of air space which should be allowed to each man, the means of ventilation, etc., and I have not the least hesitation in saying that the report of a competent person would be not

alone adverse to conditions existing heretofore at the seal fishery, but really condemnatory of it."

This is a statement of one who writes from actual experience as a sealer and fireman, who worked and lived under these conditions, and had the courage of his convictions to make them known. I am pleased however, to be able to state that many of the grievances outlined in his letter have since been remedied. I feel sure that sealers feel grateful to this poor unknown workman for his advocacy of their wrongs, and it must be pleasing to him to see those things, which he then pleaded to have reformed, embodied in a Bill before the Legislature.

The Hon. Mr. Harvey, while supporting the second reading of the Bill, takes exception to many of its provisions, in all of which I do not agree. For instance, he points out the desirability of giving a magistrate before whom an offence under section 6 of this Bill may be tried, discretionary power as to the amount of fine he may impose, and the manner in which the complaint is to be made. Personally I don't think that we could be too exacting in carrying out the date of sailing, because if the fine imposed be small we may have masters or owners disregarding the law in their eagerness for gain, but if the fine be great it will act as a deterrent, because the risk from a monetary standpoint will be too great. The hon. member imagines many cases in which the laws may be unintentionally violated, such as a captain's watch being wrong, some undue excitement etc. Of course, there always are excuses for the violation of the law, but let me remind the hon. member that in the case of a liquor dealer whose store is open after six in the evening, he is not excused because the clock in the store may be slow. The law compels him to have his premises closed at six, no matter what time it may be by his watch or clock, or what excited condition of mind he may be in, or what excitement there may be about his premises As to requiring that the complaint should be laid by a master, a master watch or three of the crew, this would be simply opening the door to violation of the law. It can hardly be conceived that one master would prosecute another, or that a master-watch or sealers would enter a prosecution. If the former did, he would be certain of not sailing in steamers to the seal fishery afterwards.

I cannot agree with the Hon. Mr. Winter in his strictures in relation to the sub-section dealing with cooks because if they can be compelled to engage in the work of strapping and hoisting of seals on board, then neither their clothing nor their persons will be in a fit condition to permit them to prepare food; and when men engaged all day on the ice come back to the ship, the least they should have is properly prepared food, but if cooks are engaged during the day at the work referred to, this cannot be done. I do say, however, that the captain should control his ship, and it is necessary to its proper discipline that all should be under his control and that no part of his authority necessary to the proper navigation of the ship should be taken away. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I need hardly assure this House, Mr. President, that I am not a sealer or familiar with the practical side of this industry. That goes without saying; but, at the same time, I might say that I have given some attention to other aspects of this matter which have attracted me because of the developments along similar lines elsewhere

in the world.

I support the second reading of this Bill, because there are certain clauses in it that I think it is desirable we should put on the Statute Book, but on the other hand there are many features, that if not altogether objectionable, certainly call for amendment. Before, however, going into the question, I should like to avail of the opportunity to express my appreciation in which I think every member of the House joins, of the admirable and carefully thought-out speech of my hon. friend Mr. Harvey, in which he dealt so thoroughly and with such a wealth of material, with the question of the seal fishery from the aspect of its present position and future prospects. He has certainly gone to great trouble in probing into phases of this problem which do not attract, or at any rate do not receive from many observers the attention that might be expected; and at this juncture when an effort is being made to deal with the whole question of the preservation of our fisheries, it is encouraging to find that the hon. gentleman, as a student of the seal fishery, has provided us with such an eminently practical and well-reasoned review of the matter as he has given, one which will be a valuable addition to the literature on the subject.

For myself, I may say that I have been for some years past attracted to such phases of this and kindred matters as have earned the attention of my hon. friend, and I rejoice that he has provided us with such an abundance of figures as he has this afternoon, because though I may display great temerity in saying so, I think the sealing industry has reached a stage where it is imperative that the best attention of this country should be directed to the adoption of methods for the preservation of the seal herds in the future, so far as is possible. I am publishing in the "Herald" to-morrow a lengthy article by Dr. Grenfell in which he sets out the changing conditions along the Labrador coast and the gradual extinction of the birds, beasts and fishes, by which the natives there live. He shows how the seals are now nearly extinct; how the whale and the walrus once noted mammals of the region have vanished; how the herds of caribou, once so numerous, are now things of the past; how trappers and furriers, and livyers have killed out the smaller animals, and how the birds of the air have met the same fate.

This is a serious matter and it becomes more so when we remember that we can duplicate the conditions in our own Island. We know that the great auk and other birds have been killed out. Naturalists and other travellers have told of the vast bird life of our territory not more than fifty years ago and how it no longer exists. The curlew and the plover are practically gone; wild ducks and wild geese are nothing like so plentiful as they were a generation ago; it is a question as to whether our caribou have held their own, not to say increased; the beaver, in spite of twenty years of protection, shows comparatively little advance; the whales are almost gone; the herrings have vanished from Labrador and from various parts of our own coast; the salmon fishery is nothing like that of thirty years ago; the problem of the vanishing lobster is agitating the official and commercial mind today; and there are very many who believe that the seal is being killed out. Every product of the ocean on which our people rely mainly for their existence is on the down grade, except the cod, and it behoves us, I submit, to wake up to what this

really means for the future of our country.

I think we could devote with much profit, both to ourselves and to those we represent, a great deal of attention to these problems,and to nothing more than to the conservation of our seal fishery, and any information which can throw light on this subject or assist in reaching such a conclusion as would enable effective conservation methods to be adopted should be welcomed by the House and the country. Elsewhere in the world today the matter of conservation is one of the foremost that attracts the attention of statesmen. In Germany we have seen it in the conservation of the forests, which policy has reached its highest degree of excellence in that country. In the United States and Canada practical and far-reaching measures for the conservation of the natural resources have been adopted within the past few years. President Roosevelt, with characteristic energy and originality, launched this movement some six or seven years ago and issued invitations for a great conservation convention attended by delegates from all parts of his own country, from Mexico, from Canada, and even from this Colony of ours, and certain basic principles were laid down which have since been followed by conservation commissions in these several countries, with the result that the public are being educated up to the possibilities of their natural resources and to the crimes perpetrated against the State by the manner in which private interests have been allowed to prostitute these resources for the enrichment of individuals.

In every department, mineral and forest wealth, water powers, animals birds, and fishes, the need for such a policy has been conclusively proved. Every schoolboy today is familiar with the story of how the buffaloes have been wiped off the western prairies. The figures of the destruction of other animals are scarcely less staggering. The same may be said of the vast mineral areas alienated from the public domain and made the pawns in huge gambles by speculators. The destruction of vast forests by fire, by neglect, and by reckless lumbering methods, is only another chapter in the same book.

But what should more directly interest us is the story of the gradual extermination of the seal herds of the Pacific which have been reduced in the past forty years from over two millions to not more than a hundred thousand. I have in my hand the last report of the United States Bureau of Fisheries, giving the results of a special investigation of the Alaska fur seal fishery in 1910, made at the instance of the American Government for the purpose of determining the exact position in regard to this industry; and the facts and figures given there show that the seal herds of the Pribyloff Islands have been reduced as I have said, from vast herds to such an insignificant 'patch' to use our own term, that it is questionable if they will be able, unless most drastic measures of preservation are enforced to be regarded as a commercial factor for very many more years.

The destruction of these seals herds has been brought about by reckless and lawless killing, by poachers from every land and also by the natives who live along the coasts of the Pacific and the Islands therein; and in this connection it may not be amiss to recall to the House that the session before last the Eskimos of Labrador petitioned the Legislature praying that our steamers should be prevented from going to that part of the territory to kill seals, on the ground

that it was becoming more and more difficult for these natives to eke out an existence along that seaboard because of the destruction of the seals wrought by our fleet.

Before I pass on to my comments on the Bill itself, I would like to say that Captain Abraham Kean of the Stephano, who has been an interested auditor here during the debate, handed me some figures which he asks me to put on record as a reply in part to Mr. Harvey in regard to the diminution which he alleges of the seals on the Front and their increase in the Gulf; and also to the arguments of Hon. Mr. Job that by setting back the date of sailing, larger seals are secured. In reply to the latter Capt. Kean quotes three instances. The first is that in 1892 he left here on March 10th, in the Wolf, striking and taking on the 12th, 12,000 seals, and finishing on the 19th, arriving here on the 23rd and landing 27,425 young harps, averaging 44 pounds. Again, in 1890, Capt. Knee leaving here on the same date in the Kite and striking seals on the 12th, arrived here on the 27th with 10,809 seals, averaging 55¼ pounds. Once more, Capt. Kean in the Aurora, sailing on March 10th, took the first seals on the 14th and arrived here on the 28th with 24,000, an average of 51½ pounds. He asked me to invite Hon. Mr. Job to name any spring since the time of sailing and killing has been put back to later dates, when the seals made such a good average as these. He went on to say, further, in answer to Hon. Mr. Job's contention, that about March 25th the young seals are deserted by their mothers, and they begin to lose weight, and his argument is that if you make a law and set back the sealing date any later, you will be faced with worse conditions than those which exist today, for the seals will fall off in weight and will thus be less valuable when brought in. That is his point of view, and having it placed on record I leave it for my hon. friend and the House to consider its value.

Now, with regard to Hon. Mr. Harvey's argument, Capt. Kean says that on the Front of the Island the main fishery has been conducted, and there has been, as a result of that, a gradual diminution of the number of the herds and comparatively smaller catches as the years go by, whereas, as regards the Gulf, he says, more ships have been sent there, these have killed more seals, and a better showing has been made on that account. Such is his view and I put it to the House. which I am sure will give it the weight that its author's standing warrants.

Turning now to the Bill before us, I would like to devote some attention, first, to its principles, and second to its details. If the Bill has any principle it is that embodied in stopping the sealing and killing dates now effective by an arrangement between the owners and the men, with the authority of a legislative enactment. With that principle I am in full accord. I have expressed myself more than once as opposed to attempts to do by private agreement what should be done by the law of the land or at investing irresponsible bodies with powers that should properly belong to our legislative hierarchy.

I might say that the regulations incorporated into sections 1 and 2 of this Bill, the first providing for the accomodation of the men and the second for their food, are merely another case of cumbering the Statute Book with needless ordinances; for the ships are all, except the Adventure to a small extent, provided with the accomodation that is demanded here, and I am satisfied that if no obligation was imposed at all

upon the shipowners, they would provide at least as good an equivalent in the shape of food as is demanded herein, for the very good and sufficient reason, if no other, that men would not go to the icefields to use the food provided in the past,and,even if they did, public sentiment would not tolerate its being used.

There is one other principle in the Bill which in my opinion is most vicious and objectionable and which I do not think this House ought to agree to. It is that embodied in Section 7, and in my opinion that section ought to be rightly described as one to encourage mutiny on the high seas. Its real purpose is to make it possible for a dissatisfied crew to compel the master of the ship to bring them into port whenever they see fit and if we, as a constituent part of the legislature of this Colony, are going to lend ourselves to such a policy, then all I have to say is that I believe the day will come, and it will not be far distant, when we will rue such an action. The effect of that section is that men who in the first week of March sign an agreement with the owners of the sealing steamers in this port and then go to the seal fishery to carry on an industry which by law can be continued until the 30th of April are given legal recognition by this measure to mutiny, or 'manus' as it is known locally, and force the captain to come to land and put them ashore. It is unthinkable to me that we should permit any such measure to go on the Statute Book, more particularly when we remember what has happened here within the past two or three years.

When the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill was making his excellent presentation of the case from his standpoint in moving the second reading yesterday afternoon, I asked him, with his permission, a simple question, namely, why it was that although in the agreement made the past three or four years between the shipowners and the men there was provision for imposition of a fine of $2 on the captain for every old hood seal killed, no attempt was made to enforce that fine; and dealing with a most flagrant instance of this, namely, the case of the Nascopie, which killed some thousands of hoods one year, the hon. gentleman was compelled to confess that after the accident to the Nascopie's propellor, which delayed her a couple of days, the crew got out of hand, disregarded the captain's orders and virtually took charge. Now, that was a serious enough matter, but I want to call attention to what I consider an even more serious case, namely, that of the Lloydsen last spring. This steamer, as we all know, struck a rock in leaving Channel, and damaged her propellor and stern gear. She had to put back and at once nearly every man left her, declaring she was unseaworthy, and calling on the Government to provide a special train to bring them from Port aux Basques to their homes. The ship, whatever damages she sustained, was not so unseaworthy but that after coming here and having repairs made she picked up another crew, went to the seal fishery and did fairly well; and yet, all her prospects might have been wrecked because of this mutinous conduct. These cases, I submit, were serious enough, but today we are being asked to go further and to encourage mutiny by law, for that and no other is the effect of Section 7 of this Bill.

Bearing in mind these instances, I dissent entirely from the proposition advanced here yesterday, that the Bill comes from the men and is demanded by them. I personally do not think it comes from the men. I

do not think that either owners or men are prepared to carry out agreements such as those that have been in force the past three or four years under all conditions and I think that when we are asked to pass laws dealing with this industry, we should carefully consider every contingency that suggests itself to us and move with greatest caution as to what we should put on the Statute Book, if our laws are not to be brought into utter disrepute.

As I have already remarked there was a clause in the agreement between the ship owners and the mens' agent for a fine of $2 for killing old hoods. In no case was that ever imposed. There were certain provisions in these agreements which were understood to be binding on all firms but I know as a matter of fact, because I had the different agreements in my office, that some firms had their men sign one agreement and other firms had their men sign one that was different altogether. Then, there was a clause in the agreement specifying the relation of the price of young fat to that of old fat and the ships owners disagreed so decidedly from the mens' agent as to this, that there was talk of its being taken into court for a pronouncement by the judges, though for some time back nothing has been heard on that score.

For these, and other reasons, I think the public mind is considerably agitated as to what may be the effect of legislation that verges on socialism. The hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill remarked that he thought the outcry that was being made regarding the 'cook' clause was a case of much ado about nothing, but in my judgment the fact that there has been such a vigorous and widespread criticism by the community of this seemingly unimportant matter, is a recognition by the disinterested public, who can always be depended upon to take a fair view of matters, that the effect of this clause is to make the cooks by law, independent of the captains, with results that cannot but be destructive to discipline on board the ships, and that cannot be other than the thin end of the wedge for the adoption of the same principle with regard to other classes among the crews in the near future. I was greatly surprised when the hon. gentleman told us last evening that only in two or three days of the cruise is there such a condition existing in relation to the industry that the cooks may be asked to do anything outside of their usual work. Surely, then, it is absurd that when the cooks are going out for the good of the voyage, they are to be compelled to sit down and do nothing on the two or three days when it is all-important that every man aboard should help in getting the seals in to the ship, and when the longest time involved in this particular class of work would be not more than 48 or 72 hours. One member of the Lower House put the matter very aptly the other night when he said: "What would the crew of the ship think if there were seals on the ice and cooks were not allowed to help get them aboard and in the night some other crews came along and stole them?" It seems to me that that puts the case in a nutshell.

We have been told of course, that the men wanted this and that this is demanded by an influential organization. I repeat that in my judgment, the claim that any legislation ought to be accepted by this House, because it comes from people with a political pull, or from organizations that are numerically strong, or from interests that have to be conciliated, is not the principle that ought to

operate with us, because it deprives us of our freedom of judgment of giving fair play to every body, but not allowing ourselves to be influenced by the threats that we will be abolished or villified if we don't follow the dictates of somebody or other who may be supposed to wield a little influence for the time being.

For myself, I have given the Bill a good deal of study and like my hon. friend, Mr. Harvey, I intend to propose certain amendments when it comes into committee. About a month ago when there was first talk of the Sealing Bill this session, I asked the hon. gentleman who is fathering it there, whether the Bill would include four matters—one, provision for the insuring of the mens' share of the catch in ships that are lost at the fishery; second, provision that the boats carried on the steamers shall be fit to take the crews in any emergency, third, that an equipment of canvas be provided on steamers by which they would be able to make ships to get to land in case of a breakdown; and fourth, a clause to prevent men being carried in small steamers to St. John's, before the fishery begins, and back to their homes after they have returned, in greater numbers than the boat accomodation of such vessels allows.

With regard to the first, that of insuring the mens' shares, there has been an agitation in this direction for some years past. With regard to boats on the steamers, I am advised, from what I consider reliable sources, that some of the boats that are taken to the seal fishery are utterly unfit to serve as refuge for the men in case any evil fortune should befall the ships themselves. As to the matter of canvas, I remember that some years ago one of our sealing steamers broke her shaft and was being carried out over the Grand Banks when another of the fleet came along and fortunately rescued them, but after the men came back to St. John's it was discovered that the vessel had been without any canvas whatever, and I remember making a protest about it in our newspaper at the time. Provisions that would tend to greater security for the lives of the men, seem to be imperative in view of recent marine disasters on the North Atlantic, and the House can, I think, very profitably add certain sections to the Bill with these objects in view.

It is scarcely necessary at this stage to go into the discussion of the details of the Bill, but I might point out with regard to one issue raised by my hon. friend, Mr. Harvey, namely, that of there being no appeal from fines imposed, that there is also no provision by which a master or owner brought before the Courts in a vexatious suit of the character he described, can be secured as to his costs; in other words, it is possible under this Bill for any man, absolutely irresponsible in a monetary way, to take action against a captain or an owner, bring him into Court, put him to large expense, and then, if the case is decided against the accuser, the captain or owner must pay all the costs and has no other way of reimbursing himself for his outlay. I think when we consider the Bill in Committee we should deal with this as well as the other matters.

The picture disclosed by my hon. friend, Mr. Gibbs, regarding the conditions under which the men are engaged in the seal fishery, forms in my opinion, strong reason for reform but, whether it should be by passing the present Bill may be questioned in some ways; in fact it is doubtful to me whether this would not form one of the strongest arguments in favour of Mr. Goodridge's suggestion that

final action be deferred and the whole matter of the seal fishing industry in all its aspects be taken up by the Fisheries Commission and an all-embracing Bill be brought in next year, because if this Bill is passed now it is not likely that we shall have a Sealing Bill again for some years.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Conditions have been remedied since.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Conditions as regards the flooring have not been remedied. The insides of the ships where the men sleep may have been sheathed, but if the men are living under the conditions described in the article read by my hon. friend, something should be done.

HON. MR. HARVEY—These charges were made because of some dispute about stokers.

HON. MR. McGRATH—That is quite true, and it may be of course, that there is another side to the matter; and, moreover, some of these conditions must necessarily be experienced by every steamer carrying steerage passengers around our coast in the fall and winter seasons, for then, when the weather is cold, and there is snow the floors must be wet and even if not littered up, it cannot be pleasant for those who have to occupy steerage quarters in these steamers at that season .Nevertheless, if there is a possibility of making improvements, they should be made and the Fisheries Committee ought to take up the matter.

Before I sit down I would like to say in reply to the comments that have been made here as to the need for drastic legal action, that we ought not to forget in regard to the clause imposing a penalty of $4,000 for a violation of the sealing or killing dates, that we have had no case on record for many years, except one, where there has been any attempt to violate the law in these respects. It cannot be altogether the fine that deters them, because if there was an offence the same thing would be done in the past, namely the owners would have someone in their employ take action after the ship came in who would recover the penalty and turn it over to the firm.

While I do not oppose the second reading of the Bill, Mr. President, I desire to say that in committee I shall propose the three or four amendemnts which I have mentioned, and also offer some suggestions with regard to the amending of other clauses.

The Bill was then read a second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Job was ordered to be deferred to committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

SECOND READING OF COMBINES AND MONOPOLIES BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time and in so doing I desire to point out that the object of the Bill is to give power to the Governor in Council whenever they deem it expedient, to cause an enquiry to be held into any alleged combine. The Commission provided for is to have power to summon any witness to give evidence and produce any proofs and documents that may be necessary The Bill exempts such witnesses from answering any question which may render them liable to a criminal prosecution. The reason that the Bill has been introduced in the Lower House is that a suspicion exists in the minds of a great number of people that a coal monopoly or combine exists in this country, and that the high price of coal today is attributable thereto. I am not prepared to say whether this is so or not, but it would be well to enquire into the matter. Various statements are made from time to time to the effect

that a combine also exists in relation to certain food products, and it would be unfair to allow these charges to be made if there are no grounds to justify them, so that it is as well that a power of the kind outlined in the Bill should be given for investigating these matters. In this country very little is known of combines, and while in some cases they have proved beneficial, in others they have been the cause of much suffering and privation. The gigantic scale upon which modern business is conducted has had the effect of making competition unprofitable, and hence the desire on the part of persons concerned in the manufacture of similar products to pool their interests and place them under the management of a directorate, and by this means it has been possible for some of these combines to depress the price of an article or force it up at will as the case may be. Whether anything of this kind is going on in this community I am not prepared to say, but this I do know, that in many instances the consumer gets goods from the seller at a smaller margin of profit than in any other part of the world. If the coal monopoly does exist it should be destroyed, because I can't think of a more injurious monopoly in a country like this with such a rigorous climate. I feel sure the object of the Bill will commend itself to the hon. members of this House.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on tomorrow.

SECOND READING OF HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATION BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. Its object is merely to include Badger Brook and Millertown in the Electoral District of Twillingate. Under the law today the people living in these places have no right to exercise the franchise, and it is for the purpose of enabling them to do so that this Bill is introduced.

The Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House tomorrow.

SECOND READING OF WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time. I scarcely need point out the object of this Bill. The agitation for the suppression of this traffic has assumed world-wide proportions, and the object of the Bill is to secure the co-operation of this country in suppressing a traffic of this kind.

The Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on tomorrow.

Hon. President read a message from the Assembly that they had passed the following bills in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council, namely:—

An Act to amend Chap. 5 of 8 Edward VII. entitled an Act with respect to compensation of workmen for injuries suffered in course of their employment.

An Act respecting the operation of Saw Mills.

An Act respecting the sale of Debenture Bonds, for raising of a Loan for the public service of the Colony.

An Act for raising a sum of money by loan for an extension of the railway system of the Colony.

An Act respecting certain retiring allowances.

Hon. President read message from the Assembly that they had passed the amendments sent down in the Food Inspection Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the above Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs tabled reports of St. John's General Hospital for the year ending Dec. 31st, 1913; report of the Government Engineer for 1913; and report of the Reid Nfld. Co. for year 1912 to 1913.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House then adjourned until Monday next at 3 p.m.

MONDAY, March 2nd.

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

On motion of Hon. Mr. Job the House went into Committee on the Seal Fishery Bill.

Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I have an amendment to propose to sub-section (a) as follows: after the word 'decks' to insert the words 'of iron' and strike out the words three inches, and put after the word 'secured' the words 'and of sufficient thickness to prevent the frost coming through.'

It is quite obvious that iron ships are meant because to sheathe wooden decks would be of course, ridiculous. The idea of the planks is to prevent frost from coming through, and this would only happen on iron ships. Then, as regards subsection (c), there are one or two ships here which are mainly fitted with iron berths, but have a few wooden berths. Now, it would be impossible to have these changed in time for this year's fishery, and if we put in after March 10th 1915, that will bring it into operation in time for next year's fishery. I would propose a similar amendment for sub-section (e). The only steel steamer I know of, which will be affected by this section is the Adventure, which has one small compartment, where the men sleep, which is heated by a stove. The greater part is heated by steam pipes. I would ask that sub-section (e) be preceded by the words 'on and after March 10th, 1915.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I rise to support the amendments suggested by Hon. Mr. Harvey in reference to sections (b) and (e). The necessity for three-inch plank on those iron decks never occurred to me until I began to think about it a little. Of course, everyone knows that originally it was intended that the sheathing was to prevent the nails of the men's boots from entering the decks. No deck is ever permanently sheathed. In reference to 3-inch sheathing, we fitted some berths in the Bellaventure, and there was only twelve inches of room in the lower berths, and of course there was no use for that part underneath the berth whatever. It was useless to put a bag in there because the water would get on the decks and in the scuppers and rush back and forth. It appears to me the best remedy would be to board it up, on either side, with plank fore and aft in the alley way, and underneath put strips four inches wide every four or five feet across the planks, so that ample room would be provided for the water to run back and forth underneath. There would then be no trouble about the dirt underneath oozing up through as would be the case if only sheathed with one-inch plank, as you can easily understand, with plank of that thickness only, every time men stepped on it. The proper way to secure three-inch plank would be on pieces running crossways. It would be better to put in only two berths instead of three, then the decks could be sheathed all over, and the men could put their boxes and bags on the plank if it is raised a little underneath to allow the water to run.

With reference to alteration in regard to steam pipes, of course I know that some steamers are not altogether heated by steam, and if we make a law to come into operation, right away there would not be time to make the change, so that we should amend the section as it stands.

Amendment was adopted.

HON. MR. HARVEY—In sub-section (f) I wish to move the following amendment: "No person employed as cook shall be required by the captain to do any other work except such as is incidental to the work of cooking if (a) he shall personally object to performing the other work, or (b) if any two of the members of the crew shall so object."

This section, as it now stands, appears to me to be an absolutely absurd one, and if I were a cook on board one of the ships no one would object to it more than I. These men cannot do as they want to, their freedom is being interefered with, and in their own interest that section ought to be changed. I think it is a pity the section is there at all because it will certainly tend to interfere with the discipline on board. It seems, however, to be very vigorously called for by those mainly interested in the men, and I do not think it can do much harm, although the principle is wrong. But to meet the immediate wants of those interested I would suggest this amendment.

HON. MR. WINTER—My opinion of section (i) is that it should be stricken out altogether. There does not seem to be anything in it at all necessary. What the Bill asks for the men are already getting. It seems to me that only the men's interests were considered when the Bill was framed, and the question of how it affects the owners has received no consideration whatever. The effect of this Bill will be to increase the cost of outfit, and some people think that is quite in order. There seems to be a general impression that these steamers are gold mines that are piling up every year big dividends for the shareholders. Now, what are the facts? Take the last two years and scarcely one of those steel ships have made any money. The greater number of them have sunk large sums of money. I think the best way we can judge whether the owners and shareholders are making money is to find out what dividends they are paying and what the shares are worth on the market today. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that not two steamers out of the whole steel fleet would get par for their shares in the market tomorrow. I know I would not give par for them. A few years ago when a steel ship was tried here, the Adventure, she proved to be a success and paid good dividends. The result was others tried them and many people invested their money. Unfortunately for many of them, owing to the non-payment of dividends they have been forced to sell their shares, for which a few years ago they paid $100, at $80 and $85.. There does not appear to be any reason why we should unnecessarily overtax these ships. The men going out now are more comfortably housed and better fed than ever before. We are asking here today, in addition to the improved menu agreed to a few years ago, that the men get roast beef. I would like to know how many men going out to the ice get roast beef in their own homes? A great many of them do not taste it from one year's end to another. I am a strong believer in feeding the sealers well, and giving them plenty of good wholesome food, and a variety of food, but I think there should be a limit. This year we are adding roast beef once a week, and it must be on

Saturday's. Next year we shall probably have another Bill asking that something else be added. In my opinion the less legislation we have about the sealfishery the better. Things are going along very well without any. This idea of mapping out a menu is ridiculous. There have been no complaints; if there were any it would be all right to bring in this Bill. Now we have to supply onions, potatoes, etc., and there is a penalty attached for not doing so. If a cook should forget to put onions in the soup on Saturday the owners would be subject to a fine. I think if you make that a law, and if a cook fails to carry it out when told, he ought to pay for it. This whole section in my opinion is very objectionable and quite unnecessary from beginning to end. We have no evidence of any complaint whatever by the crews of these steamers that they haven't been getting all they want, and why should we bring this vexatious section in when it is not asked for. There was an agreement made between the owners and crews that the latter would get a change of food and I believe that that has been carried out. The principle of this House dictating to owners as to what is to be given the crew is what I object to. Some of these steamers have sunk large sums of money and were it not for the profitable employment that they get after the seal fishery, shares would be next to nothing. As it is some of them paid no dividends whatever, even after what they earned in summer. I move that the second section be stricken out altogether.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—It may be audacious, Sir, to say so, but the value of the sealing industry to the Colony, appears to me, to be much exaggerated. I have always thought it of comparatively little value to the men, and now, my hon. friend on my left has said it is of little value to the owners. I propose to support section 2 as it stands. I should not have done so if the alteration had not been .made in the Lower House in the words provided under the amended section. The amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. Harvey will, I think, result in the very thing he wishes to avoid. It looks to me like a direct invitation to disorder and trouble. One cook's protest will be more than the protest of the whole crew. It says here:—"No person employed as a cook etc. if (a) he shall personally object," and then goes on to say "or if any two men object." I think that is a most dangerous innovation. It is a class of legislation which I think the hon. gentleman will not find any precedent for. I think it is better to let it stand as it is. I admit that the word "cooking" is vague, but it has a local meaning, and perhaps it is better to let it stand. What is going to be the logical outcome of this? As I said the Bill came before us with the three-year-old imprimatur of both parties interested. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me one outcome will be that in a very short time cooks will not be members of the crew in the ordinary meaning of the term. I understand cooks get a share now with the men. If that is so, they are all in the same box. If, under this section, they become a separate branch of the sealing realm, is it not likely they will be cut down to three or four? Personally, I question whether the crews will like it, but the owners consented to it, and I do not see we have any right to refuse it under these conditions. But in any case, this amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. Harvey I very strongly condemn.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I rise for the purpose of supporting the original

position. I think that if the wants and requirements of the number of men employed at the seal fishery be given that attention which is neces sary, then the time of the cooks should be devoted to cooking only. It may be said that during a portion of the voyage, the men may be absent on the ice the greater portion of the day, and that if the seals have to be strapped and hoisted on board that there should be nothing to prevent the cooks from doing this work. Now, if members would just think for a moment and place themselves in the position of the sealers at the seal fishery, they would most certainly object to cooks working at the seals all day. What is the condition of the wearing apparel of these men. They are covered with dirt, grease and other kinds of material, which he has to handle in connection with such hoisting, so that his person and clothing render him anything but fit to cook and prepare food for the men when they come on board to partake of their meals. I say these men are not fit, and to give a master or other person power to order the cooks to do any other class of work besides cooking except that which is necessary for navigating the ship, is doing an injustice to the men engaged in the seal fishery. Cooks who have to cook for a couple of hundred men suppose it be but two meals during the 24 hours, must have the greater portion of their time already taken up in cleaning of their apartments and in the preparation of food, and the least a man may expect, no matter whether he be educated or uneducated, is that the persons who prepare his food should be cleanly in appearance and person, and if cooks are allowed to engage in this work they cannot be either. It may be that the crew may be on the ice early in the morning and not get back till late at night. If members will take the trouble to enquire as to conditions existing at the seal fishery where cooks have been employed hoisting seals, they will find that men have come back at night and have found no food prepared for them, and they have had to cook their own meals after being on the ice all day, simply because the cooks were employed at other work. This can be demonstrated a thousand times over. Complaints of this have been made over and over again. The hon. member will find this is the case and if he will inquire of men who have been at the fishery, men who were in very good circumstances here and who had no object in colouring the facts, he will see that what I am stating is a fact. It may be said the captain should have discretionary power as regards the cooks doing work, but we must not forget that the captain is interested financially, and more so than anyone else, in the success of the voyage and his aims and designs are to get the seals no matter how the men work. When the crew come back to the ship after being out all day and find no food prepared for them, is this not the best proof that the captain has no interest in them? I can bring most respectable witnesses here to prove this on oath if necessary. My point is that the cooks are there solely for the purpose of attending to the requirements of the men.

With regard to the argument that the crews are better housed and fed than before, if we had to prosecute the seal fishery under the same conditions that existed 20 years ago, we would be making very little advance in this country along proper lines. It is quite true that all sealers do not have roast or fresh beef in their homes, but when they are at home they can supply their tables with

fresh meat, rabbits and other fresh foods. The desire to earn something makes men do things that they otherwise would not do, and men are sometimes forced to do what they would not do under better conditions. A workingman today can live better and cheaper in American cities than he can in St. John's. The only thing that costs more there is house rent. There are men now working with the Reid Nfld. Co. as machinists, who worked in American cities, and they can prove that they can live cheaper in the city of Boston than in St. John's. The people come back here because they have land here, and because many prefer to live in their own country and homes than in strange lands, even though conditions are not as good.

As to the other objection, which has been raised, viz: to the responsibility being put on the owner, and does it not give the right to the sailors to sue before the courts for the value of any food withheld from them, and fix fines and penalties in relation to acts of this kind, and these fines and penalties must be also paid by the owner. The law here, with regard to making the owner responsible is merely following along the lines of the Merchant Shipping Act of England. Of course, we all regret that the industry has not been paying large dividends lately; but nevertheless that is no reason why men should live under conditions which are not fair or unreasonable. These men are partners in the industry and have a right to dictate to the other partners the terms and conditions under which they will prosecute the fishery. These men invest their muscles, brains and work and that capital is as good as the other capital of the owners and others. This Bill in detail is really the arrangement entered into a couple of years ago between representatives of the steamers and men, and it is merely now being enacted into law. I for one, support section 2 as set forth in the Bill.

HON. MR. (JAS.) RYAN—I beg leave to support the Bill and I entirely agree with section 2 until we get down to said section (f). The cooks, I think, should be under the control of the captain as well as every other person on the ship. I have often heard it stated that cooks often went on the ice without being sent, and not only cooks but firemen and engineers. I say that the captain should not be interfered with and that he should have absolute control and command of his ship and of every individual on board his ship. I shall say nothing of the food supplied at present. I agree with all this. I believe in feeding the men well, but I do not believe in anyone being prevented from working for the good of all concerned. Section 4 proposes that a fine shall be imposed against offenders against the preceding sections. With this I disagree, as also with section 6, in reference to the fine being placed at $4,000, if vessels should sail before the time set down. This is ridiculous and in any case, even if the fine should be reduced, I do not think it should be paid to the pursuer, or at most not more than one-fifth, and four fifths to the Minister of Finance. I do not think the pursuer should be entitled to anything. In my opinion sub-section (f) of section 2, and sections 4 and 6 should be eliminated from the Bill.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I support the amendment of Hon. Mr. Harvey but would suggest that instead of making the prohibition effective on the word of two men, he should make it five. Two men may be 'coach-

ed,' before going out, for the express purpose of preventing the cooks from doing work that they may desire to do. The right of the cook to protest on his own behalf is all right. But the cook who is given the most latitude is the man who may want to make trouble and be quick to avail of every opportunity for the purpose. As I was passing the gentleman sitting below the bar, Capt. Kean, asked me to say in regard to Hon. Mr. Gibb's statement that it was not uncommon for the crews of sealing steamers to be on the ice all day and come back to find no cook, that he never knew of this in his experience.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I will prove this statement to the House and can call in evidence in support of it.

HON. MR. McGRATH—With regard to what Hon. Mr. Winter has said about the provisions, I think that even if the industry is not financially successful, if there should be a desire on the part of the owners of the steamers, and when I say owners, I mean the managing owners, because there may be a difference between the views of the managing owners and the shareholders, to provide these articles specified here, and they have shown their willingness by carrying out this agreement for the past two or three years, then there is an admission that the crew are entitled to this food. The only other conclusion deducible from the situation is that the owners of the steamers are being forced into yielding to this Bill, but I should hardly suppose that it has gone to such an extreme as that. Indeed, I think with regard to getting fresh meat, if it is possible to give the men a few quarters there is no great reason why they should not get it, even if they do not get it in their own homes. I don't suppose it is possible to keep beef fresh for many days at the seal fishery, or that it will cost very much for what the men will get of it, as it is provided here that canned meat may be substituted.

HON. MR. JOB—It has been tried in several boats, but they were not able to keep it for any length of time. The extra cost will be about $40. The masters and officers get it, of course.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Hon. Mr. Gibbs has stated that the owners of ships are liable under the Merchant Shipping Act, if the feeding of the men is not properly attended to. For instance, in vessels going from St. John's to Brazil, if the cook does not give the men what is required by the Act, are the owners liable? If this is the law we should not perpetuate it. If the captain on board acquiesces in the men not getting the food, than it might be a reason why the captain should be liable, but if the cook fails to give the crew stewed beans on the morning they are called for, and the owner is held liable, this is certainly preposterous. I think we should provide an amendment to cope with that, and I will draft one now, meanwhile, I give my support to this amendment of Hon. Mr. Harvey.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN—I am always willing to see the crews properly and adequately fed. How can men be supposed to engage in the arduous work of the seal fishery if you do not feed them well? As regards the prevention of cooks engaging in other work, the trouble will be for the captain to keep them from going to work, because when the seals are struck, all are excited, and it is difficult to restrain any man on board, from helping out the voyage. As regards the sealing venture not being a paying one, I don't see much money in it for the owners or crews. Many who go out would be better off if they remained ashore. Some years they may make $20,other years $60 or

$70. Take men working in places like Grand Falls and getting $1.70 per day. In the first week of February he leaves the work, comes to St. John's, pays $10 or $15 for his board, and finds later that the best he can makes is $60 or $70. When he gets home again he is only square, whereas if he had remained at his work in the lumber woods he would have come come out with $70 or $80 ahead. The hon. gentleman Mr. Gibbs, says the men are compelled to go to the ice. I do not know so much about that. Why there are men where I live who have never gone to the seal fishery, and are the best off. As regards accomodation I also would like to see the men well housed, as well as well fed. I believe we shall see the day when we shall revert to the old time schooner to prosecute this very important industry. It is well known that the present day leviathans—the steel ships—are not making money, while the older ships are fast disappearing, so that I firmly believe we soon shall see the sailing vessel going out to the ice. If we revert once again to the historic square-rigged schooner or "Beaver Hat," it will be the better for the country, for then, as in the days of old, there will be work in plenty for sail makers, blacksmiths, shipwrights, coopers and men of other trades, while capital at present is used up in expensive steamers which take all that can be had to keep them going. Much is said in this Bill about the food, but there is nothing said of the price of fat. That is left to one or two companies to fix when the steamers come in. I agree with the comments of Hon. Mr. McGrath as to the imposition of fines on the captains or owners. It is absurd to hold these people responsible as regards the taking of the control of the cooks from the captains, I think it will only lead to trouble. We should try to preserve order and discipline on board ship and the captain should be master while in charge. Though I agree to support the Bill in the main there are several matters in it which I must protest against.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Having introduced this amendment, I should like to say a word, especially as to the two positions taken on the one side by Hon. Mr. Robinson, and on the other by Hon. Mr. Winter. For my part, I sympathize with the latter, and would take his position before that assumed by Hon. Mr. Robinson. He suggested that there ought to be three or four cooks, who should have nothing to do but cook. I would say that the result would be that the men would be worse fed than if they had six or seven cooks. Three or four cooks could not begin to do the work of these steamers. There are times, on the other hand, when only one cook is wanted, and to tie cooks down to nothing but cooking must mean that on occasions it will be badly done. Then, again, to have a band of men on board who are not to do what the captain tells them, is to my mind an absurdity, and if I were these men, I would most certainly object. I don't like the section, even as it is amended, but I feel there is a call for it and would like to meet the call, as far as possible Personally, I would much prefer to see the section out altogether, as to me it is most objectionable. We are told that this Bill is only an embodiment of the agreement between the owners and the men. That is all nonsense. It is a good deal more than that. In that case, I think that nine-tenths of the men would not care whether it passed or not, and I don't believe there would be any call from the men to pass that legislation. I am certain that section (f) dealing

with the cooks, has never been discussed or been the subject of any agreement. Hon. Mr. Gibbs has stated that the men have demanded this, but I don't think that is so. In fact, I believe that, so far from the men demanding it, if a vote were taken of the men going out to the seal fishery, the great majority would vote against this section. Nobody is more interested in getting the seals on board than the men themselves, and why should the cooks be prohibited from doing so? You may have six or seven cooks standing idle on the decks seeing their bread and butter on the ice, and to say that they shall not be allowed to assist in getting the seals on board is perfectly absurd. I can't understand anybody suggesting it.

As to the statement that the men sometimes come on board starving, after a hard day's work, and find no food prepared for them, of course, hardships will sometimes occur, and where you have got 200 men to deal with, you will occasionally have complaints, but I believe that on the whole the men are well treated now, and that the number of complaints that come in don't amount to a row of pins. I may say that I have good grounds for making that statement, because I am badgered every year for sealing tickets, and I give away a good many, and I always ask the men to come and let me know if they have any complaints, and, with one exception, about the "duffs" I have never had a single complaint or criticism. Would it pay the captains or owners to have the men coming in cold, wet and hungry, with the expectation of having to go on the ice at 3 or 4 o'clock next morning, and treat them in that way? The men would not be fit to do a day's work next day if that were so. I have only to repeat that I don't like the section even as it is, and I only make the amendment for the purpose of meeting as far as possible the wishes of those in charge of the Bill.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I am sorry to trouble the House again. I think the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has taken a very extraordinary position. He condemns his own amendment, and yet he brings it in. The hon. gentleman has been very free in charging some of us with having talked nonsense, but if he means what he says he can not support his own amendment. I certainly made no statement such as the hon. gentleman has attributed to me. I said that if this Bill passes the likely inference will be that in course of time the cooks will not be sharemen, but servants. That, I said, would be the likely outcome if we passed this section, and I vote for it, believing that that will be the outcome.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I apologize if my tone was anything but pleasant and deferential. I was arguing the matter as an arguer would. I have no other intention. I considered it as a matter of logic. I was not so illogical as the hon. member when he says he will support the section because of what will be its likely outcome. He also criticizes my own attitude with regard to this section, fairly, I admit, but not justly. I did not say that the section was wrong, but that it was objectionable. There are a number of degrees between what is wrong and what we ought to pass. I entirely demur to the statement that I think the section is wrong.

HON. MR. JOB—Before the amendment is put I should like to say a few words. To begin with, hon. members, have stated that no complaints had been made. I do not think that is absolutely correct. People managing ships are likely

to hear these complaints, and a few have been hearing of them for a number of years. With regard to the statement of Hon. Mr. Gibbs that cooks were simply not available, and that when the rush was on there is no cooking done on board, he may have put the case strongly, but there is a good deal in what he says, and some of us have thought it would only be fair to have this matter put right. They are not all "Capt. Keans" at the sealfishery. Personally, I am prepared to support Mr. Harvey's amendment. At the same time I would prefer to see the original section stand, because I think the cooks ought to be kept on board. I should like also to correct the statement made by Mr. Harvey, that this clause was not in the original agreement. I don't think it has been carried out, but it certainly is here. I know these cooks ought to be on board to cook. That is what they are there for, and what little they can do hoisting two or three seals on board can be done by keeping two or three men from the rest of the crew on board. I hope that the section dealing with the men's food will not be tampered with. The menu is a simple one, and the cost has not increased at all. The owners and men have agreed to this small matter for three years and if they are satisfied, surely hon. members are not going to object to it. Since I came into the House this afternoon clause (c) has been called to my attention. I now suggest that we amend that clause by inserting at the beginning the words, "for breakfast" and substituting for the word "alternately" the words "for breakfast on alternate days."

HON. MR. WINTER—From the remarks of the hon. gentlemen, I gather that the feeling of the House is against eliminating the section and I therefore withdraw my amendment in favor of Mr. Harvey.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. MR. McGRATH—In view of what Hon. Mr. Gibbs has stated as to the legal liability of owners of ships in respect of the failure of the cooks when on voyages to give the crews the food provided for them, I think we should amend the section so that such a condition of things may not exist in the sealing industry. It seems to me preposterous in the extreme that the owner of a vessel in St. John's who sends her off to Brazil or to the seal fishery and who puts aboard of her all the food that the Merchant Shipping Act calls for, should be liable to pay damages if the cook out in mid-ocean, where the owner certainly has no control over him, fails to give the crew food that has been provided. But as the hon. gentleman tells us that is the law at present, I submit we should relieve a party not responsible for conditions over which he can have no control. I therefore propose the following as an addition to Section 3. "But neither master, owner, nor any other person shall be liable for any default for which he is not personally responsible." This will give everybody a square deal. If the owner of a ship supplies the food required by law, then his responsibility will cease when he has done that. If the captain sees that the food is turned over to the cook to be prepared for the men, then that will absolve him; and if the cook fails to give the food he will be responsible until complaint is made to the captain,and if the captain does not then act upon the complaint, he will be responsible. But it seems absurd in the extreme to make an owner living in St. John's responsible at law and liable to pay damages because the cook on his vessel down at the Equator fails to give the men potatoes, or, as

would be under this section, liable to a fine if the cook put onions in the men's soup any other day than Saturday.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. MR. HARVEY—My amendments to section 4 have to do with penalties and also with the question of notice. I propose that the fine for a breach of section (I) shall not exceed $500. I have never heard of such a heavy penalty for a trivial breach of the law as the Bill now provides. Then after the words "or master," in line 6 add the words "after his attention has been called to such offence." Substitute $25 for $50 as the minimum penalty for a breach of section 2. In line 8 for the word "person" substitute the words "member of the crew of such steamer," and add at the end of the section the following words: "provided that written notice of such suit shall be given to the said owner or master within seven days after the arrival of the steamer at port of discharge, one half of any fine imposed under this section shall be paid over to the person or persons taking suit and one half to the Minister of Finance and Customs for the use of the Colony."

Amendment carried.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Can't we make a provision in section 5, that sick and disabled men on board a ship without a doctor shall be transferred to some other ship which has a doctor on board? I would suggest the words "steel ships belonging to the same owners as the wooden ships," be stricken out and that for these be substituted the words "a ship carrying a physician."

Amendment agreed to.

HON. MR. HARVEY—There is a point which strikes me in reference to this Bill and particularly with reference to this section. I do not see anything in this Act repealing the old Act of 1898 which sets the sealing date at the 10th March, and fixes a penalty for a breach of that Act, surely there ought to be a clause here cancelling that. This act has been very badly drawn. That is only one section, as regards the date of sailing. I want to move an amendment to section 6. I move an amendment that the penalty shall not exceed $2,000, but do not know if that will commend itself to the House, as the fine is $4,000 under the Old Act. I propose that the fine is to be recovered by any master, master watch of any sealing steamer, or any three members of the crew of any steamer. The old clause did not name any person at all but simply says it shall be recovered. I think that is very objectionable to have anybody at all able to take suit, and move that the suit must be taken by the Captain master watch, or some other officer or any three members of a crew acting together. Hon. Mr. Gibbs has just pointed out that in the old Act the penalty may be recovered by any person giving information. I think that is objectionable, and we have the opportunity now of setting that right by adopting the amendment I now propose, and also that written notice of such suit will be given the parties within forty days of arrival of such ship at port of discharge. Also, one quarter of the fine shall be paid over to the person taking the suit and the three quarters to the Minister of Finance for the use of the Colony. The man who takes the suit would likely be interested in the matter and is compelled by the amendment to take suit within 40 days of the arrival of the ship at the port of discharge. This is my proposed amendment, and I would suggest that there ought to be an additional section repealing the clause in the old Act.

HON. MR. McGRATH—As regards

the sailing dates, I would suggest an amendment to explicitly cover the position, by repealing that clause in the 1898 Act. Our amendment should read thus: "Section 1 of the Act of 1898 is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor." No steamer shall leave port for the Gulf fishery before 8 o'clock in the forenoon of the 10th of March in any year. No wooden ship shall sail for the fishery outside of the Gulf ports before the same hour on the 12th March. No steel ship shall depart from St. John's or from any port south or west of St. John's before 8 a.m. on the 13th March, or from any port North of St. John's before 8 a.m. on the 14th of March.

Amendment put and carried.

Hon. Mr. Harvey's amendment was also put and carried.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I beg leave to propose an amendment to section 7. This is the section which I described as being one for the encouragement of mutiny on the high seas. I thought some other explanation might be forthcoming as to this section other than what it shows on its face. If the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill can explain why this section is brought in I will be glad to be enlightened. If no explanation be forthcoming I would suggest that the operation of the clause be postponed for another year, to enable us to get further information to enlighten us on the matter, and I therefore suggest that it be provided that it shall not apply this season.

HON. MR. JOB—I can tell no more about the matter than I did on the second reading of the Bill. There can be no doubt that after the young seals are killed there is a spirit of unrest on the ships. The chances of killing old seals are not too good, but the owners of the ship cannot afford to give up these chances and the masters therefore stay out to hunt the old seals. We found, especially during the last two or three years, the crews have been dissatisfied, and we know what it is when the fishermen of the country and the crews are not interested in the voyage. It is all very well to talk of mutiny on the high seas and the authority of captains, but we must know that when proper interest is not being taken in an industry is does not succeed. We then thought we would suggest a method whereby those of the crew who remained on board could double their wages, and those who wanted to be landed could get ashore, and this is the result. The case of the old wooden ships is a precarious one, and we ask your consideration of the matter. Hon. Mr. McGrath's suggestion that it be deferred to another year means that it will probably be never made law, as we cannot have Sealing Bills before us every year.

HON. MR. WINTER—This section does not compel the captain to come in and count on any portion of his crew.

HON. MR. JOB—It is optional.

HON. MR. WINTER—Where does the mutiny trouble come in?

HON. MR. McGRATH—The crew will compel him to come in.

HON. MR WINTER—But there is nothing in the section that justifies the crew in doing this. If they come in it is only with the consent of the captain.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Captain Blandford was compelled to come in.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I should think it would be a positive relief to the captain to have such a privilege. There is nothing in the section to take the power away from the captain. Some captains, if they saw the voyage turning out adversely, may be glad to drop a portion of their crews.

I would not wish to see this section amended.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I think it only fair to state that there is a strong opinion prevailing amongst the captains that the moral effect of this section is going to be bad. It simply authorizes the Customs officer to clear the ship for another trip, without calling it a second trip, and there is a strong impression amongst the captains that this will render discipline more difficult to keep than heretofore.

HON. THE PRESIDENT—Another difficulty suggests itself to me as regards the interest of the crew in the seals on board. The section makes no provision for this.

The section was allowed to stand over.

HON. MR. McGRATH—AS to section 9, I was going to suggest that we do the same here as with the previous sections, viz., provide that "Sections 3 of the Act of 1898 is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor: It shall be unlawful for the crew of such steamer to kill seals before the 15th March and after the 1st of May." Someone said the other day that the final date should be shortened to do away with the killing of old seals. This would not shorten the date that the wooden ships would stop out. When shall the killing of seals end?

HON. MR .JOB—The first of May, as usual.

HON. MR. HARVEY—As regards the repealing of the Act it is not sufficient to do what we are doing. This 1898 Act must be studied in conjunction with the Act here. There are the sections in that Act affected by this, and there are other sections besides the penalty sections which should be stricken out of the old Act. With regard to the present section, in speaking the other day about the shortening up of the season at the end, I did not mean to propose an amendment. I merely pointed it out as one of the subjects that might be dealt with by the Commission, and I do not think at this date we should repeal it here. With regard to this section, I must propose as an amendment that the penalty shall not be a penalty of $4,000, but a penalty not exceeding $4,000. Then I propose that after "seal fishery" there should be added in regard to the person taking suit: "by any master watch or any member of the crew seeking for the same, provided that written notice of such suit shall be given to the said owner, master or other person within 40 days of the arrival of such ship at the port of discharge. One quarter of this fine is to be paid to the person suing and three fourths to the Colony." It is identical with the amendment just passed.

HON. MR. JOB—I do not think that in these two sections Any man who sails before the hour prescribed should pay $4,000, and any ship killing seals before the time provided by law should pay the same penalty. I am opposed to discretion with regard to these two sections, because it is difficult to keep control over this fishery, and if you leave discretion in the hands of a magistrate in connection with these two sections you are opening the door to possible disaster. I can imagine a small penalty for minor offences, but these two sections should hold the $4,000 penalty without any possibility of reduction.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I cannot agree with my hon. friend. I have already cited a case where I was out in a steamer, and the captain was unable to abide by the law, and I gave instances which, no doubt, happen on every ship, of an occasional

seal being killed by the crew without the captain's consent. I don't like the idea of having an enormous fine of $4,000—without discretionary power in the Court. A man may break this law without intending to, and to say in such a case that the owner must be fined $4,000 would, I honestly think, be very injudicious indeed. I don't mind putting it at something like not less than $250, but I would very much prefer to leave it to the Court to assess the amount. There should be a right of appeal against any large fine of that sort.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I raised, with a legal gentleman, last night the point my hon. friend has just made and he said that the Bill would not punish owners if a seal should be killed in sport prior to the 15th. As regards the other point raised by my hon. friend, the case of Captain Farquhar, my informant said in that case no fine could be imposed. We have had one or two cases during the past twenty years where the law has been violated. In one case, the fine was imposed and collected; in the other case the fine was evaded by a clerk of the firm which owned the ship taking action and handing over the fine to the employer. I am quite in accord with devising a section by which exception may be secured, such as I proposed with regard to the owner or master not being held liable unless they are personally responsible, but I don't think we ought to give discretionary powers to the magistrate.

HON. MR. WINTER—It seems to me that this section is of very little importance at present. When the steamers sailed three or four days before the killing date, then it was important, but at present the steamers would have to strike the seals on the 14th in order to break the law, even if they wished to. And the chances of wooden ships getting into the seals within a week are not at all likely. I agree with the remarks of Hon. Mr. Harvey as regards the penalty. I think it ought to be possible to discriminate between a case of wilfull breach of the law and an unintentional one.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I can hardly understand the attitude of Hon. Mr. McGrath in relation to this section, that he does not see the force of giving a discretion as to the penalty to be imposed. If I understand him correctly, he apparently sets more value upon the seals on the ice than upon the imposition of the fine named on the men. He strenuously opposed the fourth section, and consequently it was reduced to $25. I think there may be cases where captains may sail half an hour before the time, and there should be a discretion in the magistrate as to how far he will inflict the whole fine. We should show as much concern for the rights of the seals as for the rights of the crew, and when we give a discretionary power to the magistrate in the case of offences against the crew, we should give the same discretion for offences against the seals.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I fail to see where I have shown any inconsistency. I am not making this proposal in the interests of the seals, or of the sealers, or of the merchants, but in the interests of the country and of law and order.

The sections that my hon. friend refers to were sections the breach of which would not in many cases, have any serious consequences for any one. If crews did not get onions in their soup on Saturdays or were supplied with fish brewse two days in succession instead of stewed beans one day, it certainly would not work any detriment to the men and might, under some conditions be an

advantage, but when it comes to a question of enabling the masters of steamers to take the chances of starting for the seal fishery before the prescribed time, I submit it is a different thing entirely and one that vitally affects the country. Otherwise we would not be trying to legislate about it here today. I would fine a man the full $4,000 under the section whether he sailed half an hour or half a day before the prescribed time, in order to vindicate the majesty of the law and prevent it from being treated with disrespect.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I disagree with my hon. friend. I put it to him that if his principle is correct, a man who sailed half a minute before the time is as guilty as another who sailed half a day before—a reductio ad absurdum .

HON. MR. HARVEY'S amendment to insert the words "not exceeding" before the words "Four thousand dollars" was put and carried.

HON. MR. JOB—I have an additional section which I propose shall be added and numbered section 11. It enacts the agreement made by Sir Edward Morris, on behalf of the men some four or five years ago, with owners and reads thus:—"The owners of steamers shall be liable in the case of the crew of any steamer being paid off at the end of the voyage with a balance insufficient in amount to pay the fare of the crew to their respective homes to contribute a sum not exceeding four dollars which when added to the amount paid the crew will be sufficient for the payment of the said fares." That has always been included in every agreement we have had.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I have an additional section to propose with regard to boats to be carried, as follows: "On and after January 1st. 1915, no boats shall be taken on board by any sealing steamer for use in the seal fishery unless they have been previously certified as seaworthy."

The reason I move that section is that I have reason to believe that many of the boats are absolutely worthless for saving life in cases of emergency, and I think the men ought to have a fighting chance for their lives. I would like to move a similar section with regard to the sails to be carried by ships, the object being that the sealing steamers shall be forced to take some sails. I remember the case of the Iceland, when she was driven to sea without a shred of canvas on board. I commented upon it very strongly at the time in the "Herald"; but I will hold it over until to-morrow, as I wish to discuss its terms with the Solicitor.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I have still another amendment to move as section 14. It reads as follows:—"The provision of sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this Act shall not during the season of 1914 be held to apply to steamers registered in Canada, but on and after January 1st, 1915, this shall apply to all steamers prosecuting the seal-fishery from or bringing seals into the Colony." This, I may say, is for the purpose of exempting the S.S. Seal which is leaving Halifax in a day or two, and has no possibility of hearing of this Bill. I was going on to propose another amendment with regard to the power of appeal. This whole Act ought to be gone over very carefully. It is an Act to amend 55 Victoria Cap. 2. The Act of 1898 (61 Vict. Capt. 4) appears to have cancelled the previous Acts and which of its sections are still in force I am quite sure nobody in this House knows. The gentleman in charge of the

Bill ought to find out just how we stand with regard to prior Acts before this Bill goes out of committee.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Job the committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the balance of the Order Paper was deferred.

Hon. President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly, that they had passed the amendment sent down in and upon the Bills entitled respectively, "An Act respecting the storage and carrying of gunpowder and other explosives" and "An Act to amend and consolidate the Law for the Protection of Animals" without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House adjourned till to-morrow at 3 p.m.

TUESDAY, March 3rd

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Job, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Seal Fishery Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Last evening I moved an amendment to section 7 that it should not come into operation until this afternoon, with the object of making further inquiries regarding it and so reaching an agreement.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I received a notification just now intimating that some communication was being made to the Council by captains now here and that we may expect to have it soon. I would like to know if the solicitor of the House has gone into the legal aspects of the Bill and ascertained what is its bearing upon the old Acts. Before the Bill becomes law it is essential that we know how we stand in relation to the old Bills dealing with the same matter.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Yesterday we passed section 9, which provides that no seals shall be killed by the crew of any ship, or any member of the crew of any ship before the 15th March in any year. Is it the intention that this Section of the Bill before us is to apply to steamers in the Gulf as well as those on the front? If it is not, this section must be amended so as to cover the Gulf fleet.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Under the 1898 Act, which is the last enactment, they could not kill anywhere before the 12th March. Probably this is not observed, but it is the law.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I beg leave to move as an amendment that steamers in the Gulf shall not have the right to kill before the 12th March in any year and steamers operating elsewhere under the 15th of March.

HON. MR. McGRATH'S amendment was passed and Mr. Harvey's amendment relative to the S.S. Seal was passed.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I beg leave to move that a new section to stand as section 13, be inserted, to read as follows:—

"On or after March 1st, 1915, no "steamers shall proceed to the seal "fishery from any port in this Col- "ony unless she shall have on board "sufficient sails, to afford a reason- "able prospect of her reaching land "in case of accident and no officer "of Customs shall clear any ship for "such a voyage unless a certificate "to the foregoing effect shall be pro- "duced before."

I do not know what the position as regards the old ships is, but I have been informed that ships go out with no canvas whatever. If at the present day the ships have sufficient supply of canvas this section can do no harm; if not, it may do a great deal

of good. It is a serious situation to send men on such a dangerous venture, and for them to find, should an emergency arise, that their ship has no sails, by which at least to endeavour to make the land.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I certainly am not prepared to oppose any suggestion that would add to the chances of safety of a crew in any steamer, but it seems to me that if we are going to introduce any more amendments to this Bill, we are going beyond the requirements of the case, and the reason is this—when the Bill was introduced Hon. Mr. Goodridge suggested that a Commission was sitting to consider these matters, and the answer was that this Bill had been introduced to the House before the Commission was appointed. If we are going to bring in anything entirely new or anything the principle of which is not even referred to in the Bill, we are simply evading that Commission, and it seems to me we can leave all these matters in the hands of that Commission, to deal with. I deprecate making any further additions and amendments to the sections as they are. The section which Hon. Mr. Harvey introduced just now, although a new one, had a direct bearing upon the Bill. Hon. Mr. McGrath's section has no bearing upon the Bill, and is one entirely and exclusively for the Commission appointed by this House, as well as the other House, to discuss, and for this reason I am opposed to any new amendments unless they bear entirely upon the Bill as it stands.

HON. MR. McGRATH—If the House does not feel it is necessary to add a section like this,the responsibility will not rest with me, but I can imagine no matter of importance than one tending to safeguard the lives of men at the seal fishery. That amendment is necessary I know, because of the case of the Iceland, driving over the Banks some years ago, with no canvas on board and 180 men making up her crew, and if the House is prepared to stand for a continuation of these conditions merely because such an amendment as mine is held not to be germane to the principle of the Bill, I shall have done what I conceive to be my duty when I propose this amendment. The argument advanced by my hon. friend, Mr. Robinson, that this amendment is not relevant to the Bill and should be referred to the Fishery Conservation Commission is not well taken, because the Commission has no power to deal with matters of this kind. Whether ships have boats or sails is not within the purview of that Commission; its work is to deal with the Conservation of the Fisheries, and how their financial value to the country is to be enhanced. This matter of safeguarding the lives of the men engaged in this industry, is one, which, I think can properly come within the scope of a Bill of this kind, even if it was not in the Bill when it was introduced in the Lower House, or when it came up to us. If we are prepared to spend days debating whether the cooks shall go on the ice or not, surely we should be prepared to consider a proposition to provide sails and boat accomodation that men may have a chance to save their lives when in great danger. We are providing better food accomodation, but apparently we are to stop short at providing sails by which men can get their ships to the land if a mishap occurs.

HON. MR. JOB—I agree with Hon. Mr. McGrath. It is a mistake to think that the Fisheries Commission is sitting and dealing with such matters. It is to deal entirely with the question of a close season. The examination of boats and the necessity

of having sails on board the ships, if made the object of the work of an inspector, would be a relief to the owners of ships; and it would be desirable to have such a provision if it is not already included in the Merchant Shipping Act. But whether we are liable for this inspection and whether it is necessary under the Merchant Shipping Act to equip the ships with these, I am not prepared to say. If not, a clause dealing with the matter should be acceptable.

HON. MR. McGRATH—If it is provided for under the Merchant Shiping Act at the present time, the Act is not carried out, and was not carried out in the case of the Iceland. If we can put a section in this Bill and add a penalty to it to guarantee its being carried out, I think, we should do it. Certainly, if there is anything in the Merchant Shipping Act it is not being observed, since the owners of the ships are not aware of it.

HON. MR. RYAN—The matter of putting canvas on ships is rather a difficult one to deal with, because yards must be put on the ships. Again, because the few sails you could put on these steamers would not give them sufficient headway to bring them in from the Banks, if they lost their propellors. You might put on jibs or fore-and-aft sails, but these would not bring the ships along, and I doubt even if they would keep a ship's head to the wind. They have to be abandoned on the ocean liners, especially now with the small masts that are in vogue. I know this from conversations with captains of steamers and from my own observation. My informants told me that with the jibs they might keep a ship's head to the sea, but would not do much to bring her along, even with a fair wind.

HON. MR. ANGEL—When the steamers first began to prosecute the seal fishery they were provided with full sail equipment. They were square rigged, and only had an auxiliary screw, so that they were practically dependent upon their canvas As they began to increase the power and put in expensive engines which enabled them to do much more work, they began to reduce the canvas until finally they stripped them almost completely. Every iron steamship, even the passenger ship crossing the ocean, is completely helpless if it loses its steaming power. Under these circumstances it seems to me unnecessary to provide that these steamers shall have the necessary canvas on board to bring them to port. Our own steamships which cross the Atlantic don't carry enough. We have instances every day where tramps are found drifting about helplessly, and why is it necessary to provide our sealing steamers with sufficient canvas to bring them to port? The canvas could not be spread on the masts now in use. I think they have the necessary canvas to keep them steady.

HON. MR. McGRATH—My non. friend, Mr. Job, has handed me a statement which shows that the steamers of his fleet have certain sails on board, but we have no knowledge of what may be the conditions of other ships. The House to be sure, is dependent upon my assertion as to the Iceland's case for any action it may take on this matter. I wrote a strong article on it at the time and pointed out the great danger the men at the ice run owing to these ships being allowed to go out without canvas. If at the sealfishery now any mishap were to befall one of these ships that has no Marconi apparatus on board, and she were to be driven out over the Banks,

would we ever forgive ourselves that we had not done what was in our power to cope with the position when it was in our power to do so?

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would suggest that an amendment be made that they shall have canvas sufficient in the opinion of the Lloyds surveyor.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I object strongly to this way of bringing in amendments. I feel strongly upon this question. We are meeting day after day, and amendments are pouring in in a constant stream, and I doubt if we know what we have passed. Every amendment which is introduced into this House should be put in black and white before we are asked to pass upon them. We have here today a case where an amendment to a Bill went down to the Lower House, and no notice whatever was taken of it, and the Bill came back and we are told that it had been passed without notice of the amendment. It is absolutely impossible for anybody in this House to tell what has been done during the last three or four days. I have had a seat in the Legislature for some years, but have never in my experience seen such an unholy hash as this. I venture to say that most members do not know what amendments they have passed, and I think if these amendments are going on, that the committee should rise and report progress, so that we should have time at least to read the amendments and know what we are doing.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I should just like to say, in reply to the last speaker, that so far as the amendments which I have proposed are concerned, I suggested them to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill only a month ago when the matter of a sealing enactment this year was first talked of. I might also remark that it is perhaps our misfortune that we are not able, some of us, to foresee what will arise from day to day in the minds of members as to the sections, and that in our endeavors to improve a Bill it becomes necessary to make a hash of it. I would also point out that it would be very much easier for those of us who have taken an interest in this measure and who have endeavored by offering amendments to improve the measure, to have sat silent and have allowed the Bill to go through as it came up to us. Certain amendments that have been proposed will, I think, be admitted by all interested in this industry and by the country at large to be an improvement on the Bill as we received it. If, in the process of putting through these amendments we have complicated the matter and made a hash of the thing, I think it ought to stand to our credit that we have been actuated by good motives, and that our intentions have been such as we ought to get credit for, even if we have balled things up, in trying to put these ideas into execution.

I submit that we ought not to allow ourselves to be influenced against adding clauses to this Bill by the argument that we are exceeding its scope or departing from its principle. If we had accepted this Bill as it came up to us, and if some members of this House had not gone into its provisions very carefully, and submitted the series of amendments that have been under discussion the past two or three days, what sort of a measure would it be if it had gone on the Statute Book unaltered and an attempt had been made to enforce it? I submit that we have abundantly justified ourselves by the manner in which we have improved this Bill, by providing that the crews shall get their breakfast every day instead of only three times a week

as the Bill read when it came to us; by providing that the crews should have other provisions besides a pound of soft bread every second day as it also read when it reached us; by amending the cook clause as we have done; by relieving the owner of liabilities in regard to matters for which he is not at all responsible; by altering the penalties and providing safeguards to prevent injustices and unfairness; by enabling sick and disabled men to be transferred to steamers carrying doctors; by altering the sailing and killing dates so as to ensure to the Gulf sealers the facilities enjoyed heretofore; by providing for proper boat accomodation as we have just done; and by showing up the dangers of this mutiny clause which has been the subject of such discussion. These things are our justification for the time and attention we have given this Bill, and I submit that it is better to have done this than to have allowed the Bill to go through with silent votes or without taking the trouble to study its clauses, as we might have done. Finally, if we have made a hash of this Bill, I don't know that we have complicated it so much that we cannot straighten it out so as to be acceptable to the country and accomplish the object aimed at.

HON. MR. GIBBS—While it is commendable upon the part of hon. members to do everything possible for the purpose of protecting the lives of those engaged in the sealing industry, I think that this amendment goes a little too far, in that it is legislating on lines different from those adopted by any other part of the world. It is a well known fact that steel ships do not carry sails except perhaps for the purpose of keeping their heads to the wind. The difficulty in considering an amendment of this kind is that different classes of ships require different kinds of sails, and none of us have sufficient technical knowledge to be able to draft a clause that will meet the case. There is a type of ship going out that could be fitted with sails that would enable them to steer clear of danger if anything should happen, but like the Florizel or Stephano what kind of sails do you propose that they shall carry? The most efficient safeguard for these ships is their Marconi apparatus, and to compel these ships to be fitted with sails would be an absurdity.

HON. MR. McGRATH'S amendment was then put, and lost.

HON. MR. JOB—There is another amendment which I regard as absolutely necessary. It is with regard to the right of appeal from the magistrate's decision, which we are advised is absolutely necessary.

The proposed additional clause was put, and carried.

HON. MR. McGRATH—To complete section 5 it has been suggested that it would be necessary to make a general provision in case a captain should refuse to accept a sick man on board his ship. I would suggest this amendment:—"And no master shall refuse to accept such sick or disabled person, unless suffering from an infectious or contagious disease, under a penalty not exceeding $500."

HON. MR. GIBBS—I think perhaps the hon. gentleman in his zeal to do good is perhaps going a little too far. I quite agree with the necessity for the introduction of some penalty but to make it "not exceeding $500," I fancy is going a little too far, because if a man is going to die in any case why should we give his legal representatives the right to recover an amount which he could not get any other way. It is possible a man may be so ill on board a wooden steamer that his death is inevit-

able why give him the right to recover from the captain of the other vessel the sum of $500 when the captain had nothing to do with his death. I quite agree that the captain ought to have to take the man on board. Supposing it was some poor unfortunate man with a wife and family. The sympathy of the average human being would make them go out of their way to inflict some fine. The magistrate could do that and the Court won't interfere with this decision. Certainly the Court would not interfere with the decision of the magistrate. A judgment is only set aside because of a mistake in some point of law. If the facts justify the imposition of a penalty and the penalty is according to law, the Court very rarely interferes with the judgment of the magistrate. A captain's refusal to take a man on board would give the legal representative the right to sue for a penalty not exceeding $500. Such a case may never happen, but we have to legislate to protect the rights of all parties. I think the hon. member's views may be met if we put a penalty of $50 or so.

HON. MR. McGRATH—The point I want to make is, when a man may be sick on a wooden steamer, and a captain of it with a doctor on board may refuse to accept him and the man may die because he did not see a doctor. Would the judgment of a magistrate under these circumstances hold?

HON. MR. GIBBS—If it can be shown that he did refuse him. But if there was no doctor on board how would it be possible to know that the man would not die if he received proper attention? Take the case of a man suffering from pneumonia. Who but a doctor could state that that man would have lived if a doctor had attended him? The amendment gives the right in any case; it imposes a penalty on the captain which is hardly fair under the circumstances. I think it would certainly be right to impose a penalty if it can be shown that the captain's refusal to take a man on board meant the loss of his life. That is the difficulty in dealing with amendments. I have no doubt that by to-morrow that amendment could be put in such shape as would meet the views of the hon. member and everyone present; if you make it that a master refusing to receive a sick man on board shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding $100.

HON. DR. SKELTON—I have listened to the discussion regarding doctors and am reminded of a case which happened in Greenspond many years ago, when Capt. William Kean, master of the Micmac, put in there and I was summoned on board. I found some thirty men in their berths sick with measles, contracted at the ice, where they had to be treated by the captain and engineers or anybody else who knew anything about it. Some of them were very sick, and you can understand it was not conducive to their recovery to find the state they were in lying in an apartment where the floor was covered with slush and dirt of various kinds, so that I had to pick my steps going from berth to berth. We had no hospital in which to place them, so I advised that the men be sent to their homes, and they were put in punts and started off. These men distributed measles in every part of my district, and I had to travel to visit them sometimes ten miles north and ten miles south in one day. It became impossible to visit all of them, so I recommended a course of treatment for them to use themselves, and I am happy to say that of all these men not one death occurred. Now, there might be such

a case occur again, and the disease might be smallpox. I am afraid the people in Newfoundland are not so thoroughly vaccinated as they might be. I have heard that since the new style of vaccination was adopted there are not nearly the same number of people treated as might be.

HON. MR. HARVEY—With regard to section 7, since we met this afternoon I have received a communication signed by, I think, all the sealing captains now in port bearing on this subject. The letter protests against it altogether, first against the cooks not being under the captain's control, and they think it is likely to tend to destroy discipline on board ship, and none of the captains would employ a cook with any chance of his interfering with the feeding of the men, which we will all believe. However, as we have dealt with that section, I will not read that portion, but rather that dealing with section 7 (Read extract.) Now we cannot ignore the weight of opinion which these gentlemen bring to bear on this statement, and I think to pass this section with such protestations as that against it would be a great error. I would not have proposed any amendment on the section relating to cooks, for such an influential protest as that is one I would feel diffident in opposing. As I take it, the meaning of section 7 is this: It is a section for the benefit of the ship and master, and practically says that if the early seals have been missed and the master, in the interests of his owners, thinks it will not pay to stay out and feed a couple of hundred men, he has the option of coming in and landing part of the crew and carrying on the voyage with the remainder. The section permits the Customs officer to clear the ship under law and not call it a second trip, and obviously the section is put in there for the benefit of the owners and the captains. We have it from the latter that they do not want this right to continue the voyage, because they think the men will be dissatisfied, and I am perfectly sure the owners do not take any stock in this section, so I suggest that it be relegated to the Commission on fishery matters,for consideration, or else expurgated. I think the better way would be to have this section submitted for report another year by the Commission. I move that it be taken out.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I cannot altogether agree with Hon. Mr. Harvey that this section has been placed there solely in the interests of the owners and the captains. I think the men's interests were also considered when the matter was first discussed the other day. I stated I hoped there would be no amendment, because my opinion was very strong that this would prove a very great advantage to the masters and to the voyage generally. I thought that if a steamer was not having a successful trip, it would be well to get rid of half the crew, who could go home and be better employed. It came to me as quite a surprise when the hon. gentleman opposite, drew my attention to the fact that it would prove subversive of discipline, and much has been said since then which has materially changed my views. I still hold the section is a good one, if it could be carried out, but in view of that protest and what has been stated here that it is likely to be subversive of discipline, I do not feel so strongly as to having no amendment made.

HON. MR. JOB—I want to point out that the main object of bringing this clause in has been lost sight of entirely in the discussion so far. It is very clear that the men in some of the wooden ships, as far as I know, are anxious to come in after the

young seals are cut up, and in many cases in the last few years have practically brought the skippers in. It is not a nice thing to talk about, and I did not want to refer to it, but at least two ships that I know of have been brought in by the men. There are only two things to do, either give up shooting the old seals or else make some arrangement. It may be possible that skippers may devise some scheme for controlling the men and I hope they will do so, as they have thrown down the gauntlet now, and will be able to keep the men out till the first of May. I hope it won't come to that stage, and I think this clause should be given a test. It is entirely optional on the skippers' part as to whether or not the men shall be brought to land and after he has talked it over with the men he may wish to do so in the interests of the voyage. I think, Hon. Mr. Harvey is wrong in saying this clause is for the benefit of the owners entirely. I think it will suit the men more than anything else.

HON. MR. McGRATH—The position regarding this clause appears to me somewhat like Lord Rosebery's story of the mob-orator who in the French Revolution was seen following a crowd and being asked why he did so, replied: "I must follow them; I am their leader." Under this section, the captain will have to follow the crew. I characterized this section of the Bill the other day as one to encourage mutiny on the high seas. We have had several instances cited here of a similar condition, notably the cases of the Nascopie and Lloydsen, and now the hon. gentleman has referred to two others, and if we make this law, where are we going to end? The real object of the section is to make it easy for the men to bring the ships in. Otherwise why not deal with it another way; why not let a number of the men sign before going out that they are to come in on a certain day.

HON. MR. JOB—That can be done under this clause.

HON. MR. McGRATH—If you are prepared to make an arrangement and introduce a section whereby a man can have the option of signing for a short voyage it would be a very different matter.

HON. MR. GIBBS—That could be the subject of an agreement.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I dare say it could, but the practical position under this section is this, that the men will go out and stay as long as the fishery is profitable, but as soon as it is not profitable, they will come in. The proposition I suggest is simple and can be used as an alternative. I do not think we ought to put a permium on mutiny by enacting this section as it stands.

On motion being put, section 7 was stricken out of the Bill.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill to the fact that section 4 of the 1898 act provides that any master violating any section of that act will be prevented from commanding a ship for two years; and my hon. friend ought to consult the Law Clerk as to whether any of the sections of the present Bill is governed by the Act of 1898. In other words, the two measures dovetail into each other, and we ought to be clear as to the effect of this interlocking.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would also point out that this Bill does not refer to the Act of 1898.

HON. MR. McGRATH—As regards the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Harvey, the title of this Bill is an Act to amend 55 Vic. Cap. 2. The last Act we have and the Act giving

effect to our all important sealing regulations, for the years past is the Act of 1898, 61 Vic. Cap. 26. I do not know why when this Bill was drafted it was simply to amend the Act 55 Vic. and took no cognizance of 61 Victoria, but that situation must be taken into account also before the Bill goes through.

HON. MR. JOB—There are a few technical matters, as well, that must be submitted to the Law Clerk, who at present is not here, and I propose that the Committee rise and report progress, and have the matter further attended to to-morrow.

The Committee accordingly rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Combines and Monopolies Bill.

Hon. Mr. Ayre took the Chair.

Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Representation Bill.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the House went into Committee on the White Slave Traffic Bill.

Hon. Dr. Skelton in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In moving the second reading of the Sawmills Bill, I desire to point out to the hon. members that it has reference to what is commonly called the three mile limit, or reservation, and is intended to regulate the cutting of timber on Crown Lands and particularly that portion of it lying within the limit referred to and is sometimes known as the fishermen's limit.

This land is not reserved from the operations of the Crown Lands Act, but Governments, past and present, have refused to grant licenses to cut timber over it. In ——— the Bond Government made an attempt by legislation to control in a certain manner milling operations on this strip of land, but for various reasons it did not come up to the expectations of its framer, and the objects sought to be attained did not materialize.

The principle of refusing licenses to cut timber over the area of land was not for the purpose of having a supply of timber near at hand for fishery purposes, that is for building boats. It originated in this way. Applications were made for rights to cut timber over areas of land extending to the sea shore. Some of those applications surrounded settlements, and it became necessary to protect the timber growth near settlements, for the use of the inhabitants for fuel, fencing, and building purposes, as well as for fishery purposes, and it was deemed advisable to reserve the land surrounding them from grants of the kind. The boundary of a settlement being a very indefinite term and in order that people living along and near the sea shore, may be amply protected in the supply of wood for domestic and building purposes, the whole of the sea shore for three miles was reserved or excluded from timber grants.

As stated the whole of the land has not been exempted from the provisions of the Crown Lands Act except in so far as the issue of timber

leases are concerned, mining leases, and grants for agricultural purposes are issued, the latter giving the right to the timber as well as the soil, which a license to cut timber does not give to the grantee, and in the cases of mining leases the holders of them are entitled to certain surface rights in addition to the minerals.

No doubt the idea of reserving land around or near settlements from the operation of the act was a wise policy, still it does not appear that it is absolutely necessary for the growth of population and industry that the whole of three miles along our immense coast is expedient or necessary, or that mills should be prohibited from operating on it.

There are a large number of mills now engaged in lumbering on this strip of land and to enact a law prohibiting the continuance of them would operate as a hardship not alone on the mill owners but to the country in general, and the reasons are obvious, because first, they give employment to a considerable number of people during the winter months who find it undesirable to go into the interior logging, and are thus enabled to secure employment near their homes, and by this means add to their earning power.

Those mills supply the people with lumber for the building of houses and barns, and for boat building, at a much cheaper rate than they could otherwise secure it. A great many cut the logs themselves and get the mill owner to saw them on the halves, that is giving half the lumber sawn from the logs by way of payment. We can readily understand how beneficial it is to a man in an outport who has a house, barn, or boat to build, to be in a position to go upon Crown Lands near his home and cut the logs, and instead of paying for the manufacturing of them into lumber in cash, to pay for it in the manner described. A very large percentage of houses and boats built by our people have been done in this manner.

Many a head of a family in the outports found himself, because of having to supply the wants of the home with fuel, and do other things such as preparing for the next season's fishery, unable to take advantage of employment offered elsewhere, and, if he could not employ his spare time in useful work, would find himself poorly off. Under this system of not preventing him from cutting logs and mills from operating, a great deal of valuable work is done.

Then again, those small mills which cut less than 10,000 feet board other than staves, laths, etc., supply a great many products which are advantageous to the trade and business of the country such as staves, heading for fish packages, laths and shingles, and if we had not those small mills operating in the manner described many would find it inconvenient to do work and carry on business

The number of small mills, or what are called free mills, operating on the three mile limit, and cutting less than 10,000 feet of board other than staves, heading, shingles etc., is 120. For the year 1910-11 the produce of those mills was as follows:

Staves.	Heading.	Laths.	Shingles
2,696,000	539,000	153,000	113,000

equivalent to 1,920,000 feet board measures valued at $59,907.20. Those mills there are 157 of greater productive capacity operating on this strip without license or getting their logs from it, and those mills produced last year:

Staves.	Heading.	Laths.	Shingles
4,274,000	607,000	2,314,000	10,807,000

equivalent to 4,155,428 feet board measure, valued at $57,907.20 If the

total quantity produced from those two classes of mills be added together, honorable members will find it amounts to:

Staves. Heading. Laths. Shingles
6,970,000 1,146,000 2,467,000 10,920,000

equivalent to 6,075,000 feet board measure, the estimated value of which was $88,655.40, while the quantities of the articles mentioned produced by all mills, the right to cut timber being held under lease from the Crown was only:

Staves. Heading. Laths. Shingles
64,000 9,000 2,708,000 1,719,000

equivalent to 599,756 feet board measure, and valued at $9,004.40.

There was in addition to staves, etc., manufactured from logs cut on Crown Lands by those mills, 23,199,000 feet, which was made into scantling board, etc., valued at $297,624.10 making the total output from unlicensed mills equal to 29,262,000 feet and valued at $380,279.00. The figures I have quoted are the returns for the year 1910-11 and are very complete.

These mills are supplying lumber at a much lower price than it could be otherwise obtained,and no doubt due to proximity to shipping,cheapness in cost of operating and not having to pay any royalty on their cut.

During the same year (1910-11), the number of mills operating under license were 15, and their total output was 23,226,200 feet and the 271 mills operating with licenses (practically all on the three mile limit) cut 29,262,000 feet. Of this amount about 23,000,000 was manufactured into boad, scantling, etc., the estimated value of which was $297,624.00.

It will thus be seen from the foregoing figures that half the local supply of such timber was produced at those mills, and if they were abolished it may be that large importations of lumber would take place, that such a course is not desirable because the whole output it may be said, is distributed in labor which adds to the earning and purchasing power of the people of the country and gives employment at a season of the year when many employed at the work would be idle.

Mr. Thistle, an official in the Crown Lands Department, in his report on the output, states that those mills operating on the three mile limit employ 2,434 men for about five months. Placing the average wage paid at $25 a month, there would be disbursed in wages $304,250, but this large amount is not actually paid out in wages in the ordinary sense, as a large proportion of those engaged in this particular milling and lumbering industry own the mills themselves and perform both the work of lumber men and mill men. They constitute the employer and the employed, being at the same time owners and operators.

It does not appear necessary that the whole of the three mile strip should be excluded because the supply of timber for fishery purposes may be obtained from a much smaller area, because there are many sections of the coast line where mills are not operating. According to information obtained it is not usual for fishermen to go a greater distance than a half mile from the sea shore. to procure timber, the practice is to move from one place to another where the timber is nearer. There is the right under the Crown Lands Act if it be shown that it is necessary to reserve any particular locality as a source of supply to do so by an order made by the Governor in Council.

A good deal of the timber on the three-mile limit will never be used for fishing purposes, very large quantities are destroyed by wind and decay through age, or by fire and it is

far better to have it manufactured.

This act places the control of the mills in the Government and insures that with the exception of the free or fishermen's mills there shall be paid into the general revenue of the country a substantial amount in return for their being allowed to operate. It also gives power to control the industry to prevent if desirable in the public interest the extension of it and the right to refuse licenses to mills whenever deemed necessary.

The amount of capital invested in those mills is approximately $250,000 which is really owned by residents in the localities where the mills are in operation, except in few instances, and before any prohibition be placed upon the operation of them it would be necessary to clearly show that they are a great source of damage to the country generally.

The reduction of the growth of timber on the three-mile limit is not due solely to the mills. There is a practice of rinding trees which is causing a good deal of damage and the fisherman should be instructed how unprofitable this work is from many standpoints. The trees for instance from which a hundred rinds are obtained would if cut and sold as cordwood be worth fifteen times as much as the hundred rinds and it made into shingles, laths, etc. $15.00.

The depletion of the natural sources of wealth by such means is to be deplored. The aim of all countries nowadays is to conserve and protect them and the fishermen should be educated to regard the forest wealth so near his door as his greatest asset. Honourable members of the House more especially those engaged in the trade of the country can by refusing to utilize rinds of trees in their business, almost completely put an end to this business; it largely rests with them, because if the rinder cannot find purchasers he will cease stripping the tree of its bark.

The bill prescribes the manner of checking and computing quantities cut by mills for the purpose of ascertaining whether the cut exceeds 10,000 feet, whether the material produced be staves, shingles, heading, etc.

Statement of staves, heading, laths and shingles cut by free or fishermen's mills on the three mile limit:

District.	Staves.	Heading.	Laths.	Shingles.
Trinity.	2,528,000	475,000		
Bonavista.	168,000	64,000	3,000	13,000
Fortune			150,000	100,000
	2,696,000	539,000	153,000	113,000
Value $18,872.00		$5,390.00	$306.00	$180.20
Total value		... ...		$24,748.20
Total equivalent in feet board measure				1,920,000 ft.

Statement of staves, heading, laths and shingles, cut by mills which are not free or fishermen's mills operating on the three mile limit, which cut over 10,000 feet:

District	Staves.	Heading.	Laths.	Shingles.
Harbour Main				10,000
Trinity	1,705,000	383,000	15,000	4,626,000
Bonavista	2,418,000	184,000		1,233,000
Twillingate	106,000	25,000	1,503,000	1,470,000
Fogo	10,000		30,000	250,000
St. George's		6,000	80,000	200,000
Fortune	4,000		19,000	2,238,000
Burin	1,000		61,000	105,000
Placentia and St. Mary's	30,000	9,000	6,000	675,000
	4,274,000	607,000	2,314,000	10,807,000
Value	$29,918.00	$6,070.00	$4,628.00	$17,291.20
Total value				$57,907.20
Total equivalent in feet board measure				4,155,428 ft.

Quantity of staves, heading, laths, and shingles cut by mills operating without license 1910-11:

District.	Staves.	Heading.	Laths.	Shingles.
Harbor Main				10,000
Trinity	4,233,000	858,000	15,000	4,626,000
Bonavista	2,586,000	248,000	3,000	1,246,000
Twillingate	106,000	25,000	1,503,000	1,470,000
Fogo	10,000		30,000	250,000
St. George's		6,000	80,000	200,000
Fortune	4,000		769,000	2,338,000
Burin	1,000		61,000	105,000
Placentia and St Mary's	30,000	9,000	67000	675,000
	6,970,000	1,146,000	2,467,000	10,920,000
Equivalent in feet B. M.	3,485,000	1,146,000	352,428	1,092,000
Total				6,075,428

Quantity of staves, heading, lathsand shingles cut by mills operating with license 1910-11:

District.	Staves.	Heading.	Laths.	Shingles.
Twillingate	64,000	9,000	2,618,000	1,569,000
St George's			50,000	100,000
Burgeo and LaPoile			40,000	50,000
	64,000	9,000	2 708,000	1,719,000
Equivalent in board measure.		9,000	386,856	1,719,000
Or in all				32,000 feet board measure

Statement of number of saw mills vithout license cutting 10,000 feet of board or less per annum:

Trinity	102
Bonavista	15
St. Barbe	2
Fortune	1
Total	120

The approximate average cost of installing each of these mills is estimated by Mr. Thistle at $600, the total value at that rate being $72,000.00. All these mills are operated by water power.

Statement of number of saw millscutting over 10,000 feet board per annum each year:

District.	No. of mills.	How operated. Steam.	Water.	Approx. cost. of installing each mill..	Total
Harbour Main	3		3	$1,300	$3,900
Trinity	61		57	800	45,600
Trinity		4		2,000	8,000
Bonavista	32		18	800	14,400
Bonavista		14		2,000	28,000
Twillingate	23		8	1,000	8,000
Twillingate		15		2,500	37,500
Fogo	3		1	1,000	1,000
Fogo		2		3,000	6,000
St. Barbe	4		2	600	1,200
St. Barbe		2		3,000	6,000
St. George's	1	1		2,000	2,000
Burgeo and LaPoile	1	1		2,000	2,000
Fortune	9		3	600	1,800
Fortune		6		3,000	18,000
Burin	5		4	800	3,200
Burin		1		2,000	2,000
Placentia and St. Mary's ..	9		6	600	3,600
Placentia and St. Mary's ..		3		2,500	7,500
	151	49	102		$200,200

N. B. Cost of mills estimated by Mr. Thistle.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of Railway Loan Bill.

HON MR. GIBBS—I beg leave to move that this Bill be read a second time. As hon. members will observe the object of this Bill is to raise a sum of money for the purpose of making provision for the construction and completion of the branch lines of railway. It is unnecessary to go into details in connection with this matter, as hon. members are doubtless familiar with the whole matter. I would move that the Bill be read a second time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Retiring Allowances and Debenture Bonds Loan Bill were respectively read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Second reading of Workmen's Compensation Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Hon. members will see that the object of this Bill is to extend the benefits of the Workmen's Compensation Act to those engaged in the logging industry, making these companies liable in the same way that other companies are for injuries received by the employees in the course of their employment.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House adjourned till to-morrow at 3 p. m.

WEDNESDAY, March 4th. 1914.

The House met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

The President informed the House that he had received a communication from His Excellency the Governor informing him that he had granted leave of absence to Hon. J. D. Ryan, for the remainder of the session.

The Combines and Monopolies Bill House of Assembly Representation Bill, and White Slave Traffic Bill were read a third time, passed and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Job, the House then went into Committee on the Seal Fishery Bill.

HON. MR. JOB—There is also a necessary section as regards the clearance of ships. It is as follows to stand as section 15:—

"No Customs officer shall clear any ship for the sealfishery from any port north of St. John's in the case of steel ships before the 13th of March, wooden ships the 11th of March, from St. John's, steel ships the 12th day of March, wooden ships the 11th of March, and steamers for the Gulf the 9th of March."

The amendment was put and carried.

HON. MR. JOB—There is another amendment which I have to propose, and which I referred to yesterday regarding the question of appeal. It is as follows: "19. If any person shall feel himself aggrieved by any judgment of the stipendiary magistrate under this Act, he shall be at liberty to appeal therefrom to the next sitting of the Supreme Court at St. John's or on Circuit. provided that notice of the same shall be given to the magistrate within forty-eight hours after such judgment shall have been delivered, and within five days thereafter recognizances or other security with or without sureties at the option of such magistrate shall be entered into to prosecute the same without delay and to pay such amount as may be awarded with costs."

The amendment was put and carried.

HON. MR. JOB—I would propose as the last section, "The Acts mentioned in the Schedule hereto are hereby repealed, in so far as the same are inconssitent with the provisions of this Act."

SCHEDULE.

55 Vict. Cap. 2, "an Act to regulate the prosecution of the Sealfishery."

61. Vict. Cap. 4, "An Act respecting the Prosecution of the Sealfishery."

The amendment was put and carried.

HON. MR. JOB—Positively the last amendment. In the title strike out the words "to amend 55 Vict. Cap. 2, entitled."

The amendment was put and carried.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Job, the Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendments, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Saw Mills Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—Some years ago this industry was not nearly so important as it is now. At that time there were large imports of ash staves, the duty being only $1.20 a thousand. The staves were of an inferior kind, and very cheap. When there was a big demand for fish in packages on the market, these were made up to the detriment of the local coopers, and it was suggested at the time that something should be done to stop the importation. A meeting of the Cooper's Union was held and it was decided that the Government of

the day be asked to alter the duty on ash staves. I suggested that this course be taken and that the duty be fixed at $3.00 a thousand. A deputation was appointed to wait on the Government, of which I was a member, and our request was granted. The consequence was that no more inferior ash staves were imported, and the present industry had its practical start from that time. This is a very important bill. Ten years ago staves were only worth from $2.50 to $3.00 a thousand. We should not hamper the industry in any way as it is largely engaged in by fishermen who get out these logs in the winter, and saw them in the spring. Passing through the country a couple of years ago, I was amazed to see the large quantities of good timber that had been destroyed in forest fires, property worth millions of dollars to our people. I am aware that already legislation has been passed to prevent as far as possible forest fires, and with good results, but it is indeed pitiable to witness the grave spectacle of the work of the forest fires in the past.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I wish to call the attention of the House to what appears to me to be discrimination. Under the first section those taking out licenses have to pay a royalty of 10 cents per thousand shingles a year, while under section 2 those who are already operating the mills on the three-mile limit have to pay $1.00 per thousand feet board measure, and there is nothing at all said about shingles. The small mills do not pay $1.00 per thousand feet board measure, but of course they will cut board, and those who already have licenses have to pay $1.00 per thousand feet. That appears to me to be discriminating against the man cutting board measure.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In reply to an hon. member I may say that the object of this Bill is to exclude what is called the fisherman's mill from the payment of a royalty which another class of mill will have to pay under this Act. The first section of the Bill refers to what are known as fishermen's or free mills, and if the amount of board measure cut by them in any year exceeds 10,000 feet, then they become liable to pay $1 per thousand feet, but if not they don't have to pay any royalty beyond a royalty of 10 cents per thousand shingles. I may say that very few of these mills do cut over 10,000 feet board measure. Their principal work is making lobster staves and boxes. It is for the purpose of regulating the operating of the mills within the three-mile limit, and also of preventing some of them from operating in certain localities that this Bill is framed. In estimating the quantity cut by these mills everything that they manufacture is taken into account. The scale is set forth in section 3. In deference to a request of Hon. Mr. Harvey, I would ask that section 3 stand over till to-morrow.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Railway Loan Bill.

Hon. Mr. Winter took the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Retiring Allowances Bill.

Hon. Mr. Robinson in the Chair.

Committee rose, and reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Debenture Bonds Bill.

Hon. Mr. Job in the Chair.

Committee reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Job it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on Work 'ngmen's Compensation Bill.

Hon. Mr. Ayre in the Chair.

Committee reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Ayre it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Hon. President read a message from the Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act to regulate the employment of men engaged in Logging," in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the Bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House then adjourrned until to-morrow, at 4 o'clock.

THURSDAY, March 5th.

The Council met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Mr. Gibbs, the Railway Loan Bill, Retiring Allowances Bill, Debenture Bonds. Loan Bill, and Workmen's Compensation Bill were respectively read a third time passed and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Seal Fishery Bill was read a third time, passed and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Saw Mills Bill.

Hon. Dr. Skelton took the Chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The third section of this Bill was allowed to stand over from yesterday for the purpose of inserting a sub-section with regard to tub staves manufactured in Saw Mills. I would, therefore, beg to move that the following sub-section be added:

"10,000 tub staves shall be equal to 1000 feet board measures."

In the 5th section after the words "Crown Lands Act" insert the figures, "1913".

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendments, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time to-morrow.

SECOND READING OF LOGGING BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg leave to move that this Bill be read a second time. In so doing I beg to point out to hon. members that the first section of the Bill provides that loggers shall have the right to discontinue employment upon giving a week's previous notice, and that if they leave without notice they forfeit the wages coming to them for the unexpired portion of the month, whereas if they have given notice they are to be paid all wages due to them, and in case of delay on the part of the employer in settling up, the latter becomes liable to a penalty of $1.00 a day for each day's delay. Of course for legislation of this kind there is a precedent already on the Statute Book in relation to the Fisheries Service, where if the receiver of the voyage fails to pay the amount of the share he becomes liable to a similar penalty as

this imposes, which, may be recovered by the party to whom the share is due. Another portion of section 1, provides that when the logger is engaged he shall be supplied with a ticket upon which shall be written the amount of wages to be paid. The ticket is to be signed by some person on behalf of the employer.

Section 2 makes it obligatory on the part of the employer to furnish each logger with a written statement of the time which he has worked and is entitled to be paid for. Section 3 makes a provision for the sleeping compartments being kept separate from the eating compartments, and section 4 makes provision for the appointment of an inspector by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, whose duty it shall be to report any breaches of the law to the employer as well as to the Minister, and after reporting if the complaints are not remedied, he shall institute legal proceedings against the offending party before a stipendiary magistrate. The section also makes provision for the removal of the Inspector should he fail to perform his duty, on complaint of fifty loggers, that he has so failed. The Minister of Agriculture & Mines shall inquire and dismiss the Inspector if the complaint is sustained. The section further goes on to provide as to the form of the report which the Inspector shall make ,the number of camps visited, their conditions, number of men occupying each camp, wages paid, number of men using baths, quality of food and any further information bearing upon camp life.

The next section, five, gives power to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to prepare a menu or schedule of food to be supplied to loggers while employed at their work, and that being prescribed, the employer shall provide according to that schedule, or otherwise he renders himself liable to a fine of not less than $100 and not more than $500 for each offence. Section 6 has reference to the sleeping apartments of the men and makes it compulsory on the part of the employer to provide a suitable bunk and mattress for each logger. The next section refers to bed clothing which shall be supplied to loggers at actual cost. Section 8 refers to axes which are to be supplied free of cost and if lost, the value to be deducted from wages of loser. Section 9 makes provision for a bath tub to be supplied each camp and a suitable supply of warm water to be on hand in order that loggers after a hard day's work may enjoy the luxury of a bath; in other words a good rub down before turning in. The next section provides the manner in which camps are to be protected from rain and wind and cold. Section 11 makes it obligatory that a physician shall visit each camp at least once a month and no charge is to be made loggers for medicine but a charge of thirty cents a man per month shall be made by the Company ,payable at headquarters, in consideration of which fee loggers shall have proper treatment, including nursing and proper food. On board ships medicine is given free of charge, and there is a precedent for legislation of this character. The next section provides for penalties and gives half to the person making complaint, in other words, the informer. This, I have no doubt, will prove objectionable to some hon. gentlemen of this house.

I am not able to give hon. members the reasons for this legislation but it has been before the Lower House and has passed there with unanimity on the part of members, and that in itself is a sufficient justification for the necessity of laws of this kind, because if unanimity

did not exist there it might be said that there is no reason for the enactment of a Bill of this character. I therefore move the second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. MURPHY—I would like to make a few remarks on this Bill, I have carefully gone over it, and judging from the whole thing, I think if we have to amend it there will be little of it left. I shall go through the various sections and state my experience of thirty years. In the first section loggers are required to give notice of one week before leaving their employment. The great trouble at the present time and in these parts has been to get men to go in the woods in the fall and remain in for the whole winter cut. I had the same trouble, for in my day when Christmas came, they wanted to go home. We did not object to that if they lived near, but if their homes were far away it was very objectionable as in many cases they never came back. If we could not get men to sign an agreement for three or four months, they would always be breaking up their camps, and the companies operating today are up against the same thing. It means having two crews, and whereas a camp of 20 men and four horses would be sufficient at the beginnig of the season they would have to have instead about 60 or 70 men before the season closed. Just as soon as a man becomes trained,and of some use, he is off and one has to take a new man in his place, and the same results cannot be had from him. It is only in the case of the trained man who has been at the work for years, where there is no desire to go away.

I got over the trouble by having men who were reared up at the business and knew nothing of the fishery, and did not want to go, and I kept them by giving work to them and their sons. The large bulk of men in mills in Canada today are permanent and the lumbermen there can put in lumber very much cheaper than we can here. There are hundreds of Frenchmen in Canada today who would be glad to come here and cut our pulp wood, and would make big money and they are not getting as much by $2 per thousand as it is costing our companies; and yet it is impossible for our concerns to do better while they are continually shifting men. No doubt after many years they will live that down, as I did. In the last years of my experience, I would not take a man if he was going to the sealfishery. We advised men to remain with us, and we endeavored to get them to settle nearby. No doubt, the companies will do the same thing, but if we make this Bill law, we are offering the people a premium to continue what they are doing now, because the men have only to give a week's notice and can get out any time. Things are bad enough now, but if you pass this law, you will legalize what the companies are trying to live down in the interests of the men themselves as well as of the companies—before they can put lumber in as cheap as they are doing in Canada to-day.

With regard to the payment, that part is all right; a man should be paid for the time he has worked if he wants to get out, and my experience is that once a man makes up his mind to go. it is better to let him go, because he has not the interests of his employer at heart at all. I think the man who introduces such a law as this, shows lack of experience; he is not looking far enough ahead. We want more employment of this kind in our country, and we have the means of employing hundreds of people more than we do, but until those at present engaged in the work make good, there is very poor encouragement to other foreign con-

cerns to come in here and start other mills. Consequently, I think that we are doing an injustice to the very people this bill is supposed to benefit, and I feel confident if matters were only explained to the men employed, and what the consequences would be, they would never ask for the Bill. We are not doing any good to them by enacting this law, and if it comes to that, why should we enact a law for any industry? The people in Canada have never had such a law; it was never necessary. The man who pays the best wages and treats his men the best, always has plenty of men, and the best of them, and those who do not do so will have to put up with inferior men. If we are going to make a law setting a price for everybody, and inexperienced men are to get the same wages as experienced men, it is not fair. The man with experience should get more than the one who is working his first year. I have had men and you could not trust your teams where they were chopping; I have had them "fell" trees down on my teams and break their backs. Cannot we allow the employers to make their own laws as they do in Canada?

HON. MR. HARVEY—The Bill does not fix any rate of wages.

HON. MR. MURPHY—No that part is cut out. They showed a little sense in cutting that out, but there are other things just as objectionable as that We want our people to get more labor; we want more people employed in the lumber industry of this country. As I said before, we have good prospects in our lumber. We have thousands of nice little water powers surrounded with suitable timber, and there is no reason why these should not be developed if we could get people from outside to invest their money here, but we are going the wrong way about it, by penalizing the people already here. I understand the Albert Reed Co. lost from £10,000 to £15,000 last year, and that the Harmsworth people have never paid a dividend. That is poor encouragement for a man today to start on a pulp proposition. Consequently I do not think any more difficulties should be put in their way. We should help them to get over the present trouble. No doubt local conditions have cost them a lot of money; conditions which they will have to live down before they can get in the same position as mill owners in Canada; but now we are making it all the harder for them. I do not want to hurt our people; I am only too glad they have a chance to work and I think if they consulted their own interests they would never have asked for this Bill. They can get all the work they want, and if they are not satisfied with one Company can get to another. Section 2 says "On each Saturday an agent of the employer shall give to each logger a written statement of the time during the past seven days for which he is entitled to be paid." You cannot expect to have an agent travelling sixty or seventy miles every Saturday. Section 3 is all right. The men should be comfortable, and we must make them so, because we cannot get the same results if we do not. If we do not give them a comfortable place in which to eat their meals and sleep, they will give up the job. There are many small concerns who have nice comfortable camps, built by the owner himself or his son, and one hired man. He builds it to suit his own comforts, and we should not compel him to build a second camp for eating as this section provides. If there is a large camp with a large number of men, then of course it is desirable to have a separate place for cooking.

There is really no necessity what-

ever to make this law, for if Companies knew their business they would look after this themselves. As regards section 4 and the provision for inspectors to see that the law is carried out, the Minister of Agriculture is a lawyer as a rule, and doesn't know much about logging camps. He must select the proper time to send the inspectors out, but he will have his work cut out to get competent men to traverse the country in the depth of a Newfoundland winter. None but those who have experienced it can realize what tramping the country means at this season of the year; only those properly equipped in every way can surmount the hardships which are met with. The work is also risky and great danger is often met with in travelling over ponds. Then there are times when snowshoes are no good. My opinion is that it will be found to be impossible to carry out the work of inspection at all . As regards complaints, if every little occurrence is to be made a subject for complaint, trouble and confusion will result, and I think a Commission should be appointed to look into the whole matter of the logging industry so that employer and employee should get fair play; but to bring in a bill of this kind with, practically speaking, no one knowing anything about it, is as unfair as it is unjust. Then again, with these inspectors it will be a difficult task to get fair and unbiassed reports, as they will be in sympathy with one side or the other. The men should be compelled to give a report as to the conditions of the camps.

As regards the procuring of baths for the men, they can manage this for themselves by cutting down a molasses tierce, but the trouble will be to get hot water. Certainly there will be music between the cook and the man who will dare look for such a luxury in a logging camp. Unless an extra cook is provided, the men will have to have a valet to prepare their baths for them, for who is going to empty the bath when the men are done with it? There has been a great deal of trouble trying to keep these camps clean. I have often seen cooks refuse to put food before men until they had washed themselves. Some of the men may be used to baths, but not the majority of them. The baths, as I said before, can be made by the men themselves, and no doubt the companies will provide them when fitting out, but I do not think the companies will guarantee the hot water. Now, as regards the quality of food to be supplied. Each man knows what he is to get in the camps, for before he engages to go logging he can satisfy himself as to the kind of food he will get. It is only a greenhorn who does not look to this important part. The camps are comfortable and warm, often too warm, because there is not enough ventilation in them. With regard to the penalty of $100 to $500 for failure to provide the prescribed food, there may be some years, when a company may be well equipped, but I have known of times when you could not get a barrel of flour or anything else in these camps for two or three weeks, and I have been myself with three pairs of horses all tied up for the two or three weeks feeding the horses, and the men could get no supplies over the lakes, so that eventually I had to employ dog teams to get what was absolutely necessary.

But now, because they run short of a few raisins or dried apples under this Bill the Company can be fined from $100 to $500, and the person complaining can pocket half the fine. This law seems to me to be

absurd. It is simply giving a chance to men who think they have some cause for complaint, to get even with the companies in this way. Some will have a grudge against the 'bosses', and will go to any trouble to take action. In my experience there is greater trouble in getting a good foreman than any other man. I have invariably found that if Newfoundlanders are left to themselves, under good men and treated and handled well, they are good men, but put them under bad bosses, and they are all bad. There is no doubt that these men would be only too glad to get back at the bosses, through the owners. As regards section 10, these camps are generally boarded up. It is always cheaper to cover them with board than anything else. These boards close together and thus make the camp comfortable and warm. The camps are also well fitted up and lined inside. I agree with the provision for the visits of the doctors to the camps every month, if only to look at the condition of the people and see how they live and keep their camps. I think it should be the duty of the mill owners to see to that without being compelled to do so by law. There is not a mill in Canada today where the owners have an up to date hospital near at hand for their own people. Take the Nova Scotia Steel Company and others in Sydney. They have an hospital right where they are (one that the Government is called upon to make for them specially) and the only thing the Companies supply is the patients. They were never called upon to build a hospital for themselves. A sick man is not wanted in a lumber camp. He is generally got out as soon as possible. With regard to supplying lodging in camp for the agents, the men are always glad to see an agent around, and will treat him O.K. As to section 14, there are people too lazy to work who would only be too glad of an opportunity to find an easy way to make money without working for it. This system of imposing fines is vicious and wrong. There is no reason why we should be called upon to penalize people for such trivial matters as we see enumerated in this Act. The fishermen themselves have never been consulted in the matter.

The man or men who drafted this Bill knew very little about logging conditions, and the Bill seems to have been framed by those who for other reasons have become popular with the fishermen. It seems to me to be a sorry way to show interest in the welfare of the fishermen, to prevent the pulp mills and owners of lumbering mills from getting over their present trouble by legislating against them and making it harder for them to carry on their business. The parties behind this measure evidently did not look far enough ahead. In the best interests of the people themselves and of all concerned, I think it is unfair to put this through. It would be better to send the Bill back and see to it that employers and employed are treated right. Do not put the mill people in a worse plight than they are today. We are not doing enough now to encourage capital to come to us. The mill owners are beset by money difficulties and in the interests of the common welfare do not legislate them out of existence. This Bill, I assure you gentlemen, should not be passed. Nothing should be done to injure the present industry or discourage others who may wish to come into the country. I take a great interest in the lumbermen and fishermen and therefore, Mr. President, as far as I can see, the best thing to

do with this Bill in the interests of all concerned, is to read it again this day six months.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Mr. President. I think we have cause for congratulation that we have amongst us a gentleman who is able to give us so enlightening a review of this Bill as my hon. friend, Mr. Murphy, who speaks with the experience of a lumber operator of thirty years standing, and whose analysis of the Bill makes it perfectly clear, I think, that this is altogether too important a matter to be dealt with, as it should be dealt with, at this late hour in the session.

The effect of this Bill is decidedly far-reaching, and it is one that we ought to most carefully weigh before we pass it. We had before us last week another measure emanating from the same source, a Sealing Bill, which required amending in every section, if not, indeed, in every line, and I do not think we should be asked within two or three days of the closing of the House, to attempt to consider this Bill, more especially as no information whatever has been given as to the reasons for the inclusion of its various sections. Doubtless the introducer of the measure in the Assembly considers there were reasons for the framing of this Bill in the form in which it is presented to us, but I think we are at least entitled to know before we pass the measure what these reasons are.

Instead of that, however, the Bill has been sent up to us without even a member of the House being asked to take charge of it in this Chamber, so that my hon. friend opposite, Mr. Gibbs, out of charity, so to speak, had to move its second reading, and even he has declared that he is not in a position to state the reasons why it was introduced, or why the several sections have been incorporated in it. I submit that it is absurd to ask this House to put on the Statute Book a measure of this character without our being informed of the reasons for it, and the effects which it is expected to have, and while I do not say that the ignoring of the House in this manner was due to any other cause than lack of knowledge of Parliamentary procedure, I respectfully submit that before we undertake the consideration of the measure we ought to be fully informed as to its purport.

As this Bill was originally presented in the other Chamber it contained two clauses providing for a minimum wage, but these have now been struck out. From the viewpoint of the men who believe in a minimum wage such clauses in the Bill would be quite understandable; and the remaining sections of the measure which we have now before us would then be an essential corollary. In other words, the Bill would require a minimum wage to be given the men, and would require other things to be done for them; and it should, on the other hand afford a degree of protection to the mill owners and logging contractors. Instead, however, it is a matter of common notoriety that sentiment in the Assembly was so opposed to the minimum wage provision that the introducer was obliged to withdraw these two sections, and so we have before us today, what is, to use an oft-quoted expression, a case of the play of Hamlet with the principal character missing; and what is left is a Bill calling for certain things to be done that, as it stands, are utterly impossible of carrying out, or quite undesirable, in some respects, even if they could be.

For instance, the first section enables men to leave their employment by giving a week's notice, whereas Mr. Murphy tells us, with the authority of an expert, that what is required is

some scheme by which men can be discouraged from leaving their work, and induced to remain for the whole season for their own monetary advantage, even more than that of their employers. Then we have a provision that the men must be given a written statement of their time every Saturday, possibly a desirable enough regulation, if we knew why it had become necessary, but seeing that it is not done by other concerns, such, for instance, as at Bell Island Mines, we are, I submit, entitled to ask what are the reasons which dictated its inclusion in this Bill and why should we be asked to pass it into law until these reasons are supplied to us?

Then, there is a provision made for inspectors, and it seems to me Mr. President, that we have had altogether too much legislation providing for inspectors this session and if we keep on at this sort of thing we will soon be able to mobilize an army of inspectors of one kind or another sufficiently large to put down the revolt in Mexico.

I would next point out that these inspectors are required to carry out certain duties, but when one comes to analyze these provisions one begins to see that they are in reality a screaming farce. Let me illustrate. Although it is provided that inspectors shall be appointed and the theory is that they shall live in the lumber camps, there is no provision in the bill requiring the logging operators to board or lodge them, though there is provision that an agent representing the loggers shall be boarded and lodged when requested, but he is another personage altogether, who I will come to later. The unfortunate inspector, therefore, will have to sleep in the woods and feed himself on rabbits, unless he carries his grub in a pack on his back, so far as the Bill is concerned. Then it requires him to report once a month on the number of camps he has visited, the condition thereof, the number of men occupying the same and the wages paid them per day; the number of men using the baths, the quality of food supplied and any further information bearing upon camp life in its operation. This may be very essential information, but there is no machinery whatever provided in the Bill by which the inspector is to obtain this information and nobody named to give it to him.

To begin with, there is no clause in this Bill giving the inspector specific authority to enter upon the property of any lumberman or millowner for the purpose of securing this data, and lacking such specific authority, nobody need allow an inspector on his property or into his camps, but can eject him as a trespasser, and the inspector has no redress. Moreover, even if he should get in by courtesy of the owner there is no obligation imposed on anybody to supply the information. The owner, for instance, is not required by anything in this Bill, to give an inspector the number of men in the camp or the wages paid them or the number using the baths. The cook is required, it is true, to provide hot water, but he is not compelled to keep tally of the men who take baths or how often they do it. Again, although in theory the inspector, I presume, is to cover a territory which will occupy him for a month, he making, as it were, a monthly round, there is nothing in the Bill to prescribe what time he shall remain in any camp or what he shall do with himself when he has the information prescribed in the bill secured as to any given camp.

Yet another point. Provision is made that an inspecor must investigate any complaints made by fifty loggers, but it is set out that the signatures of these must first be proved by some-

body's affidavit. Now, let us take, for instance, the case of men in lumber camps at the head of Red Indian Lake, separated by the length of the Lake and the Harmsworth railroad from Millertown Junction and then by the Reid road to Grand Falls, from any Justice of the Peace. How is it going to be possible to prove the signatures of these people by an affidavit under these circumstances?

Again let me point to a provision attached to that I have just noted, which I consider little short of idiotic. It says: "Upon complaint of neglect of duty signed by not less than fifty loggers, inspectors complained of should be dismissed by the Minister; provided no dismissal shall take place until or before a full inquiry has been held by the Minister; and unless he is satisfied that the charge against the inspector has been proven." Now, will somebody please tell me how a complaint made by men at a lumbering camp in the interior of this country in the middle of winter can be investigated by the Minister, unless he goes out there himself for the purpose of taking evidence and ascertaining the facts of the matter, and is it to be seriously proposed that this duty shall be cast upon the gentleman who holds that office for the time being, namely, that he must himself personally investigate every charge of this kind that is made.

Then again there is also reference in the Bill to an agent of the loggers. We have no explanation of who this is to be, or why he is to be, what his duties are, or where he is to figure at all. Is he to be a sort of Trades Union delegate, and if so, how is his status to be prescribed? There is no Loggers Union and is there to be one such agent for the whole of the lumbermen that are employed in the interior, or is there to be one for every camp or for every distinct company operating? Again, who is to pay this agent, what are to be his duties and why should we give legal recognition to any such person until at least we know the purpose for which he is being created? We have not made provision for fishermen's representatives of this kind, for sealer's representatives, for farmer's representatives, and why then should we be asked to recognize agents of loggers and what, moreover, will be the effect of our recognizing such persons? These are all matters that should be explained to us before we are asked to pass this Bill.

These are glaring defects but so it goes on in every line of this Bill. It is unnecessary for me to do more than I have done thus far in pointing out its weak points, to make it evident that on this score, at any rate, the case for postponement is very conclusively proved.

I now propose to deal with another aspect of this Bill, and it is this, The measure, we are told, comes to us with the stamp of the F.P.U. or in other words, is approved by the Fishermen's Union. Why, I ask, is it then, that the same measures are not provided with regard to the treatment of the fishermen themselves. There are hundreds, if not thousands, of men all round this country, fishermen,shipped men,or sharemen lodged and boarded by the Planters who hire them. If there is need to provide a schedule of food as Section 5 of this Bill enacts, for the use of the men in logging camps surely it is necessary to have a similar schedule for the use of fishermen in bunk houses or similar places all round the seaboard, and if inspection of lumber camps is essential and provision is made for men taking baths up in the woods in the middle of February, with the thermometer perhaps 25 below zero, it ought at least be equally ne-

cessary to provide for the accomodation of the fishing classes and the securing of baths for them when they are engaged in the fishery business. Moreover, if a shipped man in the logging industry is to have the right to leave whenever it suits him, why is not the same provision made for a shipped man in the codfishery? Then, again, it is provided by this Bill that the cook houses or bunk houses in the logging woods shall be distinct, but there are thousands of people going to the Banks, Labrador and around the coast in connection with the fisheries, who are living in forecastles of schooners, in berths, ranged around it, with all the cooking done on a small stove right amongst them. Now, I ask, if that sort of thing is prohibited in the lumber woods, why isn't it prohibited on these fishing vessels, and why have we not an army of inspectors created to go into the forecastles of schooners and see that the men have food and lodging at least equal to what is called for under this Bill. If our people are able to live at the codfishery and face the conditions they do, surely the Bill now before us is not necessary in regard to the logging industry.

Then again, it is provided under this Bill, that employers must oblige a physician to visit each logging camp at least once a month and that no charge shall be made on the loggers for the medical services of the doctors so supplied unless hospital treatment and medicine is furnished, and for these the men shall not pay more than thirty cents a month. In the numerous other industries in this country doctors are not provided free. Even in the seal fishery, about which we have been legislating the past week, it is not provided that the men shall get a doctor's services for nothing. Men don't get it on the Railway, in the mines or in other enterprises they don't even get ordinary medical treatment without paying at least thirty or forty cents a month, and they certainly don't get hospital treatment for that figure. I submit, therefore, that this Bill is one that has very little to commend it on the score of logic, common sense or fair play. I do not mean by this to be considered as maintaining that ideal conditions exist in the lumber woods and that things could not be better; but before I am prepared to assent to the second reading of this or any other Bill, I want to have it shown to me why the Bill is introduced, what is the need of it, and of what magnitude are the grievances it proposes to remedy.

My next inquiry regarding this Bill is, why is it introduced at the present time? So far, certainly, as we in this House are concerned, we have not heard of any complaints as to conditions in the logging camps that would justify the Bill. There may be much need for it, but we haven't one shadow or tittle of information before us today to warrant our accepting it. We know, on the other hand, that the pulp industry is not paying in this island so far. It is a matter of public record, as shown by the official reports of the two companies operating pulp mills amongst us, the Albert Reed and Harmsworth concerns, that the former lost $65,000 in its operations last year, and that the Harmsworth Company, while it made a slight profit, has never paid a dividend during all the seven years that the money of its shareholders has been invested in this country. We know moreover, that as a result of representations made by these companies to the Government quite recently, proposals have been put forward looking to a removal of the duty from sulphur, imported for the making of sulphite pulp, an indispens-

able ingredient in the manufacture of paper. In the face of these conditions, is it desirable, unless there are grave reasons for so doing, to put a measure of this kind on the Statute Book at the present time? I say it is not. Of course if there were systematic ill-treatment of the men, if they were over worked, underpaid, underfed and subjected to hardships unreasonable in their industry, I say by all means let us put the Bill through and under suspended rules if necessary; but to ask us to adopt a measure of this kind, without a solitary instance being quoted here to justify it, I think, is going too far.

The next question, I submit, which we should ask ourselves is, are there any such laws in force anywhere else where this industry exists? I am informed by those who claim to be in a position to speak with authority, that in Norway and Sweden, which have large pulp and paper enterprises, there is no legislation whatever regarding this industry except a Workmen's Compensation Bill. That information may not be correct, but we have nothing to offset it and so must assume it is true. Now, as it happens Scandinavia is our keenest competitor in this industry today. The pulp and paper produced in Norway and Sweden and marketed in England fix the standard price for the produce from this country in the British market. I believe it is safe to say, all things considered, our manufactures cannot compete with the Norwegians, and if we enact a measure of this kind compelling those interested in this industry amongst us to face still greater difficulties, the position not alone becomes worse for them, but the tendency will be to scare off other people who might, under less discourageing circumstances, be willing to come amongst us and establish similar industries.

Here is a memorandum on the subject of the conditions in Scandinavia:—

"In Norway and Sweden all work done in the woods is done as piece work. A man and a horse together get ten kroner or about $2.70 per day, this being an average rate of pay. Out of this the owner of the horse has to feed the animal and provide board and lodging for himself. The maintenance of a horse is about 60 cents per day and that of a man about 35 cents more. All the hauling of logs in those countries is done by contract and two trips a day are usually made each trip with a load of twenty logs, seven inches in the small end and 21 to 23 feet long. The ordinary wood choppers are paid one twelfth of a kroner or about three cents per log. By cutting an average of twenty-five logs of the above size per day, he gets an income of three kroner for himself, but out of this he has to feed himself, which, as I have already said, costs him thirty-five cents a day. No doctors are supplied at all. If a man wants a doctor he has to provide for him at his own expense."

I am assured of the same thing with regard to Canada, that although it has such a large number of pulp and paper mills and so many thousands of people are engaged in log cutting every winter, it has no such legislation as we are asked to pass today. The Canadian loggers are not considered to need any more protection than the ordinary laws of the country afford them. Canada is destined to be a keen competitor of ours and a curious situation has arisen as between us, namely, that in Canada they are finding themselves able to produce pulp and paper at a lower

rate than we can. As railways open up in Canada we will have even more competition from that country and it ought not to be forgotten in connection with this matter that it doesn't pay now to cut spruce and fir for lumber in Newfoundland. It is the pine, which brings in about $35 per thousand, that makes it a paying proposition to attempt lumbering here. It is estimated that it costs $2.00 per thousand feet more for wood for pulp-making amongst us here in Newfoundland than it does in Canada.

Further as to the matter of the wages the Toronto Star of January 30th, or only a month ago,makes the statement that a lumberman from Northern Ontario went to that city and offered fifteen unemployed men—for the newspapers have been full of stories of the thousands of workless people in Toronto this winter—to go to work at $25 per month in his lumber camp. In other words men are working in the lumber camps of Ontario to-day for $25 per month and that the lumbering companies here are prepared to pay at least that to any man who will ship with them and stay the winter out. In the Ottawa Journal of February 4th., I find allusion to the fact that the lumbermen get from $20 to $25 per month and also that they have to pay 75 cents a month for a doctor's services, this, be it noted, not including hospital treatment or any other medicines only those furnished out of the medicine chest at the camp or what the doctor may have with him when he makes his round. More expensive medicines, surgical attention, and hospital accomodation are extras.

I have also a publication here issued by the State Labor Bureau of the State of Maine, including an article entitled "Industrial Conditions in the Maine woods." I will not burden the House with any lengthy extracts from it, though I shall be glad to put it at the disposal of any Hon. member who may care to peruse it. But I should like to say that this is a Government publication and I propose to quote a few brief extracts from it showing that in all essentials conditions are substantially the same in the State of Maine to-day as they are in this colony. It says on the point of labor "there has not been "much change in the hours of labor "in late years." As in the early days "the rule is from daylight to dark. "The men get up in the morning an "hour or so before daybreak and "walk a mile or more to the cutting "ground, sometimes waiting for the "sun to rise so that they can see "how to hew the trees. They work "steadily with half an hour for lunch "late in the forenoon until dark. In "December this does not make a very long day. but in January and "February the woodsmen work many "hours."

The next condition to which it refers is not one, I am glad to say, which prevails amongst us. The quotation is "Formerly it was a long trip to a woods camp, but nowadays a man can leave Boston in the morning and be there at night, just what large numbers are doing. Employment agents send thousands into the woods in this manner each year. That the quality of the labor supplied for the woods has deteriorated in the past decade or so is the universal complaint of the operators. Formerly the men belonged to the State and took a pride in their work Now they are foreigners and derelicts of the cities and the old-time workmen did a great deal more than the present day ones, according to the operators."

In the Maine camps, so another paragraph says: "The bunks are ranged in two tiers, one two feet or less from the floor, and the other five or six feet above the floor. Two men sleep in each bunk, the bunks being separated from each other by partitions. Ventilation is provided by a skylight in the roof, Not always is this used and after supper the air is often blue with smoke." As a matter of fact, I may add in passing, one of the complaints of doctors and other visitors to our camps is not lack of heat but excess of heat and lack of ventilation. Moreover, with us each man has his own bunk.

The food is much the same as with us, canned and corned beef, fresh and salt fish, vegetables, condensed milk, cookies, cake, tea or coffee, some preserves etc. As to wages, experienced teamsters get a dollar a day, sled tenders the same, sawyers 95 cents, yardmen 85 cents, lower grade workers 65 cents a day. Making allowance for the countries, we compare in this country very favourably with our neighbors in Maine. The whole question of life in the lumber woods is treated in this publication and what I have quoted is sufficient to show that, as I have said, in all essentials conditions are much the same as here.

In view of all these facts then, it seems to me that before we pass this Act we should know more definitely where we stand than we do at the present time. The last speaker, Hon. Mr. Murphy, has made it clear that conditions in the logging industry are very much more satisfactory than they were in bygone days, that the people are, broadly speaking, comfortably housed and fed; that the wages have increased very decidedly, and while none will question the right of the woodmen to the best pay, the best food and the best treatment they can secure, we ought to hesitate to enact a measure of this kind until we know there is a need for it, on the one side, and until we have satisfied ourselves as to what effect the passing of this Bill would have on outside capital.

I take it, that we all desire to have more pulp and paper mills started in this Colony and the question is will the passing of this Act encourage such concerns to come here and operate. I am afraid, Mr. President, that when it comes to be known abroad that we are considering measures of this character, imposing restrictions and obligations upon these lumbering industries which certainly there has been no case made out for and which we know the companies regard as needless, the tendency will be for them to go Scandinavia, Canada or America, to invest their money where they are not subject to such restrictions as are provided in this Bill when, by taking a moderate course we might secure that they would establish here amongst us, thereby providing more work for our people stimulating better wages and generally improving the condition of things all round. Moreover, we ought not to forget that during the next few months the Dominions Royal Commission will visit this Colony. That Commission has been appointed by the Imperial Authorities, in conjunction with the Governments of the autonomous overseas dominions, to make a tour of Greater Britain with the object of learning the best way to develop trade between the mother country and the Colonies and to stimulate intercommunication in various ways tending towards the material, social and other development of the Empire. Just imagine the situation which

will confront these gentlemen when they come here about July next. They will see these fine mills up in the interior, but will be told that the Companies operating them have not yet been paid any dividend and are they also, to be told that a further crippling of the enterprises is resulting from the enactment by our Legislature of a measure of this kind? I think we ought not to make ourselves a party to such a situation as that during the present year at any rate.

Before I sit down down I would suggest to my hon. friend, who has moved the six months' hoist for this Bill, that we ought to put on record with some particularity our reason for so doing, and I shall be very pleased to second this motion if he is willing to accept the resolutions which I shall now read:—

Whereas this Bill comes to the House in the last days of the Session and without any explanation whatever as to the reasons why its enactment is asked for.

And Whereas this House holds that it should be furnished with such information before being asked to vote upon the measure.

And Whereas it is a matter of public knowledge that the companies established here for the manufacture of pulp and paper have not yet succeeded in paying dividends.

And Whereas the Government has recognized the existence of this condition by taking power in the present revenue **Bill to remit** when deemed advisable, the duty now imposed on sulphur imported for use in the manufacture of these articles

And Whereas, the enactment of this measure, unless it can be shown that there is ample cause therefor, is calculated to influence outside capital from investment in similar industries in this country.

And Whereas it is desirable that such investments should be encouraged, and it has not been shown to this House that any injury to our own people will result from failure to enact this measure at this session.

Be it therefore resolved that this House, while perfectly willing to consider this measure on its merits when supplied with information to enable it to reach a decision thereon, finds itself unable to proceed further with its consideration at the present time through lack of such information.

And be it Further Resolved that, therefore, in the opinion of this House, this bill should be read a second time this day six months.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I feel that as this bill comes up here practically unanimously passed by the other branch of the Legislature it would be a matter of very doubtful courtesy to forthwith give it the six months' hoist. Personally I should like to study the Bill more before I would adopt the resolutions proposed by my hon. friend. My own feelings about the matter are that the most courteous way we could treat it would be to appoint a Select Committee to deal with the Bill, and that we should wait until we get their report before proceeding any further. I think I would move that the Bill be referred again to a Select Committee.

I feel, however, that this House has been treated with very scant courtesy with regard to the Bill. I don't in the least accuse the originators of the Bill in the Lower House of any intentional discourtesy to this House, but nevertheless it is discourteous to send up a bill of this nature without apparently having asked anybody to look after it. I sympathize with the hon. gentleman who has taken it up, and done his best in submitting it to the consideration of this House, but I certainly do think that this should not be allowed to pass

without somebody referring to it; that a Bill of this elaborate nature should come up here without any kind of reason given to warrant it, and without any means of our discussing it at all intelligently.

Another point about it is that it was only delivered to the House for its second reading, after the House met to-day, and I question whether anybody except Hon. Mr. Murphy has ever seen a copy and can intelligently discuss the second reading. Now in saying this I am not opposing the bill, but on going through it I find that it is really a parallel to the Sealing Bill. It is thoroughly badly drawn, and nearly every section will have to be re-written and amended. In the case of the Sealing Bill we took three days in Committee at such work, and to start in at this late stage and try and make this Bill workable with a Committee of the Whole House, I think is going to be an absolute impossibility.

Personally, I have in different years spent a considerable time in logging camps, and I have a little knowledge of the business, and it seems to me that nine-tenths of the Bill resembles the case of Don Quixote tilting at windmills. At the same time I don't agree that this Bill is introduced for the actual intention of handicapping logging companies. I have no doubt that its real intention is rather to put this logging industry in a condition where it will benefit the companies and the men, but we have to consider that both the large companies operating here have been extremely liberal in their treatment of this Colony. They have had the welfare of the men at heart, and done everything possible for their social welfare. I speak from a personal knowledge of what has taken place at Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls. They have made these model towns, in every way, and the houses there are probably infinitely better than in that part of St. John's where a similar class of man lives. I think we should take all these things into consideration when dealing with this Bill, and I think it would be better not to treat it in the way that has been proposed, and I therefore move that a Select Committee be appointed to deal with it.

HON. MR. ANGEL.—I beg to support the motion of Hon. Mr. Harvey that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. There are many provisions in this Bill which I think will have to be amended.

With reference to the first section, dealing with the employment of the men, I remember when the first mill was started at Benton, the manager had the same difficulty in keeping the men at work. On Saturday nights they wanted to go home, and the result was that they found it impossible to operate the mill, so that they were compelled to make a strict rule that nobody who left their employment without due notice need ever come back, and by strictly adhering to that rule they finally succeeded in getting the crews to work more steadily. I remember the mills now operating at Botwood had the same difficulty, with the result that they had to employ men from Canada. They were obliged to pay those men more than our men, but they could afford to do so, as they worked all the year around, which they could never get the Newfoundlanders to do. I dare say that kind of thing has altered since then. I know that in our mechanical industries the same trouble exists. Men came to us and promised they would not go to the sealfishery, as they wanted steady employment, but when the fishery fever got hold of them we could not keep them.

There is another question I should like to ask, and that is, who employs these agents mentioned in paragraph

2. Their duties are pretty well defined, but we are not told who employs them. Either the loggers or the Government must pay them. With regard to the baths, I think probably we would have to pass a law compelling the men to bathe. I am reminded by this of a story that my hon. friend, Dr. Skelton, told me a few months ago, where an old gentleman was troubled with rheumatism, and the doctor suggested that he be rubbed all over with oil and afterwards in the evening get a thoroughly good washing. The man looked up at the doctor and said, "Doctor, I don't think I have been washed all over ever since I was a baby." I have much pleasure in supporting Mr. Harvey's motion.

The motion of Hon. Mr. Murphy to read the bill six months hence, was then withdrawn, and that of Hon. Mr. Harvey to appoint a Select Committee to investigate and report on the Bill was carried.

The President appointed the following as the Committee:—Hons. Harvey, Gibbs, Robinson, McGrath, Job, Murphy, and the President.

Hon. President read a message from the Assembly that they had passed the amendments made by the Council in and upon the bill entitled "An Act for the Protecton of the Growth of Partridge Berries," with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the amendments were read a first and second time.

HON. MR. JOB.—Since I proposed the amendments to this Bill, we have had a consultation on the subject between the Board of Trade and the Government, aud as a result the Board of Trade agreed to accept this amendment. I must say at the time I was a little disappointed, but the Government generally appeared to be afraid to trust the Board of Trade at present to make regulations, and we thought half a loaf better than no bread, and accepted the amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the amendment passed, and a message was ordered to be sent to the Assembly that this House had passed the amendment without amendment.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs tabled the reports of the cashier of the Newfoundland Savings Bank and of the Inspector of Weights and Measures for the year 13.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House then adjourned until to-morrow at five o'clock.

FRIDAY, March 6th.

The House met at 5 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Saw Mills Bill was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that the House had passed the same with some amendment.

Hon. President read a message from the Assembly that they had passed the accompanying Bills in which they requested the concurrence of the Council namely:—

An Act respecting Municipal Affairs.

An Act to amend 61 Vic., Cap. 8, entitled An Act respecting Salaries.

An Act to amend 61 Vic. Cap. 2, entitled an Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

An Act respecting Nfld. Railways & Train Ferry Service.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs these Bills were then read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. MR. GIBBS gave notice that on to-morrow he would move the suspension of the 33rd Rule of the House in relation to all Bills, Addresses and other matters now before the House or to come before the House, for the remainder of the Session.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House then adjourned until Monday next at three o'clock.

MONDAY, March 9th.

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

ORDER OF THE DAY.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg leave to move the suspension of the 33rd and other rules of the House with respect to all Bills, Addresses and other matters now before or to come before the House for the remainder of the session.

Motion adopted unanimously.

SECOND READING OF THE MUNICIPAL BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg leave to move the second reading of this Bill, and in so doing, I may say it is scarcely necessary for me to point out to the House the reason for the introduction of the Bill. It is the outcome of a petition which was presented to the lower branch of the Legislature, signed by upwards of 3,000 rate payers of St. John's, praying that the election of a Mayor and Council be deferred until 1915, and that the Municipal affairs of the city be placed in the hands of a Committee to be appointed by the Governor-in-Council. The object of the Committee is to enquire into and report on the best forms of Civic Government for the City. The Bill, I may say, was before the lower branch of the Legislature and passed there without division. The second section of the Bill is for the purpose of making $1,000 extra contribution towards the upkeep of the Fire Department, and the third section is in relation to the age at which a person driving for hire in St. John's may be permitted to pursue such avocation. This section is put there at the instance of the Truckmen's Union who petitioned the Municipal Council some time ago pointing out the necessity for setting an age limit for persons applying for licenses as drivers in the city of St. John's. It will be noticed that there is a provision there that the section cannot apply to fishermen or farmers residing outside and not employed in the city limits. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Might I ask the hon. gentleman before he sits down, to explain why is it that no provision is made in section one to carry out the express provision of the petition that the commission to be appointed shall act without remuneration; and why is it that there is no provision for the plebiscite under the Municipal Bill which is also a feature of the petition?

HON. MR. POWER—I wish to call attention to section three of the Bill which places the age limit for those entitled to drive horses at 18. I think a boy of 15 or 16 is quite competent to take charge of a horse, and I think that if this has to be applied in all cases, it must necessarily be a hardship. I know of a case where a father died and left a helpless family. His eldest son was 15 years of age and accustomed to manage his father's horse and to say that that lad shall not be allowed to drive a horse, I think is a great hardship. When we go into Committee I shall offer an amendment that the age limit be 16 years instead of 18.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In reply to Hon. Mr. McGrath, I might say that I do not know why this provision spoken of was not put in the Bill. The Bill was considered in the Lower House and passed without division. The petitions were before them and they were cognisant of the facts of the provisions in them. I shall find out the reasons that induced them to omit these provisions from the Bill and

inform the House wen we go into Committee on the Bill.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I had some observations to make on the second reading of this Bill, but pending the arrival of the information which the hon. gentleman has promised to secure, I have no objection to letting the matter go over until the Committee stage, when we can debate it further.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House tomorrow.

SECOND READING OF THE SALARIES BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In moving the second reading of this Bill, I would point out to the House that under the Act 61 Vict. cap. 8, the salary of the Governor of the Colony was $7,000. By the Act of 63 Vict. it was increased to $10,000, and it is now proposed to raise the salary to $12,500. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Bill, which was reported without amendment, read a third time, passed, and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

SECOND READING OF MARINE AND FISHERIES BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The object of this bill is to enable the department to make rules and regulations for the exportation, inspection, culling etc. of all pickled fish and to make provisions for the issue of labels to factories &c. and the rules when published in the Royal Gazette shall have the force and effect of law. I understand that this section is really a recommendation of the joint commission appointed by the House of Assembly and this branch of the Legislature. The fourth section is for the purpose of enabling the Marine and Fisheries Department to set apart and reserve certain waters for the propagation of the fishes that may be in the waters. This could not be done under the existing law. It is claimed that this is the practice followed in the State of Maine, where artificial propagation of fish, especially the lobster has been carried on for years with much success. Forty years ago it was found necessary in some parts of the United States to make regulations restricting the catching of lobsters. At that time it was believed that if the lobster had an opporunity to lay one litre of eggs that this would be sufficient to ensure a supply for the demand and to that end regulations were directed. It was not long, however, before those having charge of the work were convinced of this biological blunder, because the supply was rapidly decreasing. It is a well known fact that in practically every portion of the North Atlantic Coast the lobster fishery is either depleted, or in a state of decline, and the evidence of this we have in our country. In 1889 the annual catch of lobsters in the United States was about 30,000,000 pounds, valued at $800.000. In the course of ten years the annual crop was reduced to one half, while its value had more than doubled. Since 1899 the failing supply has not been checked. Statistics of Maine and Massachusetts tell the same story. Maine which produced two thirds of the output of this fishery some years ago shows a decline from 14,234,182 pounds with a market value of $268,739 to about 12.000.000, while its value had advanced four fold. The average price per pound in the shell in Canada in 1883 was 9 to 12 cents. Large lobsters

which twenty-five years ago brought five cents a peice, are now sold in the shell at 30 cents a pound, which represents a cost of fifty cents for all edible parts, or over a dollar a pound for the clear meat of the tails and claws alone. Thus from being one of the cheapest food products of the ocean it has become one of the dearest luxuries.

The problem is how to aid nature in increasing the number. According to investigations and scientific research the following are now adopted:—

(1) Closed seasons of various periods in different localities.

(2) A legal gauge or length limit, namely 9 inches in New York, Rhode Island and Connecticut; 10½ in Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts; 9 inches and 10½ in different districts of Canada.

(3) Egg lobster laws, or the prohibition of the destruction of female lobsters.

(4) To increase the supply in the sea by fry artificially hatched and immediately liberated, and as practised in Canada, by holding the berried lobsters in large enclosures, called lobster pounds, and later setting them free when the young are ready to hatch.

(5) By the rearing method, lately introduced, of holding the fry artificially hatched and rearing them until the fourth or fifth stages, when they go to the bottom,and are able to take care of themselves.

The number of eggs produced increases with surprising rapidity in proportion to the cube of the length or total volume of the body of the lobster. The approximate number of eggs according to students of marine biology produced at 8 inches is 5,000; at ten inches, 10,000; at 12 inches, 20,000; at 14 inches, 40,000; at 16 inches nearly 60,000; and at 18 inches, nearly 80,000. In the case of 532, 10 ½ inch berried lobsters taken from the waters of Massachusetts the smallest average and the largest number of eggs borne were from 5,000, 13,000 and 36,000. The maximum production is at the 15 or 16 inch stage when some produce nearly 100,000 at one time.

It will thus be observed that our effects have been mainly directed in protecting the immature or small lobster, while it is the class of big lobsters, which produce the fifty thousands that has been nearly wiped out.

It is asserted as a fact that a lobster lays its eggs but once in two years, and not annually, as was formerly supposed. Ignorance of the fact that there is a definite spawning period, that the eggs are laid but once in two years, and that they are subsequently carried from ten to eleven months to hatch in June or July of the summer following the year when laid is responsible in a considerable measure, for erroneous ideas as regarding the efficacy of closed seasons.

If then, it is true, as we are thoroughly convinced it is, that the normal rate of survival in the lobster is not greater than 2 in 30,000 or 1 in 75,000 (and it cannot be greater than 2 in 10,000) the fact is big with importance to the lobster fishery, and the sooner it is faced the better. It has a direct bearing upon our laws and fishery operations. It enables us to valuate the egg and the lobster truly. It shows in a conclusive manner that the present gauge laws are indefensible, because they rob the fishery of billions of eggs necessary to maintain it. It further shows that the method of hatching the eggs of this animal and immediately liberating its young is ineffective, because of the meagre results which can come from

it. On the other hand, it speaks loudly in favor of a law to protect the large egg producers, and of the newer plan of rearing the young to the bottom-seeking stage, as the only means by which pisciculture can hope to aid this fishery materially.

We speake of the 'living chain' from egg to adult, but the metaphor is not a happy one. There is no 'chain' relation in living nature only a succession of individuals, of individaul eggs, united in origin, but distinct in each generation. The embryologist begins with the egg producer. Spare the egg producer then, and nature will save the race. We cannot wholly take the place of nature in dealing with eggs, but we can defeat the ends of nature by killing the 'bird' which lays them.

But, do you say, "We have the egg lobster law, and the protection of lobsters in spawn should remedy our difficulties?" In reply we have but to recall the fact that adult female lobsters lay their eggs but once in two years, and consequently we should not expect to find more than one-half of this class with spawn attached to the body at any time. This at once reduces the protection aimed at in the egg lobster law by one half. The other half shrinks to small proportions when we consider that there is an overlap of four weeks in July between the climax of the periods of hatching and spawning, when the majority of all adult female lobsters are without eggs of any kind, and also when we further consider the ease with which a fisherman by a few strokes of the hand can make a berried lobster eggless.

The recommendations made by the Buerau of Fisheries of the United States in relation to protection and propagation of the lobster are:

(1) Adopt a double gauge or length limit, placing in a perpetual close season or protected class all below and all above these limits. Place the legal bar so as to embrace the average period of sexual maturity, and thus to include what we have called the intermediate class of adolescents or small adults. These limits should be approximately 9 inches to 11 inches, inclusive, thus legalizing the destruction of lobsters from 9 to 11 inches long when measured alive. In this way we protect the young as well as the larger adults, upon which we depend for a continuous suppiy of eggs. The precise terms of these limits are not so vital, provided we preserve the principle of protecting the larger adults.

(2) Protect the 'berried' lobster on principle, and pay a bounty for it, as is now done, whether the law is evaded or not, and use its eggs for constructive work or for experimental purposes with such work in view.

(3) Abolish the closed season, if it still exists; let the fishing extend throughout the year.

(4) Wherever possible, adopt the plan of rearing the young to the bottom-seeking stage before liberation, or co-operate with the United States Bureau of Fisheries or with sister States to this end.

(5) License every lobster fisherman, and adopt a standard trap or pot which shall work automatically, so far as possible, in favour of the double gauge, the entrance rings being of such diameter as to exclude all lobsters above the gauge, and the slats of the trap of such a distance apart as to permit the undersized animals to escape.

Many objections can be raised, but this plan is definitely on scientific grounds, while the other methods are not. The best thing that can be said of it is that it would eventually give us more eggs, and in an ever-increasing quantity—the greatest need of this fishery, both now and in the future.

Under present conditions, the supply of eggs is yearly diminishing and at a tremendous rate.

The most striking objection to the proposed changes would be that if class 3, that of the big producers, has been nearly exterminated, and we proceed to wipe out class 2, the smaller adults, there will soon be no more lobsters; but this is not valid. No doubt if this change were made, the supply of smaller lobsters would be temporarily increased where the 10½ gauge law still prevails, as was the case in Massachusetts in 1907 when the 9-inch law went into effect: and this might be followed by a temporary stringency. No one can speak with positive assurance upon this subject, but the important point to bear in mind is that under such an arrangement it would have a perpetually protected class constantly growing and at work all the time.

Again, it may be asked: Will enough lobsters survive to enter the exempt class? We believe that there would, and the answer to this question is to be found in the records of catches for every locality where lobsters are now trapped. Even in places where the average size is small, large lobsters occasionally appear, and in sizes showing more than one year's growth. Why were not all such animals weeded out the previous year? Instead of waiting to be caught up in the end, these 'escapes' would all enter the protected growing class, to enjoy a green old age of 50 years, and possibly more, though we have no positive knowledge of the life span in this interesting race.

The trouble of a double gauge, such expenses as would be needed in adjusting traps to admit and hold lobsters of the legal size, would have to be met but it would be well worth while. In our opinion the markets would not be seriously disturbed. Protect the big egg producers and nature will preserve the race.

Without doubt there are many who consider any legal measure involving a double gauge impracticable because of the difficulty of carrying it out, for to be effective it must be uniformly adopted and enforced. If the present laws are to be maintained in principle, the following steps should be taken.

(1) Raise the legal gauge to 10½ inches wherever it now stands below this limit.

(2) License every lobster fisherman, and adopt a standard trap, with slats of sufficient distance to permit the undersized lobsters to escape.

(3) Destroy the present enormously destructive interstate commerce in short lobsters.

(4) Do not turn another larval lobster into the sea, but devote the energy expended in lobster hatcheries to rearing these young to the bottom-seeking stage after the methods now successfully practised in Wickford, R.I.

There can be no doubt whatever, that our lobster fishery is doomed unless we seek the best and most efficient means of protecting it. Where we packed 76,000 cases twenty years ago, exclusive of the fishing done by the French on the Treaty Coast, which if taken into account would make the total about 100,000 cases, the past year we did not pack 16,000. It has all been due to a want of knowledge as to the best means of protecting the fishery and as to how it can be most successfully carried on, and if any means can be devised for protecting the industry it will be worth thousands to the country, considering the present price of lobsters. I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time and on motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Bill.

HON. DR. SKELTON in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill was then read a third time and passed, and a message sent to the Assembly that this House had passed the same without amendment.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to move the second reading of the Train Ferry Service Bill, and desire to point out that the Bill sets forth that the Newfoundland Railway and Train Ferry Syndicate, Ltd., have made a proposition to the Government for the construction of a railway across the Isthmus of Avalon, in the Island of Newfoundland, from Rantem, or from such other port in Trinity Bay as may be found desirable, to Little Southern Harbour, or such other port in Placentia Bay as may be found desirable, with the intention of operating a train-ferry service therefrom to Louisburg, in Cape Breton, or such other port as may be found desirable, and also for the construction of a railway from Humbermouth, Bay of Islands, to South West Arm, Green Bay with a branch therefrom to White Bay, with the intention of operating a train-ferry service from the said Bay of Islands to Gaspe, in the Province of Quebec.

The first section provides that the Syndicate shall have the right to lay out, construct and operate a railway across the Isthmus of Avalon from Rantem, or from such other port in Trinity Bay as may hereafter be selected by the Company or their assigns, with the right to put in a train-ferry slip in connection therewith, as some convenient point at or near Burin, and may also lay out, construct and operate a railway from Humbermouth, Bay of Islands, to South West Arm, Green Bay, with a branch line therefrom to White Bay.

The next section gives the right to the Company to enter upon Crown lands or other lands for the purpose of surveying the proposed route and to fix a site for the railway. The next section makes it obligatory on the part of the Government to grant to the Company land where the railway runs through to the extent of 100 feet on each side of the centre of the tracks, and in addition a block of land and land covered with water five square miles in extent, and with a sea frontage of one mile; such land however, only to be granted to the Company on completion of the railway. The railway on the Isthmus of Avalon has to be commenced within three years and to be completed within four years, and the Bay of Islands to Green Bay line shall be commenced within five years from the date of the completion of the Avalon railway and to be completed within three years from the date of commencement.

Section 5 provides for the expropriation of private lands through which the railway is built and should there not be sufficient Crown Lands available to the extent of one mile sea frontage at each of the terminals, the government may grant such waterlots as in the opinion of the Governor-in-Council shall be deemed necessary, payment therefor to be settled by arbitration. The next section provides for the cost of arbitration. Section 9 enables the Company to acquire and hold waterlots, and operate docks and elevators, and collect wharfage and shore charges for the use of its works and buildings. Section 11 admits all construction material free of duty, and Section 12 provides for the admission free of

duty after twenty years of the articles described therein, which are to be used in connection with the business of the Company and not for sale. If the Company does not commence and complete the railway or either of them within the period prescribed in Section 4 all the provisions shall cease and become void.

The object of the Bill is well known to hon. members, and it is unnecessary to go into details. Suffice it to say that the materialization of these schemes will be of great benefit to Newfoundland. The waters around our shores are teeming with fish, and if only improvement in shipping facilities is brought about, then there is no reason why the other fisheries of this country in the near future should not rival those of other countries. In an item published in a Canadian paper recently it was there stated that fresh cod was brought from British Columbia and landed in England fresh, and if that can be done, there is no reason why salmon, halibut and other fish here cannot be landed there as well. The man or company who can build and operate such a service as this proposes will be a great benefactor to Newfoundland.

The Bill was then read a second time, and House went into Committee on the same, Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

The Committee on the Train Ferry Service rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. On motion the report was received and the Bill was read a third time, passed and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

Hon. Mr. Harvey tabled the report of the Select Committee appointed in connection with the Logging Bill; also the report of the Joint Committee of the Legislature on the subject of the Fisheries, which he requested to be read to the House.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House adjourned till to-morrow at 3 p.m.

TUESDAY, March 10th.

Pursuant to adjournment Council met at 3 o'clock.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Train Ferry Service Bill was read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message acquainting them that this House had passed the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Municipal Bill

Hon. Mr. Angel took the Chair.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—Mr. Chairman, there is no provision in this Bill that the new City Authorities appointed under it are not to be paid, and I move that the following be added to section 1—"The members of the said Commission shall act without pay or remuneration of any kind."

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. Whilst we may not know officially the genesis of the Bill before us, we all know, as citizens, that it was introduced as the result of petitions signed by about 3,000 citizens. I hold a copy of that petition in my hand, and it contains the words, "said Board to hold office for twelve months, to act without any pay or remuneration of any kind." To embody any such amendment as that proposed by my hon. friend would be to cast a reflection on the good faith of those who have signed the petition. Here is the petition; this is what these men have asked, and on those grounds alone the Bill has been granted. Apart altogether from that there is no provision in the Bill for payment, so how can the members of the Board pay themselves? I oppose the amendment as un-

necessary.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—I cannot agree with my hon. friend as to this amendment being unnecessary. The proposed new Municipal Commission is being created on the distinct understanding that its members are to act for a year without salary. That was specifically set forth in the report of the Executive Committee of the Citizens' Association. It was also, as my hon. friend has mentioned, embodied in the petitions that were circulated throughout the city for signature. But, curiously enough, it is not embodied in the measure before us. For some reason, the Bill brought into the Assembly did not contain a clause providing that these gentlemen should receive no salary; neither did it contain a clause providing for a plebiscite. Why these things were omitted I do not know; neither does any one in this Chamber. I asked the gentleman in charge of the Bill, Hon. Mr. Gibbs, yesterday while these provisions were omitted, and he could not say. He promised that he would endeavour to ascertain, and has informed me just now that he could get no information on the point.

To say the least, this is a curious business; and if my amendment can do no good, it will certainly do no harm. If the gentlemen to be named are to work without salary, it can injure nobody to have it specified in the Bill, that they are to receive no money; and if there is any idea to the contrary, then we shall be able to prevent it becoming effective. for such was never intended. My hon. friend, Mr. Robinson, says the amendment is unnecessary, but while I do not say that the gentlemen to be appointed on that Board are going to divide among themselves the $1,500 now set aside as salary for the Mayor and Councillors, I contend that if any twelve men so wished, there is nothing to prevent them doing so, for they may certainly vote it to themselves in the form of expenses, if not as salaries.

The hon. gentleman's argument, he now says, is that this amendment is not necessary, because it is already stated in the petition that these men are not to receive any remuneration. It is also stated that there is to be a plebiscite, but there is no provision in the Bill for that. If it is necessary to make provision for that, as I think it is, it is also necessary to make provision that the members of the Board are to act without remuneration. He contends that because it is in the petition, that is enough. But we are not enacting the petition; we are enacting a Bill based upon part of the petition. I fail to see where it is any reflection on the petitioners to propose these amendments which the petitioners asked for; on the contrary, it is, in my opinion, bad faith on our part, as a Legislature, if we refuse to include in the Bill what these men petitioned for. I would also like to point out to the hon. members present that I fail to see where the Governor-in-Council is going to get the necessary authority to hold a plebiscite. This Bill provides no machinery for such a purpose. My hon. friend, Mr. Robinson, also argues that this is a financial measure and implies that therefore we cannot amend it. That this House cannot amend a money Bill I am quite aware, but this is not a financial measure. The hon. gentleman might just as well argue that we have no power to amend a general Municipal Bill because it has financial provisions. If the Lower House had sent up Section 1 of the Bill with the clause in it that these Commissioners were to work without pay or remuneration, nobody would have baulked at it. I think the reason it was not put in was because it was overlooked. Again, if this Bill had come up with a provision in it for holding a plebiscite, this House would have agreed to it, and I think

we ought to amend the Bill on the same grounds that we have amended others during the session.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I think it might be as well to let this section stand over, if the hon. gentleman has other amendments to propose. I agree with both gentlemen who have spoken and I think the amendments might have been put in, but as it is not a serious matter if they are not, I think the section might stand as it is.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—I might say that I have another amendment of 3 new sections to follow section 1, to cover the plebiscite. With regard to these amendments, I may explain that I intended to ask the Solicitor of the House to draft them, but he not being available, I consulted his partner, Mr. Conroy, who is a member of the Executive Committee of 25 chosen by the Citizens' Association, and conversant with the work of the Committee, so I thought he would be a good man to draft them, as he knew what the Committee intended when they put in their report the promise of a plebiscite. These sections invest the Governor-in-Council with power to provide for a plebiscite on the proposed new Municipal bill and to include in the ballot to be submitted to the electors alternative schemes of municipal control thereby enabling the rate-payers to say which they prefer.

HON. MR. POWER.—All arrangements for Municipal electors are made by the Government, and have been in every election held since the first, in 1888. I have not seen the petition, but I understand it was very largely and influentially signed, and I think it is very commendable on the part of the gentlemen comprising the Committee to take such interest in the affairs of the city. In 1888 the Municipal Council came into being, and the first election took place in September, and was very successful. I happened to be one of the first Council, but all the others have passed away. They were a fine body of men, and their work was well done. Their great undertaking was the laying of the big sewer through Water Street. Some people have had the audacity to say that St. John's is no better now than it was fifty years ago, but if they could go back to that time when the first Council took charge they would see that great improvements have been made. The Sanitary and Fire Departments were in one confused mass, and the first Council had to initiate and inaugurate new departments and did all that could be expected of them. They gave of their ability and did not spare themselves at all on behalf of the city. I spent 15 years there, and I am very glad to see these gentlemen interesting themselves in the City's Government, if they can afford to do so. That was the fault with many previous Councils; men could not afford the time for the work. I shall be only too glad to give any information I can on the matter.

HON. MR. MILLEY.—I am sorry that this Bill has come up so late in the session, more especially in regard to the amendments made by my hon. friend. Mr. McGrath. I am sure the amendments may be considered, a rather tall order for the electorate. With regard to the first amendment to prevent the fifteen hundred dollars being taken by the Committee, I feel confident that none of the citizens would object if they did; I, for one,would not be against their putting it towards their expenses in visiting the water works, and going around the city in connection with their work during the period of office. In regard to the last amendment, it is rather late in the day, in my opinion, for such an amendment,. I should like to have more time to consider it before voting. I do not think I could do justice without more information, and I shall

support the Bill as it stands.

HON. MR HARVEY—I am inclined to think, myself, that the amendment we have just heard with regard to the plebiscite is necessary, if the intentions of the members of the Committee which had charge of the petition are to be carried out. I am a member of the Committee which had charge of the petition, and it was certainly understood that any proposition put forward by the Commission should be submitted to the people, in order to make the recommendations effective, and in order that the plebiscite bill may be put into law. If there is no power now to hold a plebiscite it seems to me we are going to be in a great mess when the Legislature next meets, or, at any rate, when the Council lose their power on the 30th June, and I do not see how reforms are to be carried out unless the plebiscite can be held, and, if we are rightly informed, that cannot be done without the amendment. Now, there is great difficulty about holding a plebiscite, to my mind, and more important than anything else is the actual verbiage. We cannot submit it, as a whole, to the city because there are certain to be a very large number of recommendations, and we will certainly have many objecting to some of them, while perhaps these agreeing with the others. It would be better to have certain questions, bearing on the matters, submitted to a plebiscite. In any case, I favor the passing of that amendment because I do not see otherwise what use the meetings of the Committee are to be if they do not get a plebiscite, and if that amendment goes in I think the other had better be put in also. Hon. Mr. Milley made the point that no one would object to the $1,500 being applied to the Commissioners' expenses, but their out-of-pocket expenses will have to be paid anyhow I think it has been an oversight in leaving it out, and there would be no harm in putting it in if the other goes. I think it is as well to have that clear. It was certainly the intention of the Committee and the petitioners, and under these circumstances I shall record my vote in favor of the amendments.

HON. PRESIDENT—I did not intend to speak on this Bill, but I may say that I agree with Hon. Mr. Robinson. I think we ought to take this Bill as it is rather than amend it now, for it is a purely legal Bill that was no doubt very well considered before it was dismissed in the House of Assembly. The Bill, as I take it, was based on the petition signed by 3,000 citizens and was framed by the lawyers—I am not prepared to say which. They must have given it some consideration before framing it. I think it would have been much better if the Bill had come up earlier. I feel that we ought not to run the risk of losing this legislation by a number of amendments which are altogether unnecessary. I disagree with Hon. Mr. McGrath altogether as regards that $1,500; I do not think the amendment necessary. I do not think the men appointed would use it to pay their out-of-pocket expenses,and that money is absolutely safe. But that, of course, is only my opinion. I do not think we are justified in considering that this has been ill-considered and that these two clauses that Hon. Mr. McGrath refers to have been omitted through oversight or negligence. I am inclined to think the Bill has been well-thought-out and one we ought to pass. Hon. Mr. Harvey has pointed out the difficulty of introducing sections in the Bill to cover that point with reference

to a plebiscite, and they are sufficient to prevent me from tampering with the Bill as it is. Of course, every hon. gentleman has a perfect right to exercise his own views on it. but these are mine.

HON. MR. HARVEY—How would you get over the difficulty of holding a plebiscite?

HON. PRESIDENT—I am not responsible for the Bill.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I cannot, Mr. Chairman, understand the position of my worthy friend, the Hon the President. He was a member of the Executive Committee of the Citizens' Union, and as such must have been a party to the proposition embodied in their report to the effect that the new Municipal Bill should be submitted to the people next winter by a plebiscite. Yet to-day he comes in and argues against the inclusion of a clause in this Bill which will provide the machinery for carrying out that intention and having a plebiscite on the Bill when it is framed. Might I ask what is the objection to making provisions in this Bill for a plebiscite?

HON. THE PRESIDENT—Hon. Mr. Harvey points out some; there may be others that I do not know of.

HON. MR. McGRATH—That reply, Mr. Chairman, only makes the situation more mysterious to me. It seems to me that the attitude of my hon. friend and those who take the same views as he does, is the most complete condemnation of the Citizens' Committee that could be desired by its worst enemy, because, what are the facts? These twenty-five gentlemen, composing the Executive Committee of that movement, presented a report to a public meeting recommending a Bil and a plebiscite thereon. That report was adopted, and following upon it these gentlemen started petitions which were circulated throughout the city and which were signed by 3,000 people In these petitions it was specifically guaranteed that there would be a plebiscite on the new Bill, and yet to-day objection is raised to adding a clause to the Bill which will give the Governor-in-Council power to take a plebiscite on the measure, as was the intention of the originators of this movement if their official declaration counts for anything. I ask the hon. gentleman again as one of the Committee, did he support or did he oppose a plebiscite, and is he prepared now to have a plebiscite or is he not? Three thousand people in St. John's have signed a petition to the Legislature asking for municipal reforms These reforms are to be embodied in a Bill, and that Bill is to be submitted to a plebiscite. At any rate that is the logical position from what we know occurred; and if the Executive Committee of the Citizens' Association did not know what they were doing when they put this plebiscite clause in the report and petition, if they did not mean to carry out their pledge to the public, then no more caustic comment on the whole movement for civic reform could be imagined, and, in my humble judgment, we should kick this Bill out. I do not want to suggest motives that may cause any ill-feeling, but here in my hand I hold a copy of a petition in which a plebiscite is clearly provided for; yesterday I asked why machinery for this plebiscite was not provided; and to-day, when I propose such machinery, hon. gentlemen oppose the proposition emphatically. Why is that?

HON. THE PRESIDENT—Ask the lawyers.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Well, I asked the lawyers, and one of the lawyers, a member like my hon. friend of that Executive Committee of the Citizens' Union, drafted for

me the amendment I have proposed. to carry out the undertaking to which the Committee was pledged, The hon. gentleman's answer is that the Bill was fully considered in the other House. We have no evidence of that, unless he can tell us the lawyers who informed him.

HON. THE PRESIDENT—No lawyer informed me.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Then, in that case what becomes of his argument that the Bill was thoroughly considered? Wherein is there any reason to suppose that this Bill is any differrent from the various Bills that came up here before it this year? We had to seriously consider and radically amend all of these Bills, and why should there be any objection to our doing so with the measure at present before us.

HON. THE PRESIDENT—Some people say it was not necessary to amend these Bills.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Well, that may be so, but this House in its judgment thought differently, and undertook to amend them, and my hon. friend introduced some amendments himself, so that he must have thought there was need for such. Here is an instance where, if an amendment—not necessarily my amendment, but some amendment—is not adopted and a section added to this Bill,there will be no machinery whatever to give effect to the undertaking embodied in the report and in the petition, namely, that next winter, before the new Municipal Bill is considered by the Legislature, it shall be referred to a plebiscite of the rateprayers of St. John's. How can my hon, friend answer the question why is there no provision in this Bill to carry out that undertaking? Does it mean that after all the loud talk we have heard there is a disinclination on the part of some people connected with this movement to trust the citizens of St. John's at a plebiscite? I do not say that that is what is at the bottom of the matter, but I do know that we have a clear-cut situation before us; that clauses to cover that situation have been drafted by a legal gentleman who was a member of the very Committee that gave that undertaking, and that for some reason or other, there is an unwillingness being manifested to take the obvious course. In other words, it seems to me as if the public were being "flim-flammed"

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—Inasmuch as the clause is in the petition on which the Bill is based, I fail to see the necessity for the amendment. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has alleged that unless we make provision for a plebiscite, here and now, no such may be had. The word "plebiscite" is an elastic one. It may involve anything from the submission of one or two simple questions, to the details of an entire and voluminous Bill. The former appears reasonable, the latter impossible. It will take all the care and consideration of the Governor-in-Council for some time, to assure the best method, first in the nature of the plebiscite, and then its details. I think we can safely leave these things to be dealt with by the Governor-in-Council, on the lines laid down in the petitions. It is certainly beyond our powers to dispose of this matter, at this period. The hon. gentleman claims superiority for his amendments because they were drawn up by a lawyer. The gentleman to whom he refers is one of the ablest in the Island, and his opinion is rightly valued by all who consult him; but there is a great difference between drafting amendments and discussing them. Drafting amendments, even by an eminent lawyer, does not necessarily imply that they are invulnerable.

We may be quite prepared to take the opinions of lawyers on matters of law, without agreeing with them as to matters of civic management. If their decisions were, of themselves, sufficient, what necessity would there be for a plebiscite? Why not accept the views of a chosen one or two? I submit that the Governor-in-Council has ample power to make such arrangements as he may deem necessary, and that he, acting on the advice of the Commission, is the best qualified for the work. If we pass these amendments, however excellent, they must, at this late period of the Session, be imperfectly considered, and we may put a rope around those on whom the responsibility rests, and effectually prevent them from doing what would prove the best in the interests of the citizens and the municipality. We would do very much better, I think, to leave the Bill as it is.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—The holding of a plebiscite upon the part of the Council—for the Council will be in existence, the Act merely defers the election—must necessarily entail expenditure, and unless special provision be made for the holding of such plebiscite, the Council would not have the right to utilize the funds of the city for holding it, and I do not think I am wrong when I say it will be necessary to make provision for it. When the Citizens' Committee met I had the privilege of being a member, and it was my privilege to advise, when a draft of the report of the Committee was submitted, that the provision for a plebiscite should be embodied in the report. The petition presented to the Legislature called for a plebiscite, and personally I don't think we would be carrying out the present wishes of the three thousand people who have signed the petition if we do not put into the Bill a provision whereby that form or system of Government may be dealt with. I do not say that the whole Municipal Bill should be submitted to the public, but rather the form or system of government, or how the affairs of the city should be administered. It should not be a difficult matter to frame questions to be submitted to the ratepayers to have them pass opinion upon them, and personally (I speak as a private member of the House, not as representing the Government here, this is not a Government measure), I think that we should, in compliance with the expressed wishes of the citizens, insert a provision for holding a plebiscite. With regard to my hon. friend's other amendment, that members should act without pay, I do not think that under the first section they have a right to take any pay whatever. It should be expressly given as in the Municipal Act. A certain section of the Act sets aside a fund as compensation for the Mayor and Councillors, and under this, even if the Committee were desirous of doing so, they would not have power to take any money for their services.

The amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. McGrath, to Section 1, was now put, and lost on division.

HON. MR. McGRATH.—I beg to move that instead of section 2 as it stands—the section which I have already read and which I will read again—shall stand, sections 2, 3 and 4. While I am on my feet I would like to point out to the House that the terms of this amendment, embracing three new sections, cover completely the points raised, and I submit, effectively answer the criticisms put forward by those who disapprove of my proposal. Nobody, that I am aware of, seriously proposes that there should be a plebiscite on all the sections of a Municipal Bill. Certainly I do not. To propose any such thing would be preposterous. Nor do I imagine that the Executive Committee of the Citizens' Union had any such scheme in their minds when they declared themselves

in favor of a plebiscite. Certainly, again, the learned gentleman, Mr. Conroy, who drafted this amendment, had no such idea. The phraseology of the sections makes this perfectly clear. Provision is made for the submission to the plebiscite of alternative schemes, such, for instance, as a commission form of Municipal control, the system such as we have had to the present, or some other system which may be evolved, and the voters will be asked, if my amendment passes, to decide upon which of these alternative schemes or proposals they favor. I would like to point out to those who oppose this amendment that a refusal to adopt this proposition will put both themselves, the Legislature and the electors who signed the petition, in my humble opinion, in a very ridiculous position. The Executive Committee recommended a plebiscite in their annual report. It is only fair to assume that they must have had some definite idea in their minds when they made this proposal, and if they had, we may fairly ask ourselves what was that idea; was it or was it not that provision should be made for a plebiscite at this session? If it was, and I think it was, for I am strongly influenced to that opinion by the remarks of my hon. friends, Mr. Harvey and Mr. Gibbs, then why is there such objection to including provision for this plebiscite in the Bill before us? On the other hand, if the Citizens' Committee did not contemplate providing for the plebiscite in the present Bill, and at the present session, then we ought to know from somebody competent to speak what were the ideas of the Citizens' Union in regard to this important matter. In other words, this proposal for a plebiscite, was either a well-considered carefully thought out proposition, or else it was a mere shot in the dark, which nobody considered the effect of, except that it would look well to put in a plebiscite clause; and no further consideration was given it, though if this be so, then, as I have said before, it seems to me that no greater condemnation of the Citizens' Union or no greater evidence of unfitness for the work they have undertaken could be imagined than is comprehended in that situation.

I am frank enough, however, to say that in my judgment the Citizens' Committee were honest in putting forward the plebiscite proposal and in asking the citizens to sign for it, and I cannot conceive of any reason why it is objected to to-day, unless there are some other influences at work planning to deprive the people of St. John's of the right that was pledged them by the report and the petition. We are told that the Governor-in-Council can arrange for a plebiscite. Well, I admit the Governor-in-Council might take upon themselves authority to do so, but if they did they would have to secure an indemnity from the Legislature at the next session, because they have no legal warrant whatever for resorting to such an appeal to the civic voters, and they have certainly no warrant whatever to appropriate for the purpose the money that will be required, and if next winter the Governor-in-Council find themselves obliged to resort to the expedient suggested, then all I can say is that I think this is reducing legislation to a farce. Now I beg to move that instead of section 2 as it stands, the sections which I have already read, with slight change, be inserted to stand as sections 2, 3 and 4.

HON. MR. JOB—Is it clear that the Governor-in-Council have the authority to arrange for a plebiscite without legal authority from the House?

HON. MR. GIBBS—They may have authority to do so, but no legal authority; it may be an inherent power, because the holding of a

plebiscite involves the expenditure of money, and where there is no vote for the purpose there is no legal right. I might say that the Committee in their recommendation requested the holding of a plebiscite to take the consensus of the electorate, but if they did not make any such recommendation the Legislature could enact into law the form of Government which they may wish to submit, without the citizens being consulted in the matter by a plebiscite beforehand.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—If we pass this amendment, we will find ourselves up against a difficult proposition. The Bill, when completed, will probably consist of some 200 sections. How can these be presented for the approval or otherwise of citizens, by a plebiscite vote? To present the salient points for popular decision is another matter. A plebiscite may decide as to whether or not the general method of municipal government is desirable, or it may approve or reject any direct and uncomplicated proposals. It may be the intention of the Governor-in-Council to present alternative schemes for the selection of the citizens, or it may not. The nature of the plebiscite can be determined, only after long and careful consideration by the Council of Twelve. This section virtually compels the submission either of every section of the new Municipal Bill, or of the Bill as a whole, in which latter case the position will be worse than ever; for he is a complaisant man indeed, who will not find some point of disagreement amid the many sections of a necessarily intricate Bill. There are some leading questions which in my opinion ought to be submitted, and will be submitted, and it is in arriving at the decision as to which of those questions are to be so submitted, that the Government will be confronted with its principal difficulty; difficulties which would become tenfold worse if hampered by hurriedly-framed legislation. It would, I think, be dangerous to press this addition to the Bill.

The amendment was then put and lost on division.

For the amendment were Hons. McGrath, Harvey, Gibbs, Goodridge, Ryan, Templeman and Power, (7); against the amendment were Hons. Robinson, Skelton, Ayre, Milley, Harris, Baird and Job, (7). Whereupon the Chairman, Hon. Mr. Angel, gave his casting vote against the amendment. Amendments to sections 3 and 4 were also put and defeated, on the same division. On motion the Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment.

HON. MR. GIBBS then moved that the Bill be read a third time.

HON MR McGRATH—I beg to move as an amendment that the Bill be read a third time this day six months. I think we should put ourselves on record as a House in repudiation of the case embodied in the rejection of the plebiscite. I don't know that there was ever a case in this Legislature where so grave a disregard for the views of a petition signed by 3,006 people calling for a certain form of vote to be carried out has been exhibited. There is a petition,it calls for certain things to be done, 3,000 people have been induced to sign it, a great percentage of them doing so because of the fact that they believed they were to have the opportunity of pronouncing on the Bill by means of a plebiscite, and now they find that they have been "flim-flammed" out of their rights. It makes no difference to me personaly, whether the electors and citizens of St. John's have a plebiscite or not; but surely

we ought to have some regard for the principle upon which the petition was presented here and upon which it was based. It is a well-recognized fact that the citizens called for certain things, but they did not get what they called for, but only what certain people will give, not what the petitioners ask.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I take strong exception to the expressions and statements made by the hon. gentleman. He has referred to the action of this House as a rejection and repudiation of the citizens' right to a plebiscite. I say that no such question has been at issue; this House has not repudiated the principle of a plebiscite in connection with a municipal election. Moreover, the arguments advanced here have, in most instances, accepted the principle of a plebiscite in this matter, but have been directed against tying the hands of those responsible for the methods which they should adopt for holding such a plebiscite. I am as desirous as my hon. friend that we do go on record, and I think that if what has been said here this afternoon is put down and recorded correctly—and I believe it will be—the consensus of the opinions expressed by those who had objected to the ill-digested and ill-considered amendments brought in at this last moment will be found to be rather an objection to the methods than to the principle.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I don't wish to argue but merely to explain my vote. It has afforded me great pleasure to support the amendments proposed by my hon. friend opposite, and I think they are workable. There is no doubt as to how the vote is going, but all the same I think that the want of logic on the part of the Council in this action is quite remarkable. The amendment did nothing but invite the giving of legal powers to the Government to hold a plebiscite. The hon. gentlemen who have voted against this giving the invitation to hold a plebiscite, say they are not opposed to a plebiscite; they want the Government to hold a plebiscite illegally and to break the law. That I take it is the position taken by the Council, and though I am going to support the third reading of the Bill, it is because I think it is better that we should carry out the plebiscite illegally, but I must confess that I cannot understand the attitude of the majority of the Council in adopting this method

HON. MR. McGRATH—I beg to withdraw the amendment. I merely proposed it to register my views on the matter. That the amendments were introduced at the last moment is not my fault. I found the Bill, when it reached us, defective in certain essentials, as I considered them; and I introduced the amendment to cure these defects. That the amendments are ill-digested and ill-considered I deny. They are the work of Mr. Conroy, K.C., a leading lawyer and a member of the Citizens' Committee, moreover, and therefore presumably familiar with that Committee's intention.

On motion the Bill was read a third time, passed, and it was ordered that it be sent to the Assembly with a message informing them that the Council had passed the Bill without amendment.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT.—I beg to inform the House that I have received a notice from the House of Assembly acquainting the Council that they had passed the amendments made by the Council in and upon the Bill sent to them entitled, "An Act to Regulate the Prosecution of the Sealfishery," with some amendments, in which they

request the concurrence of the Council.

HON. MR. JOB—In moving that the amendments made by the Assembly to the Council's amendments in the Sealing Bill be now read a first time, I must say they are not of a controversial nature. These amendments that caused so much trouble and took so much time have met with the approval of our brethren below, and in fact I think the Bill has been given the little touch of polish of the sort we would expect it to have received from that Chamber. The only really serious amendment is in clause 3, where they have taken out the word 'master' and left in the word 'owner.' The other amendment is in clause 15 and it is an alteration of the verbiage which improves and makes it clearer. A technical amendment occurs in clause 16 wherein are inserted the words "which exceed $100" in reference to the fine, and provides for no appeal if the fine is under $100.

HON. MR. McGRATH—Do you fully realize the effect of that amendment? It would be well to consider whether this amendment does not deprive a master from taking his ship out for two years.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—When this Bill was at its second reading I asked that it be deferred until the Report of the Joint Select Committee was received. I regret I was not here when the Bill was discussed in Committee. Had I been, I certainly would have voted against the clause which says that a master shall have no control of the cooks. I think it is going too far when we interfere with the authority of the captain of a ship and rather dangerous. These captains only have control of their crew through their personality, and it is unwise to place any restrictions on their authority.

HON. MR. JOB—I move that the amendments passed by the House of Assembly be read a first time. (The amendments were read).

HON. MR. JOB—I move that the amendments be read a second time.

HON. MR. McGRATH—I move as an amendment to clause 16 the following words: "provided that where no right of appeal exists the provisions of section 14 shall not apply." The effect of the amendment made by the Lower House is that under section 16 of the Bill, if we passed it, the captain of a sealing steamer which sailed before 8 a. m. is liable to a penalty up to $4,000 and is liable to a similar penalty if his crew kills seals before the prescribed time. He is also in addition debarred by the law from commanding a sealing ship for two years if he violates these sections. He may commit some technical offence, in which case he may be fined $100, but under the amendments he might have trivials to merit a fine of $99 which would debar him from taking a steamer to the ice for two years. I submit that if the offence is so trivial as only to merit a fine of $99 it should not lose a captain his ship to the ice for two years, and for that reason I propose the amendment.

Hon. Mr. McGrath's amendment was put and carried, whereupon the amendment sent up by the Assembly was read a second time and passed, and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with an amendment.

Hon. President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly acquainting him that they had passed the amendments sent down, in and upon the Saw Mills Bill without amendment.

Also that they had passed the Bills entitled respectively "An Act to incorporate the Conception Bay Electric Company" and "An Act to in-

corporate the United Towns Electric Company" in which they requested the concurrence of this House.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Job these Bills were read a first and second time, referred to a Committee of the Whole House, passed and sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

The President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting Pilots and Pilotage in the port of St. John's" and "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act", in which they requested the concurrence of this House.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the 'Pilots Bill' was read a first and second time, and referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

HON. PRESIDENT—Mr. Chairman I may say that this alteration to the present Pilots Act has been made to some extent at the request of the Pilots. There is at present a sum of $6,500 to the credit of the Commission. and none of the Pilots today know how it got there. They are anxious to make this amount the nucleus of a pension fund, and they are willing to subscribe $50 annually towards it.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment and on motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill was read a third time, passed and sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Revenue Bill.

HON. PRESIDENT—I discovered today that canned meats. that is canned beef, brawn, etc., instead of paying a duty of three cents per pound as formerly, now pays ¼ cent per oz., the can included. The increase in the duty on this very necessary article is thus about 40 to 50 per cent. I have not seen last year's Act, and do not know how it reads; but it appears to me to be a most extraordinary increase on an article of such common consumption as beef. I heard the intention of the change was to prevent fraud, but I do not see how any fraud could be carried on where the duty is imposed on the weight. The tendency is to put only 14 ozs. in the cans instead of 16 ozs. The cans are not styled one lb. or two lb., but No. 1 and No. 2. The Board of Trade provisions and groceries Committee, asked the Government to alter this and to compel packers to state the weight on the can, no matter what it contains. I would like the hon. gentleman in charge to give me some information on this; if it was the intention of the Government to increase the duty about fifty per cent.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I may say in reply to the hon. member that the reason given by the Minister of Finance & Customs is that a good deal of the tins imported contain but 14 ozs., and that this rate is put on now for the purpose of making it uniform, and a regular pound weight will pay the same duty as before. It was stated that persons importing 14 oz. tins were paying the same rate of duty as those importing 16 oz. tins and goods were being sold as if they contained full weight. Now they will have to pay one quarter cent per oz. and all will have to pay alike.

HON. PRESIDENT—It appears to me to put a premium on misrepresentation. If a can contains only 14 ozs. and is sold by the can, the implication is that the can contains a pound. Aside from that, I want to point out to the Committee that whereas under the old tariff a case of meats paid 75 cents

duty, it will now pay $1.14. Of course it is not worth our while discussing it because we cannot alter it here. I notice they are also charging duty on the tins, which is certainly wrong. I never heard of that being done anywhere else. They might just as well put a duty on bottles containing pickles. I am sorry I did not see the Bill before it left the Assembly, as I feel sure the Government did not intend to increase the duty to this extent. They merely desired to regulate the business.

HON. MR. McGRATH—As I understand it, the position is this. The Government found that parties were importing canned meats, who when presenting invoices, deducted the weight of the cans and paid duty only on the weight of the contents. In other words, if each tin weighed an ounce. in twelve tins there would be a reduction of three quarters of a pound and so on to a case, and the Government introduced this amendment, making the duty 1-4 cent per ounce, contents and can together.

HON. PRESIDENT—It is the first time I heard of such a thing being done, although I have been in the business for a long time. We always passed on a reputed pound and a case of canned beef, containing 54-pound tins, was passed at three cents per pound, even though it contained 15 or 16 ozs.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received and on motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill was read a third time, passed and it was ordered that a message be sent the Assembly that this House had passed the same without amendment.

HON. PRESIDENT read a message from the Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled, "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying the public services of the Colony," in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

HON. MR. GIBBS moved that the Public Service Bill be read a first time, after which he moved that it be read a second time.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of opposing the second reading of the Bill, but to express my surprise at the late hour that these important Money Bills have been sent up to us. We should have been given time to look into this Bill. Although this Branch of the Legislature has no right to amend these Money Bills, still we have a perfect right to discuss them, but sent up as they are now,at this late hour, we have not any opportunity of so discussing them, and again I must enter my protest at this proceeding. In the past, it has not been an unknown occurrence for this Chamber to reject a money Bill, and while I should not wish to go to this extreme, I do say that we ought to have sufficient time to consider such important Bills as these. Take for example, the clauses dealing with remunerating public servants. Some of the public servants are notoriously underpaid. Some of the salaries seem to be unfair. I know of public servants worth much more than they are getting. I would without any wish to discriminate in any way, mention in this connection, the Deputy Minister of Finance and and Deputy Colonial Secretary. Both gentlemen are worth much higher salaries than they get, and we should have an opportunity to discuss matters of this kind, for that is as much the duty of members of this as the other branch of the Legislature, to see that the public funds are properly expended. While we have no right to amend the various provisions, we can comment on them, and give them due con-

sideration. Evidence of the necessity of this is shown by the remarks of the President this evening as to the Revenue Bill. Had we the time we might have called the attention of the Finance Minister to the matters to which I have referred. In all fairness to this branch of the Legislature we should have these Bills a week before we are asked to debate their provisions.

The Bill was then read a second time, taken into Committee and passed by the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Revenue Bill was read a first time.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In moving the second reading of this Bill I would point out to the House that the really important parts of the amended Revenue Act provide for increased duties upon intoxicants of various kinds; also upon tobacco and cigarettes, and provides for an increased excise duty upon "Oleomargarine," and medicated beef fluids. These increased duties are rendered necessary because of the fact that the Government were faced with a deficit at the end of this fiscal year. I beg leave to move that the Bill be read a second time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Revenue Bill.

HON. MR. AYRE took the chair.

The Bill was passed without amendment, read a third time and adopted, and a message sent to the Assembly notifying this fact.

HON. MR. HARVEY— I rise to move the adjournment of the House and in doing so, I should like for a few moments to call attention to the fact that early in the session I expressed a wish that something might be said before the House rose as to the policy which it was proposed to pursue and which is being pursued as regards public health. I am very sorry that no statement of any kind has been made by the representative of the Government in relation to this important matter, and that nothing has come before us. The sum of $24,000 is now voted annually as against $4,000 previously, to advance the interests of this department, but we have had no expressions as to the policy to be pursued nor have we any report before us as to what has been done. As regards the broad problem of public health, so far as my observation has gone very little has been done, and the work by the commission on Public Health, has been abandoned, which was begun and which was being carried on as regards its broader and more practical aspects. The schools are not being attended to as they were. The outport doctors who had been visiting the schools are, I understand, doing so no longer, and the visiting nurses who were kept busy moving about the country and visiting the outport homes and looking after the children, are no longer at work, while the frequent public lectures given by traveling lecturers are being no longer carried on; the good work of the outport doctors whom the commission took great pains to keep interested in various ways in public health matters is no longer being carried on. The valuable reports and the beginnings made by them in the hygienic and medical examination of the schools appear to have been entirely abandoned, as also work of public education by advertisement, correspondence, and lecture. As a result I believe that the fumigation of infected houses is not being nearly as vigorously attended to and that true preventive work has been practically dropped and two years valuable time lost. In fact, nothing is being done at all so far as we know outside of what curative work is being done in St. John's. We have heard a great deal this session from hon. members as

to the 'unwisdom' of confining ameliorative legislation to St. John's proper. This was a work which was being pursued with some activity all over the country, and a great deal of good was being done, now nothing is being spent by a Commission on Public Health and when that Commission was forced to resign the vote was increased to $24,000, and the whole of the work as a public warfare and preventive effort, was immediately abandoned. The subject of the conservation of the public health is a most important one, especially in this country. The practical efforts to deal with it instituted and carried on up to recently are abandoned so far as one can see, and except for a certain amount of curative work confined to the town of St. John's, the whole business seems to be dying of inaction. Energy and enthusiasm to deal with a big problem of this kind on really broad lines are needed, and the campaign must be studied and carried out in the country at large. I do not desire to minimize the curative work now being pursued in this city. It is no doubt good work in its way, but as a practical public policy we must begin at the other end and push it vigorously from the other end, if we want to get real results. From a philanthropic point of view the treatment of patients is of course good and desirable, but it should not form our sole, or even our main plank. You cannot do much towards eradication of disease and extending their lives for a year or two, even curing perhaps an occasional case, if you get it early enough. Prevention and educational methods are the only ones which can form the groundwork of a true public policy, and our expenditure should be directed to this. I regret, Mr. President, that it has not been thought well to make some statement to the House during the currency of the session as to what the definite policy is to be or even whether is an definite policy seriously determined upon at all. There seems to be no account of expenditure or how the grant is to be used before the Legislature, and we have not even a report from the medical officer in charge of the work submitted. We have, as I understand, the prospect before us of the erection of a series of sanatoria in electoral districts. What had been the decision as regards this policy? Criticism has proved beyond question that the plan is a great mistake. Is it to be proceeded with? We have no information on the subject. They would cost in upkeep far more than we can afford, and if we could afford it, the results would not give value for the expenditure. They are on the lines of cure and no policy based solely on cure is justifiable or wise while it is very expensive. I move the adjournment, Mr. President, solely for the purpose of drawing attention to a matter upon which we ought to be fully informed, and which must be regarded as one of the greatest importance to the whole country.

Hon. the President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly, intimating that they had passed the Council's amendment in and upon the amendment, sent up by the Assembly in and upon the amendment sent down from the Council, upon the Bill entitled. "An Act to regulate the Preservation of the Seal Fishery"; without amendment.

HON. PRESIDENT—I have the honor to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will prorogue the present session of the Legislature at 3 p.m. to-morrow.

Council then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, March 11th.

The Council met at 2.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

At 3 o'clock His Excellency the Governor, accompanied by Mrs. Davidson, and his A. D. Cs., was conducted to the Legislative Council. The Usher of the Black Rod having summoned the members of the House of Assembly to the Bar of the House, the Bills passed during the session were read and assented to by His Excellency who then delivered the Closing Speech from the Throne.

(The Bills assented to and the Speech delivered will be found at the end of the House of Assembly Proceedings, pages 918 and 919.)

The President of the Council then informed the members of both Houses that it was His Excellency's will and pleasure that this General Assembly be prorogued till Wednesday, the 15th of April next, and that the Assembly stood prorogued accordingly

INDEX.

ABSENCE, LEAVE OF,—
To Hon. R. K. Bishop, 45.
To Hon. George Knowling, 45.
To Hon. John Anderson, 45.
To Hon. J. D. Ryan, 163.

ANGEL, HON. JAMES.
On Patent Bill, 50, 77.
On Advertisements Bill, 52, 54.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 95.
On Sealing Bill, 110, 135, 151.
On Saw Mills Bill, 164.
On Loggers Bill, 179.

ADDRESS IN REPLY,—
Proposed by Hon. J. Anderson, 4.
Seconded by Hon. J. J. Murphy, 28.
Committee on, 32
Debate, 32
Reply to, 41.

ALIENS BILL, 41, 43.

ADVERTISEMENTS BILL, 42, 51.

ANDERSON, HON. J.
Proposing Address in Reply, 4.

ADJOURNMENT, MOTION FOR, 200.

BISHOP, HON. R. K.
On Address in Reply, 32.
On Resolution of Condolence, 40.
On Patents Bill, 42,
On Aliens Bill, 42.

On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 43.
On Advertisements Bill, 44.
On Dental Bill, 44.

CONDOLENCE, RESOLUTIONS OF,—
Re Hon. J. S. Pitts, 40.
Re Mrs. Skelton, 69.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL, 42, 43, 94, 98, 109.

COMBINES AND MONOPOLIES BILL, 133, 157, 163.

CONCEPTION BAY ELECTRIC CO., 197.

DENTAL BILL, 42, 55, 62.

FISHERY RESOLUTIONS,—
Message from House of Assembly, 91.
Committee, 94.

GUNPOWDER AND EXPLOSIVES BILL, 82, 90, 91, 97, 100, 149.

GOODRIDGE, HON. A. F.—
On Address in Reply, 35.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 65, 81, 83.
On Fishery Resolutions, 93.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 94, 96, 98.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 97.
On Explosives Bill, 97.
On Sealing Bill, 100, 110, 197.
On Loan Bill, 199.

GIBBS, HON. M. P.—
On Patents Bill, 45, 46, 49, 50, 55, 59, 71.
On Advertisements Bill, 52, 54.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 63, 82, 84, 86.
On Resolution of Condolence, Mrs. Skelton, 69.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 88, 99.
On Explosives Bill, 90.
On Fishery Resolutions, 92, 93.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 96.
On Sealing Bill, 124, 137, 147, 149, 153.

On Combines and Monopolies Bill, 133.
House of Assembly Representation Bill, 134.
On White Slave Traffic Bill, 134.
On Saw Mills Bill, 157, 164, 165.
On Railway Loans Bill, 162.
On Workmans Compensation Bill, 162.
On Loggers Bill, 165.
On Municipal Bill, 181, 193, 194, 196.
On Salaries Bill, 182.
On Marine and Fisheries Bill, 182.
On Train-Ferry Service Bill, 186.
On Revenue Bill, 198, 200.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATION BILL, 98, 134, 157, 163.

HARVEY, HON, JOHN,—
On Address in Reply, 32.
On Patents Bill, 46, 57, 60, 62, 71, 74.
On Advertisements Bill, 53.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 66, 85, 87.
On Fishery Resolutions, 92, 93.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 94, 95, 98.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 99.
On Sealing Bill, 104, 112, 113, 135, 136, 141, 142, 144, 146, 148, 149, 152, 155.
On Loggers Bill, 178.
On Municipal Bill, 189, 190.
Moves Adjournment, 200.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE,—
Members of, 32.
Report of, 41.

INSPECTION OF FOODS BILL, 55, 63, 78, 82, 98, 134.

JOB, HON. W. C.—
On Patents Bill, 75.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 88, 97, 99, 180.
On Fishery Resolutions, 93.
On Sealing Bill, 101, 110, 140, 142, 145, 146, 148. 150, 153, 155, 157, 163, 197.
On Municipal Bill, 194.

LOAN BILLS,—
Public Service, 134, 162, 165, 199.
Railway, 134, 162, 164.

LOGGERS BILL, 165, 187.

MURPHY, HON. J. J.—
Seconding Address in Reply, 28.
On Loggers Bill, 167.

MUNICIPAL BILL, 180, 181, 187.

MARINE AND FISHERIES BILL, 180, 182.

MILLEY, HON. S.—
On Municipal Bill, 189.

MeGRATH, HON. P. T.—
On Patents Bill, 43, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 55, 61, 70, 75.
On Advertisements Bill, 52, 54.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 67, 81, 83, 86.
On Explosives Bill, 91, 97, 100.
On Fishery Resolutions, 92, 93.
On Cruelty to Animals, 94, 95, 96, 98.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 97, 99.
On Sealing Bill, 112, 126, 139, 140, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 154, 156, 197.
On Loggers Bill, 171.
On Municipal Bill, 181, 187, 188, 189, 191, 193, 195, 196.
On Revenue Bill, 199.

POWER, HON. M. F.—
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 81.
On Saw Mills Bill, 163.
On Municipal Bill, 181, 189.

PATENTS BILL, 41, 43, 45, 55, 69, 82, 91.

PILOTS AND PILOTAGE BILL, 198.

PARTRIDGE BERRIES BILL, 82, 88, 97, 99, 109, 180.

PRESIDENT, HON THE,—
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 78, 82.
On Sealing Bill, 146.
On Municipal Bill, 190.
On Revenue Bill, 198, 199.

ROBINSON, HON. J. ALEX.
On Dental Bill, 44, 62.
On Advertisements Bill, 52.
On Patent Bill, 59, 69, 78.
On Inspection of Foods, 85.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 95.
On Sealing Bill, 111, 137, 142, 145, 150, 152, 155.
On Municipal Bill, 787, 192, 195, 196.

RYAN, HON. J. D.—
On Advertisements Bill, 51, 52.
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 82.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 99, 100.
On Sealing Bill, 113.

RYAN, HON. JAMES,—
On Sealing Bill, 139, 151.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL, 134, 162, 164, 165.

RULES, SUSPENSION OF, 181.

REVENUE BILL, 198.

SEALING BILL, 98, 101, 110, 135, 149, 163, 165, 197, 201.

SAW MILLS BILL, 134, 157, 163, 165, 180, 197.

SELECT COMMITTEE,—
On Loggers Bill, 180.
On Fishery Resolutions, 94.

SALARIES BILL, 180, 182.

SKELTON, HON. DR.
On Sealing Bill, 154.

TEMPLEMAN, HON. P.—
On Inspection of Foods Bill, 69.
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 96.
On Partridge Berries Bill, 97, 100.
On Sealing Bill, 140.

TRAIN-FERRY SERVICE BILL, 180, 186, 187.

UNITED TOWNS ELECTRIC CO, 197.

WINTER, HON. M. G.—
On Cruelty to Animals Bill, 95.
On Sealing Bill, 122, 136, 143, 145, 147.

WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC BILL, 98, 134, 157, 163.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL, 134, 162, 165.