PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

DURING THE

FOURTH SESSION

OF THE

Twenty-Third General Assembly

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1916

ROBINSON & COMPANY, LTD, PRESS
Duckworth Street, St. John's, Newfoundland
1916.

NEWFOUNDLAND

OF

JOURNAL OF ASSEMBLY

OF THE

FOURTH SESSION

DURING THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

SESSION, 1916

THURSDAY, March 16th, 1916.

His Excellency having fixed the hour at which he proposed to open the present session of the Legislature at three of the clock in the afternoon of this Thursday, the sixteenth day of March, instant, the members of the House of Assembly met in the Assembly Room at a quarter to three of the clock in the afternoon, when Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

At three of the clock a message from His Excellency the Governor was delivered by the Gentlemen Usher of the Black Rod, commanding the immediate attendance of Mr. Speaker and the House in the Council Chamber. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, and the House attended His Excellency the Governor in the Council Chamber, and having returned to the Assembly Room, Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency had been pleased to make a gracious speech to both branches of the Legislature, a copy of which for purposes of greater accuracy he had obtained and which he then read to the House.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. President and Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

Since the last session of the Legislature the terrible struggle between the warring nations of Europe has continued to rage with unabated violence. The splendid traditions of the fighting forces of the Empire have been admirably upheld, and, in conjunction with our Allies, substantial progress has been made towards achieving the result which is inspiring us all, the conclusion of a peace that will preserve the liberties of the world and the advancement of the nations along the pathways of enlightened civilization.

The contingents from this country for military and naval service have, I am proud to say, conducted themselves with such gallantry and devotion to duty as to have won the highest praise from the responsible authorities, and the enthusiastic response made during the past year to the appeals for further recruits is, I am glad to say, likely to be continued on a similar scale during the present year.

At the beginning it was hoped and expected that the war would be short and the end attained without exceptional demands upon the manhood or resources of the Mother Country and the Oversea Dominions Instead of that, however, the conflict is proving one which threatens the very existence of the British Empire and of the nations associated with her in the effort to maintain civil liberty and the rights of free states. Unexampled calls have been made on the Mother Land and the other portions of the Empire, and they have been nobly met. A measure of compulsory enlistment has been enforced in the British Isles. Can-

ada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa have undertaken obligations proportionately great; and I have every confidence in the new invitation now being addressed to the young men of the Colony to do their part in the fighting line, and to the rest of our people to recognize what is required from those who remain at home that there will be a response that will keep Newfoundland where she was at the outset, in the very first rank in proportion to her population.

In view of the growing seriousness of the tonnage problem to the Colony as evidenced by some of its phases at present, measures will be introduced to invest my Ministers with further powers to enable them to deal with this matter in the general interests of the Colony.

The industrial operations of our people during the past year have been attended with highly satisfactory results. The high prices obtained for the staple products of the fisheries, forests and mines have enabled the working classes to enjoy a high degree of prosperity. This is all the more gratifying when we remember how the economic interests of every country have been disturbed by the far-reaching effects of the war, and we have surely cause for thankfulness that here in Newfoundland we have suffered so little.

One of the lessons which this war has taught the peoples of the British Empire is the desirability of promoting inter-imperial trade, and we may not unreasonably hope that one of the results will be a very great increase in the demands for the products of our fisheries, and that the development of our forest and mineral resources will be even more actively undertaken than heretofore.

Bills will be submitted to you for the consolidation of the laws of the Colony, a work last undertaken twenty-five years ago; bringing up to date the Education Law; for bringing the Measures, into conformity with the law with regard to Weights and standards existing in other countries; and to provide for the Municipal Government of the town of St. John's, as well as other measures.

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

The accounts for the past fiscal year, and the Estimates for the coming one, will be submitted to you in due course, and I am sure that you will make suitable provision for the requirements of the Public Service, with special reference to the increased obligations which the war will impose on the Colony.

You will be glad to know that there is a very substantial increase in the revenue from all sources, encouraging the hope that, at the end of the fiscal year in June next, our receipts will suffice to meet the expenditure on current account. It is now apparent that the decrease in revenue for the last fiscal year of $720,000 was largely due to the reduction in imports, consequent on the uncertainties as to trade development during the first year of the war; but we may reasonably assume, seeing there has been such a marked recovery the present year, that there is no longer any reason to fear a return to the conditions of twelve months ago. On the contrary we may hope, as the months pass and the outlook for the Allied cause grows brighter, that this condition will reflect itself in still larger imports and more enhanced prosperity.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

In accordance with the Act passed at the last session of the Legislature providing for the submission to the electors of the Colony of the question of the prohibition of the importation,

manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors, an election was held in November last resulting in the number of votes polled in the affirmative being a majority of the total number of votes cast and amounting to over forty per cent. of the total number of votes on the register, as required under the Statute. Under these circumstances a Proclamation called for by the Statute will issue at an early date, prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors into or in this Colony at any time after the first day of January, 1917, except as provided for in the said Act.

I commend the duties of the session to your assiduous care and pray that the guidance of Divine Providence may attend you. The sentiments of profound loyalty expressed by the Colony, and the practical manifestations of patriotism which have supported the same since the beginning of the war will, I feel sure, stimulate you all to the zealous performance of the session's tasks.

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. WALSH—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 4th session of the 23rd General Assembly.

And, Sir, I fully appreciate the honour conferred on me and through me on the District I have the honour to represent in this House, but, Sir, I must express my regret that the task was not assigned to some abler one, one who could do full justice to His Excellency's most inspiring speech.

However, Sir, with your permission and to the best of my ability, I will deal briefly with the various subjects referred to in the Speech.

The first paragraph deals with the question which is foremost in the minds of the whole civilized world today, namely, the great European conflict, in which we in this ancient and most loyal portion of the Empire are playing our part nobly and well. No nation or people on the face of God's green earth have a greater horror or disgust for war and its awful consequences, than the members of this great and glorious British Empire, of which it is our proud boast to be a part, but much as we hate war it is by far preferable to national dishonour, and dishonour, Sir, would have been our heritage had England remained neutral as the German war lord hoped, and allowed plucky little Belgium to be devastated, her splendid institutions razed to the ground, her priceless works of art wilfully destroyed, her priests, nuns and all civil population outraged, and all of this done in direct violation of a solemn pledge or treaty to protect her neutrality. And the Great British Empire. through her Sovereign, signed this treaty, and Emperor William, the ambition-mad Kaiser, was a very prominent figure at the ceremony, but as the Imperial German Chancellor put it, treaties are but "scraps of paper," and the success of German arms demand a short cut into France, we will crush her and then we will turn our attention to the chief object of our ambition. Your treaties mean nothing to us, and the word "Honour" has no place in our diplomatic councils, and has appeared in name only in the German dictionary. For forty years we have been preparing for this opportunity. The only nation we fear is England, and she is on the verge of internal revolution; our hour has come. You will meet the foe and you will defeat him; take no prisoners, slaughter all before you, and strike terror into the hearts of the people. We must overrun Europe with our military machine, and Prussianize its people.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the substance of this modern Attila's address to his troops before they went into action. This, Sir, was his insane ambition, but the grand old John Bull, the exponent of liberty and fair play, the guardian and protector of smaller nations, and, in fact, the sheet-anchor of civilization, was reluctantly obliged, when every other means of averting war had failed, to warn Germany that her line of conduct was tantamount to a declaration of war. In effect, he said, "Halt, Sir! Call off your dogs or I'll shoot," and he shot, and that one shot, Sir, shattered to pieces all the German plans, the product of forty years of trickery, treachery and duplicity. As soon as the treaty was violated, England was plunged into war; she did not consider that treaty a "Scrap of paper." It possessed the signature of our Sovereign, and she could never hope to hold up her head amongst the nations of the earth if she did not enforce the observance of that solemn agreement. England was—if you like—unprepared, but not to the extent of a temporary peace with dishonour. It is true that she had only a small army in August, 1914, but in March, 1916, what do we find? Kitchener's "contemptible little army" has grown to millions, munitions are in abundance, our mercantile marine has been largely increased despite the German submarine campaign, and our Navy, which has fully demonstrated its ability to rule the waves, has grown to the extent of over a million tons. Our territory has been enlarged by hundreds of thousands of square miles, our domestic troubles have all disappeared, and to-day, Sir, England, Ireland, Scotland, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Canada, and great, big-hearted, little Newfoundland has clasped hands in everlasting friendship. The whole Empire is cemented into one immense brotherhood, both in name and spirit.

Now, Sir, let us examine the result as regards Germany. Millions of the flower of her manhood have been sacrificed, her towns and cities are teeming with starving widows and orphans, her industries are demoralized, her commerce has been swept from the seas, her banking institutions are on the brink of bankruptcy, her Navy, which we heard so much about, is a close prisoner in the Kiel Canal. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is no idle boast to say that "Britain Rules the Waves," that the Navy which is the glorious boast of every true Briton and the fear and envy of her enemies is doing its work well. John Jellicoe is on the job.

"We have closed the Gates of Dover
Straits,
And North where the tide runs free,
Cheek by jowl, our watch dogs prowl
Grey hulks in a greyer sea."

And well it is so, Sir, not alone for the safety of the British Empire, but for the protection of neutral nations as well. The Fleet of England is to-day safeguarding the cities of the United States and preventing devastation of its fair soil and the enactment thereon of all the crimes which were committed in Belgium, Poland and Serbia, which forever disgrace the name of Germany. The British Fleet to-day is affording the same protection to the United States as it is to Canada and Newfoundland, and the sooner hyphenates understand this, the better in the interests of the civilized world.

The second paragraph deals, Sir, with the Naval and Military contingents sent from Newfoundland. As you are aware, Sir, when this war broke out, this country had no soldiers and we had rarely ever seen one outside of St. John's, and if by chance a soldier did appear in the outports,

he was looked upon as a kind of curiosity, but when the call came "Your King and Country need you," what loyalty and affection we have for the old flag—under which we have enjoyed liberties that no other people on earth can boast of—caused a noble response from our young manhood, and it is their determination to uphold with their lives, if necessary, the splendid traditions which have been handed down to us by our forefathers, and these traditions are "To keep aloft the grand old Union Jack," which is the emblem of that liberty, freedom, and equality enjoyed by every member of this vast Empire. And no Prussian tyrant shall ever lower that flag one inch "if Britain to herself be true." The Mother's call was heard in every hamlet of the British Isles. It reached through the wilds of Africa, through the jungles of India, the bush of Australia, through the prairies of Canada, around the rock-bound coast of Newfoundland and in the many other lands where this emblem of freedom unfurls itself to the breeze, and the manhood in each of these climes answered "We are coming, Mother England, and we are millions strong." You know, Sir, we here are small in numbers, but notwithstanding this we have sent contingents both to the Army and Navy—loyal sons of Terra Nova are to be found in almost every branch of the service, and our men both on land and sea have already experienced the grim reality of war. That they have acquitted themselves honourably we all know. We have it from the most authentic authority that our men under fire have acted like veterans. Everybody in Newfoundland is familiar with the bravery of Lieutenant Donnelly and his little band of heroes, one of whom I am proud to state is a constituent of mine—Private Matthew Collins, son of James W. Collins, H. M. C. of Placentia. These heroes captured that Hill and held it against fearful odds, thus doing credit to themselves and upholding the honour of Newfoundland. This reminds me that Newfoundland has increased its territory, seeing that we own this famous Caribou Hill on the Gallipoli Peninsula. I don't know whether the Premier intends to make it an additional district, but I want to tell him that if Captain Carty is a candidate seeking the suffrage of the Caribouites, I don't want to be his opponent.

There are many other instances, Mr. Speaker, where our soldiers distinguished themselves, notably at the evacuation of the Gallipoli Peninsula, where they occupied the post of honour. Our seamen also have discharged their duty and gained distinction. They have been commented upon most favourably by the officials of the Admiralty, and at least one of them today is the proud possessor of the much-coveted Distinguished Service Medal. So you see, Sir, already four of our men have been decorated. But, Mr. Speaker, I regret to state that some of our men have made the supreme sacrifice. To the sorrowing relatives I extend my heartfelt sympathy, but no word of mine can lessen such grief as theirs, but they have the happy consolation of knowing that their sons nobly died, they gave up their lives in a righteous cause for the protection of others.

"And how can man die better,
Than fighting fearful odds,
For the ashes of his fathers
For the Temples of his Gods?"

As for the need of further recruiting, I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is very great; it is not at all difficult to see how this war must end. England must be victorious if she but to herself be true. We are fighting a great, unscrupulous nation, one with forty years of preparation, and whose sole

ambition is to destroy the British Empire, one whose national toast for the past two score years was "Here's to The Day."

So, if we are to succeed, it's men and still more men we need. If we in this Colony are to measure up to the other parts of the Empire and retain the proud position we now hold, our recruiting must be continued and stimulated. England, to-day, Sir, is fighting for her life, and the quicker we realize it the better, if we are preserve the liberty in which we were cradled, and now is the time to act, not after a German victory.

"Oh cruel fate, were the night too late
To undo the work of the morn."

Newfoundland says no Prussian tyrant shall ever rule our soil, and, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that as soon as our people fully realize the urgent need for further recruits, sufficient will be forthcoming,—yes, Sir, if we stand by the old Flag as we should, victory will soon perch on our banners, but we must and shall stand by it.

"England stand you steadfast,
Come along from Wales,
Scotland send your warriors,
Ireland never fails,
Britons from beyond the Seas,
Answer to the call,
To fight for God and Country
To conquer for us all.

In connection with our Volunteer movement, I must pay a well merited tribute to their Excellencies Sir Walter and Lady Davidson for the magnificent work they have done in this behalf. To His Excellency's untiring zeal the success of the movement is greatly due and his interest does not end when the men are trained and embarked, he follows them to England and his personal influence has added greatly towards their comfort, in fact, his fatherly affection accompanied them to far off Egypt where his brother uses his good offices in their behalf. Too much praise cannot be given Lady Davidson for the splendid work accomplished by the Women's Patriotic Association, which has in no small way contributed to the comfort of our Soldiers and Sailors, and in this splendid work she was ably assisted by the good ladies of the Island through the various branches of the W.P.A. to all of whom we extend our sincere thanks. To the mothers of the volunteers who made such noble sacrifices we say ,'God Bless Them" and we sincerely hope and pray that they shall soon have their boys home again, covered with glory, having done honour to themselves and to the land of their birth.

The next paragraph in the speech Mr. Speaker deals with the threatened tonnage shortage in Newfoundland. You are well aware Sir, that this condition of affairs was brought about by the sale of so many of our local steamers to Russia—one of our Allies—and also by the loss of a number of our sailing vessels which have not been replaced. This Sir, together with our dependence on foreign ships which owing to the war are not available I submit as the cause of this apparent embarrassment. But the silver lining of this dark cloud has appeared through the mists, and thanks to the untiring efforts of the Prime Minister in this as in all other matters where the welfare of our people is concerned this seemingly very difficult problem has been practically solved. The Premier and his Ministers in conjunction with the Board of Trade and Mr. W. F. Coaker, representing the Fishermen's Protective Union, have gone into the matter in a statesman-like manner, and we are already assured that at least no serious embarrassment that would materially interfere with our industries need be feared.

Through the courtesy and generosi-

ty of Lord Rothermere and our local steamer owners we are assured that the all-important article Salt, without which our staple industry would have to be abandoned is assured us in sufficient quantity to carry on our fishies. I anticipate no serious shortage in provisions or general merchandize. and as long as our stocks are sufficiently large to tide us over another month or two, I think this present crisis in the tonnage shortage will be passed. But in times of peace prepare for war is a good maxim, and I think this a most opportune time for the whole question to be gone into earnestly. Personally I think it a lamentable state of affairs that we in Newfoundland, where we have so many competent builders and abundance of the finest class of building material, are compelled to put our gold into the pockets of Canadian and American builders for the purchase of our banking and coasting vessels. I do not know what the laws of these countries are, or the encouragement, if any, offered by their respective Governments, but I am convinced beyond all shadow of doubt that the time has arrived when this important industry which means so much towards our commercial existence should be fostered.

The next subject is the Revenue. Not being a financier, Mr. Speaker, you can easily understand that my reference to this subject will be brief.

It is very gratifying to know that although the Revenue was short last year on June 30th $750,000. it is hoped this year that the revenue will meet all expenditure and in all probability will give a small surplus. This deficit in the revenue was brought about by short imports, the imports into this colony for the year 1914-15 having been over $3,000,000 short of the previous year. This was caused by the fear on the part of some importers as to what might happen on account of the war, and by the desire of others to dispose of their old stocks. Another reason which might be attributed was the difficulty of obtaining many lines of goods and the many obstacles in the way of procuring freights. Of course all of these conditions were brought about by the war. And, Sir, when we consider that we in Newfoundland are just as much in a state of war as England, France or Germany, we have every reason to be thankful for the splendidly prosperous condition we find ourselves in today. I want to offer my congratulations to the Hon. the Finance Minister on our splendid financial standing which is in no small measure to be attributed to the judicious management of his department.

The next subject referred to in His Excellency's speech deals with the recent Prohibition Election. As you are aware Sir, at the last session of this Assembly a unanimous vote was cast granting the people the power of expressing at the Polls their decision with regard to this very vexed question. Considering the fact that the whole people were divided into two camps we have every reason to be proud of the conduct of our people. It is a pleasure to me to be able to extend to the whole people my hearty congratulations on the splendid example shown by the absence of the rowdyism which too often disturbs the quiet and peacefulness which is the glorious heritage of the Anglo Saxon race. It is most gratifying to know that our people can differ on questions of policy without allowing their differences to interfere with the splendid harmony which is the bulwark of our national existence.

Now Sir, just a few words in reference to our industries. Thanks to the protection afforded us by England's Navy our Bank fishery for the past year was most successful, our Labrador and Shore fisheries were also a

fair average, and owing to most of our keenest competitors in the foreign markets being drawn away from their usual avocation to engage in the more profitable employment of munitions, etc., and the great difficulty of others in catching and marketing their fish owing to conditions brought about by the war all of which tend to enhance the value of our product and so increase the earning power of our people. The seal fishery of last year Sir, was almost a blank and owing to the sale of most of our steel fleet, this most important branch of our industries is seemingly on the decline, but this may be Sir, a blessing in disguise, for had we gone on indiscriminately killing off such large numbers of our young seals and not made provision for the future, this industry would in time be destroyed, as the whole family or families would be exterminated, hence I say Sir, this is a blessing in disguise, and in a few years when the industry is allowed to recuperate I hope to see this Legislature regulate it so as all fear on this score can be cancelled, we hope and trust that the voyage of 1916 will be fraught with much prosperity and the safe return of our people.

The lobster fishery has declined to an almost alarming extent, but when we examine the cause and carefully study the possible effect on the future we are not so much disturbed. Now Sir, the first cause was an actual decline in the number of lobsters caught owing to the indiscriminate slaughter of the female lobster which destruction has been going on year after year and no attempt being made to effect a remedy until the present Government awoke to the fact that if something was not done and done quickly this valuable industry would be lost to us. So a propaganda was launched in charge of Commissioner Dee, a most qualified official and we have every reason to believe that his work is fast bearing fruit. The second reason I will advance for its decline in dollars and cents, at least, is the loss of the German market,and owing to war conditions we have not been able to duplicate it. However, perhaps the same theory can be attributed to the crustacean as to the seal and temporary rest may so stimulate this industry that when the clouds that today are hanging over Europe have finally passed away and the human race are once more united and the commerce of the world passes to and fro unmolested, then with this rest after years of continual toil, our lobster fishery will again add greatly to our wealth and welfare.

A great improvement is noticeable with regard to our Herring fishery, and I think Sir, that with the introduction of rigid laws properly enforced to standardize this splendid article of food much wealth will be added to the pockets of our people. I cannot pass entirely from this most important subject without saying a word on behalf of the great need for cold storage for bait purposes, hundreds of thousands of dollars are annually lost to the country for the want of bait and I hope that something will soon be done to effect a remedy. Any expenditure in this direction will be a gilt edge investment. During the past two years, while on the revenue service on the South Coast and Placentia Bay, I had an opportunity to study the question by personal observation. During the months of August and September hundreds of our fishermen were compelled to lounge about the decks of their vessels in beautifully fine weather, when fish was plentiful on the Banks and at Cape St. Mary's, but unfortunately no bait was available.

Our lumbering industry which gives remunerative employment to so many of our people was a good average last

year and I look with confidence to the not far distant day when Grand Falls will be one of many paper towns. During the latter part of the year a great increase took place in the output of Iron ore from Bell Island, which is such a great factor in swelling our revenue and it is only reasonable to assume that after the war this Mine or Mines will be developed to many times its present capacity as metals are bound to be in great demand. In conclusion, Sir, I hope and trust that whoever holds the honourable position I hold to-day at the opening of this House in 1917 that his references will be to the past European conflict which will have ended in a glorious victory for Briton and her gallant Allies, that the lobby of this House will be filled with our returned heroes, and that peace and prosperity will reign throughout the whole empire. I have much pleasure in moving for the select Committee.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion so ably and eloquently proposed by my friend, the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's, Mr. Walsh, for the appointment of a Committee to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. And before going further, I should like to tender my hon. friend my congratulations on his very excellent speech. I do this not as a mere matter of form but in all sincerity, for I doubt if we have ever listened to a more eloquent opening address than that he has just delivered. As he has so fully and exhaustively covered the several matters referred to in His Excellency's Speech, it is unnecessary that I should delay the House with any lengthy observations.

His Excellency begins his Speech with a reference to the great war now raging in Europe, and it was natural he should have done so, for it is always uppermost in our thoughts, it is the all-absorbing topic. The conflict has now raged for nearly two years, and as we view the situation today we do so with much more satisfaction than we did when last we assembled in this House.

When we met here nearly a year ago, one might almost have been forgiven if he had taken a gloomy view of the existing conditions. Our soldiers, with those of our gallant ally, France, were hard pressed on the Western Front. In the East our Russian allies, though fighting valiantly, had been driven back and back, until we wondered whether her defences would not break under the terrible punishment she was receiving. But with a courage and tenacity that evoked the admiration of the world, she held on until with abundant reinforcements of men and guns, she was able to check the onslaughts of the enemy. The cause for this seemingly desperate situation was, as we all know, primarily due to shortage of munitions. Conditions of warfare had changed. Rifles and bayonets had ceased to be effective, battles were now won with big guns and plenty of them. The problem was to supply them, and this duty the Mother Country undertook, and during the year she has not alone kept her own soldiers well supplied, but has so organized her resources as to very largely assist her Allies also. The year has likewise witnessed a wonderful development in our armies, both in numbers and efficiency, and also in the extent of the battle line. The small expeditionary force which represented the Empire in the beginning of the war, and which played such an heroic part in the retreat from Mons, and in the subsequent defeat of the enemy at the Marne, has been increased ten fold, and in addition a large army is in training in the home land. A year ago we were fighting on the Western Front only. To-day our soldiers are at grips with

the enemy, not alone in France and Flanders, but in Mesopotamia, in Egypt, on the Serbian frontier, and in East Africa, where the last of Germany's colonies is now being wrested from her. The year has seen three other nations—Italy, Bulgaria and Portugal—brought into the conflict; it has witnessed the disastrous Balkan campaign, and the overwhelming defeat of our allies, the Serbs and the Montenegrins, and the overrunning of their countries by the superior forces of the enemy; also the abandonment of the Gallipoli enterprise, in which we were so greatly interested because our boys were there. It has also witnessed some severe fighting on the two principal fronts, which, while largely without any definite result, at least has proved the ability of the Allied troops to hold their own. During the past few weeks a struggle greater than anything ever known in history, has raged about the forts of Verdun, which, through the bravery, endurance and skill of the gallant French troops, has resulted in a severe check to the enemy. While on land we have held our own, on the sea we have been supreme. Our navy has maintained its superiority and won a victory all the greater because the enemy has never dared challenge its supremacy. With the exception of a small area where floating mines or occasional submarines cause some loss, our ships sail the seas without fear of molestation or danger. True we have had some losses, but they are insignificant when compared with the huge number of ships engaged in keeping the trade of the Empire going. Words, Sir, can give no adequate expression of our indebtedness to the navy; no proper estimate can now be made of what the "freedom of the seas" means, or what Germany has suffered through the loss of her merchant marine and the slow strangling pressure of our fleet. Sufficient for us to know that the glorious traditions of the navy have been gloriously upheld; and that we can rejoice in the fact that the sons of dear old Terra Nova are bearing a noble part in its activities.

The year has been one of trial and tribulation, anxiety and sorrow, but it has brought its compensations also. The Empire has demonstrated its solidarity and its strength; it has maintained unimpaired the noble traditions which have been handed down from generation to generation; it has shown once again its immense recuperative power in the face of difficulty and danger. If one had suggested less than two years ago that Britain should raise an army of three millions of men he would have been laughed to scorn. We were a naval not a military power, what did we want with soldiers? But the need came and realizing the danger to the Empire and their individual responsibility in the premises the loyal sons of the Old Land, and the new lands across the sea, rallied round the flag they loved so well, the flag that for a thousand years has braved the battle and the breeze, until their numbers represent the force I have just named. In the words of Britain's Prime Minister, "I do not believe there is a more remarkable achievement in the history of the whole world."

And, Sir, as we view the situation to-day, we do so with tranquility and absolutely without doubt as to the outcome of the struggle. Each day as it passes strengthens the position of our Allies and ourselves, and leaves our enemies in a more crippled condition. From the day when the soil of Belgium was violated by Germany and a solemn international treaty treated as a scrap of paper, when, as an Empire called upon to redeem our sacred pledge, we plunged into the

struggle, there has been no doubt in the minds of Britons the world over as to what the end would be. Fired with a conviction that we were fighting in a just and righteous cause, only one object has been before us,—to pursue the war to victory with all the skill, resource and energy of the Empire. Nothing short of that; nothing but a decisive victory will satisfy. Militarism with all its hideousness must be destroyed. The smaller nations must be protected from aggression,a lasting peace must be assured.To quote the words of the King's speech at the opening of Parliament on Feby. 15th, "We shall not lay down our arms until we have vindicated the cause which carries with it the future of civilization." There can be no inconclusive peace; that would mean only a postponement of the struggle. To make terms with Germany now, as Mr. Ian Macpherson so very clev-erly put it when speaking in the British Parliament a few weeks ago, would be like the Report of the Lord Chamberlain on the Gunpowder Plot, in which he said he "discovered 25 barrels of gunpowder in the cellar and had removed 10, hoping the other fifteen would do no harm." The only terms on which peace could be discussed were stated by the British Premier as far back as 1914. Said Mr. Asquith: "We shall never sheathe the sword, which we have not lightly drawn, till Belgium receives in full measure all and more than she has sacrificed, until France is adequately secured against the menace of aggression, until the rights of the smaller nationalities of Europe are placed upon an unassailable foundation, and until the military domination of Prussia is wholly and finally destroyed."

And these words not only represent the feeling in Britain, they speak equally as strong the opinion of our gallant allies.

Now for a few moments let me refer to our local interest in the war. As an integral part of the British Empire,—the "oldest and most loyal colony" as we frequently speak of her, how has Newfoundland shared in the war? How has she fulfilled her obligations to the Empire? Has she done her duty? I would not care to say that she has done all she might have done, or should have done. But this much I think may be said, that comparatively she has kept her place with the other Colonies. In discussing our contribution it must be remembered that we had absolutely no active military organization to draw from. (The Boys' Brigades cannot be termed such —they only teach a certain amount of drill to our youths.) Such, however, was not the position of the larger Colonies, all of whom had their militia or other military institutions. So that we started under a serious disability. When therefore the Government shortly after war was declared offered 500 men for the army and further pledged itself to increase the Naval Reserve to 1,000 and keep it at that figure, it was felt that a good beginning was made. There was, I think, much doubt at first as to whether the men could be secured, but to the everlasting credit of the young men of the country, and particularly of St. John's, the figure was not only reached but surpassed, so that in a couple of months we were able to send a full battalion, completely officered, equipped, and partly trained across to the old country. Since then recruiting has gone on quietly but steadily, and up to the end of February over 2,000 men had been accepted and enrolled, or four times the number at first offered. Our promise regarding the Naval Reserve has also been kept, and over 1,000 of our men are now serving in His Majesty's Navy. From the viewpoint of our pledge, then, we have more than done our

duty. But when the pledge was made it was not anticipated the war would continue so long, or that there would be such a demand for men. But the demand has come, and it is our bounden duty to see that we do our share. So the call has gone forth for even another battalion and the response so far is so satisfactory as to warrant the belief that in a few weeks the battalion with sufficient reserves will be forthcoming. All honour to our young men who are thus proving their loyalty to the flag and showing to the world that the rich red blood of their British sires flows unrestrained in their veins. We have reason to be proud of our soldier boys, Sir. Newfoundland may well and proudly hold up her head for the lads who have gone abroad have done her honour. Their conduct whether in the training camp or facing the foe in the trenches has won unstinted praise. They have bravely upheld the best traditions of the British race on the field of battle, bravely and fearlessly done their duty. I need not here refer to their exploits in the field, they are well known to every member of the House, suffice it to say that the story will be writ large in the annals of this country, and that so long as time shall last the heroic part played by them in the Gallipoli trenches and on Caribou Hill will remain an undying memory. We look to the list of awards for evidences of their valor, and we find their names inscribed there; we look to that greater Roll of Honour, the roll of those who have made the supreme sacrifice, and there too, are their names to be found. They died for us. And while we weep over their graves, we rejoice in the greatness of the lives that preferred death to dishonour, that were willing to die that truth and righteousness might prevail. And let us not forget our lads in the other branch of the service,—our Naval Reservists—who have likewise served their country well, some of whom also have fallen at the post of duty. Though less conspicuous, theirs was none the less dangerous work. Treading the slippery decks of their vessel in all weathers, ever alert for sight of the sneaking submarine, or clearing the ocean paths of the treacherous mine, they have performed a service to the Empire that cannot be measured by words. To them also, we say all honour. Of them also Newfoundland is proud. And so, Sir, we have no need to be ashamed of what we have done. We have not held back our boys, neither do we hesitate to assume those financial burdens which their going imposes on us. And that is the least we should do, if prevented from going ourselves, to look after those who have gone, their relatives and dependents. And here it is gratifying to note that the Colony has recovered from her temporary embarrassment, and is equal to meeting all her financial obligations with the possibility of something to spare. This is due, of course, to the recovery of our people from the dread of the war scare, to increased importations and the additional revenue which comes through our ad valorem duties from higher cost of goods. I do not think there is any need for us to fear the future. Generally speaking, trade conditions throughout the country are good, and prospects for the coming season are bright. Nearly all of last year's fishing voyage realized very high prices for the fishermen, if not over profitable for the merchant, and the probabilities are the price will not fall off very greatly this year. There may be a little trouble with regard to the earlier cargoes of fish owing to the difficulty of securing transportation, but there are yet some months to arrange for that, and with a little energy and foresight on the

part of our mercantile community the difficulty should be overcome.

So far as the western fishery is concerned I think we need anticipate no trouble. The merchants there have a fine class of vessels which are used extensively in the trans-atlantic fish trade; they are not dependent on outside tonnage. I notice His Excellency deals with the threatened shortage of tonnage, and foreshadows legislation. A good deal has been said and written on this matter recently and the situation seems to be an awkward one. The pity is it was not foreseen by those gentlemen of the trade whose interests are most affected. In the hurry to get rich quick they were parties most of them, to the sale of the splendid fleet of steel ships which has been accumulated during the past few years, and which if retained,would have solved all our difficulties. Patriotism is the reason I have heard advanced for their transfer to our Russian Ally; but the owners took good care it was the kind of patriotism that paid. And now instead of making an effort to get themselves out of the difficulty into which their own lack of foresight has plunged them, they are throwing the onus of providing tonnage accomodation on the Government. It was ever thus, Sir. So long as there was a paternal Government willing to assume the responsibility, why should they worry? Seemingly they can't move without Government assistance. Helpless infants that they are, while we are at it, it might be well to provide them with swaddling clothes. As I understand the situation now, largely through Government effort the problem is practically solved and we need feel no very great anxiety.

The one event of more than ordinary importance in connection with our Colonial life, which occurred since last we met was the Prohibition election held in November last. The conditions under which the election was held are familiar to members of the House and it is unnecessary to repeat them now. Suffice it to say the result has been such as to demonstrate most clearly the desire of our people to be freed from the traffic and its attendant evils. The issuing of the proclamation as announced in His Excellency's speech will settle this issue for many years to come, so far as this country is concerned.

In conclusion, Sir, I think as we review the year we have much reason to be thankful. The Empire has maintained its honoured position. It has assumed the burdens and responsibilities, and borne the sacrifices incident to the great war, with that courage and determination which has been so characteristic of her people in all ages. While the suffering has been great, it has been insignificant when compared with that of our allies or enemies. Our shores are free of the invader, our trade is unhampered, our ships carry on their business almost with the freedom of peace times, our armies are unbeaten, and our Navy maintains undisputed sovereignty of the seas. As a Colony our life has been almost normal. Every branch of industry and trade has prospered, employment has been abundant, and our general position is one which might well be envied. Imperially and locally we look to the future with confidence. Confident that success will crown our own arms and those of our loyal and gallant allies, confident, as His Excellency so well says, in "the conclusion of a peace that will preserve the liberties of the world and the advancement of the nations along the pathways of enlightened civilization."

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding to consider the speech with which it has pleased His Excellency the Governor to open this Legislature, I should first like to extend

my congratulations to both the proposer and seconder of the motion now before you. I think every one in the House both on this and on the other side, will agree with me when I say that both these gentlemen are deserving of the congratulations of the House. I think they both showed a thorough and full appreciation of the great issues that are today facing us in this Colony, and which face every country in the World. They have put their views before us in language that compares very favorably with any address on a similar occasion that has been given since I have been here. Passing now to the Speech from the Throne, one naturally considers first that one vital issue which occupies all our minds and attention above every other subject ,the struggle that is going on in Europe. So much depends for us all; so much depends for civilization; so much depends for the Christian spirit amongst the nations upon the result of this titanic struggle. Nations who are now neutral may look on at that struggle, but these nations are just as much concerned in the result as the combatants on the fields of Flanders and France, and on the other fields all over the world as we ourselves. The issue will affect them as much as it will affect us, and no nation can afford to see the cause for which Great Britain and her Allies are fighting go down to defeat before the system which Germany represents. The cause is too vital and too great for any neutral sentiment to exist upon the issues. Twelve months ago at the opening of this Legislature, I expressed a hope that when we opened on this occasion we would be able to look back upon a lasting and permanent peace brought about by the victorious efforts of the Allied armies. This hope has unfortunately, not been realized, but we can today see opening up before us the bright hope of ultimate and complete triumph for our forces and a lasting peace which will render safe the principles for which the Allies are fighting. Looking back over the period of the war I do not think that any one can regret that Great Britain took the stand she did in August, 1914. We know now that the doctrines preached by the German professors and by their militarists were not mere theories; we know now that their doctrines and teachings were statements of what they intended to carry out in practice; we know now that the principles which they laid down were not merely theories for the study-hall but the outrages which they intended to inflict upon the human race to satisfy their lust of power; we know now that the initial step which the Germans took by the invasion of Belgium and the tearing up of their treaty, by which they guaranteed her neutrality, was only the first of a series of acts of a kind which they have been repeating over and over again during the past two years. In every feature of the War Germany has shown the same disregard for the principles and doctrines of international law and human justice which she showed in this preliminary step.

Newfoundland has taken her part in this War, and Newfoundland will do more. She has already contributed to the military and naval forces of the Empire. Our young men have enlisted in great numbers and every day now we see more of them flocking to the Colors. The sentiment which was at first to a large extent confined to St. John's, is now spreading all over the Island, and people from the remotest hamlets in the country are flocking daily to the Recruiting Offices ,so that the movement is confined not only to St. John's and the surrounding neighbourhood, but is being felt all over the country. This

question of recruiting is one which is the most serious to our people. We have the same obligation that exists all over the Empire,true though it is that we may not be under a legal obligation as they are in the Mother Country. There a measure of compulsory service has been introduced, but to my mind the obligation resting upon our young men is as great here as it is there. We are bound in honour to do our share in this regard, and I am glad to say that we are doing it. We have sent forward a great number of soldiers and sailors, and now a second battalion is in process of formation. The response is so good that this second battalion will soon be ready to go forward and join their brothers of the first.

I think, Sir, I have already said that it is probable that the great issues, the great decisive events of the war, are now taking place. The struggle around Verdun is evidently the beginning of the end. It indicates how speedily and quickly the result will be realized. Now is the time when the whole material strength of the Empire should be shown. Now is the time when young men who are willing and able to enlist should offer themselves This is their opportunity to show their patriotism, and I am quite sure that when, after the war is over,and the parts done by the various portions of the Empire are examined into, it will be found that the people of Newfoundland have done their full share in this glorious work.

Now, Sir, looking further at the speech, I would consider another feature of the situation. You will agree that there are other questions which must arise at a time like this. The question of trade and commerce must be always under vigilant consideration by those responsible for trade and commerce, and by the Government of the Colony, and consequently provision will have to be made for dealing with the shortage of tonnage to handle our imports and exports. We are dependent so absolutely upon our import and export trade, that this is a question of even more vital importance to us than it would be to a place which is not wholly dependent upon the sale of its produce, and the purchase of its supplies from sources outside the country.

We have recently seen in the public press that this question has caused some anxiety; that a shortage of tonnage is likely to occur unless some very drastic measures are taken. The cause of this shortage is not the result of the war. I think with foresight and with a true sense of patriotism, a great deal of this trouble might have been avoided. I am inclined to agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Currie, that the trade in this matter have not shown the patriotism which we might have expected of men of their standing in the community. I think that it is far from patriotic at a time like this in a country like this dependent so much on tonnage, to export and to sell at a very large profit ships on which the trade of the Colony is so very largely dependent. In Canada and in Great Britain I find that measures are taken to prevent this sort of thing, and extra taxation is imposed on all excessive profits of such a nature arising out of the war. I think in those countries provision is made to make the former owners pay largely for the provision of tonnage to take the place of those sold; and that it is the duty of this legislature to see that a measure of that kind is taken to protect the people of this country against similar conduct.

Most of the ships, the locally owned ships, upon which this trade depends, were sold at a large profit. There have been sold, for instance, the two

ships which went from Port aux Basques to North Sydney, the 'Bruce' and the 'Lintrose,' and the 'Bonaventure,' 'Bellaventure' and the other ships, all at a large profit to the owners, and now after making this great profit, they come to the Government and ask them to make provision to replace the tonnage which they sold, and it has even been suggested that the Government give them a subsidy to carry on the trade. If the subsidy is needed, let it be provided out of the excessive profits arising out of the sale of these ships.

I don't intend, Mr. Speaker, to go through the Speech paragraph by paragraph, but there is one matter which is always regarded with interest in the Speech from the Throne. It is a portion to which we all look forward with interest. It is the paragraph referring to the financial situation. All are anxious to know the financial situation of the country. What has been done, and what the proposals are now. Of this we find but little information in the Speech. We are told that the revenue has been a large one and the Minister of Finance hopes at the end of the financial year to be able to show a revenue equal to the current expenditure. That is a matter of which we are certainly pleased, but if we are to consider the situation, the large extent of taxation which exists in this country, and the fact that this taxation is day by day increasing, I mean by that we know the prices are going up day by day, and every advance in price means where there is an ad valorem duty an increase in the taxation of the people. In view of that we might expect the Speech to foreshadow a large surplus at the end of the financial year; brought about both by large returns from taxation, and also by careful economy in the conduct of our public service. We know that there is room in our public service for large economies. We know that many items can be reduced, and that much expenditure can be saved. We know that with proper management not only could the ordinary expenditure be reduced so as to leave a surplus, but so as to help reduce our indebtedness, which must necessarily have been increased in carrying on the war.

I am glad to see that there is no intention, as far as I can gather from the Speech as I heard it read, to directly increase the taxation of our people by new taxes. Some people anticipated as the result of a proclamation for the enforcement of Prohibition that there would be a falling off of the revenue. I suppose that is a natural effect of such a measure, but I think with your increased revenue and automatically increasing taxation this deficit should be met without increasing the burden of the people.

I notice that it is the intention to submit a measure dealing with the Government of St. John's. This is a matter of very great importance to the citizens of St. John's in particular, and I hope when this measure is brought in it will be the realization of the wishes of the people, and that a good measure will be produced. It has been in the course of preparation for two years. A special Government for the city, a special commission was appointed, which undertook the Government of the city during the past two years ,and the duty of drafting legislation to recommend to this legislature was left in their hands. We expect that measure when it comes here to have the result of remedying any faults which have come to the notice of the gentlemen who undertook this work, and will justify the confidence which has been placed in them.

Just one matter I would like to refer to: the matter of reporting the

last Session; that is, the manner of reporting the debates in this House. I think that the reporting last year has been the worst that I have ever known in connection with this Legislature. The debates have not yet been fully published in the daily papers, and I presume that as a consequence the Hansard is not yet complete. Some new system must be initiated that will insure satisfactory reporting, as the system now in vogue seems to be absolutely useless for the purpose required, and which entails a waste of money which should not, in the interests of the country, continue. In ordinary years the debates dragged on through the summer, ending somewhere in October or September, although the House closed some time in April. It ought to be a simple matter to inaugurate a system that would entail the speech being typewritten and the member having in his possession a copy thereof, within a day or so. I mention this early in the Session so that steps may be taken by the Internal Economy Committee to have improvements made so that we can have a system that will work more satisfactorily than that which heretofore has been in use. The system that we have been following as far as the debates are concerned, is one that was in vogue when the speeches of this Assembly were reported in longhand, but now when all the reports are taken down in shorthand, and we have at our disposal such devices as typewriting machines, surely some other method of reporting that would be more satisfying can be evolved. In conclusion, I would like to repeat what I said last session on the occasion of opening the House that when we meet here on this occasion next year, that we will reassemble with the shadows of war dispelled, and that we then may prepare to face the problems which a permanent peace will bring to the world, and that we will be able to say that the principles and truths represented by Great Britain and her Allies shall have sunk in the past conditions and circumstances that never more will show their influence amongst mankind.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just one or two words in reply to the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition who has just sat down. And first I would like to remark that I entirely concur with him in the sentiments of hope expressed at the termination of his speech, namely, that when we meet here again a year from now on the occasion of our next session that we will be able to congratulate ourselves one and all, the British Empire and the world at large, on the termination of the titanic struggle through which we are now passing, and the establishment of a permanent and lasting peace. With him I desire to congratulate the members on this side of the House who so distinguished themselves here this afternoon by their able and brilliant speeches. Both gentlemen have already shown great aptitude for public speaking but I think that you will all agree that here this afternon, not alone the matter, but the form and structure was everything that such an occasion as this might desire. I think I might also go a little further and congratulate my friend the leader of the Opposition on the lack of anything of an acrimonious nature from him or his side and the total absence of anything that might dispel the harmony which I am pleased to note exists on this opening day. In fact I think I might say, speaking for the Government, that the Opposition whilst giving full flight to their well-known imaginations occasionally, have, in matters affecting the serious legislation of the colony as representatives of this House, aided the Government in

every fair and reasonable way since the outbreak of the war. We have passed through troublous and difficult times during the last two years. Indeed from the outbreak of the war right up through that period when we beheld dark clouds ahead of us, and when we were confronted by the prospect of a shortage of revenue, with important obligations staring us in the face. We now are confronted with still another, the tonnage question in this Colony. I think the time has arrived when we ought to endeavour to fix the cause really to blame for this state of affairs. All we know for certain is that during the last 40 or 50 years the whole control of the freighting of this Colony has passed out of the hands of the local merchant. No purpose can be served by blaming any particular firm in this matter. Formerly, many sailing ships took our produce to market and returned with salt, flour, coal and other articles of merchandise which enabled the trade to maintain the business of the Colony. Now, these ships have practically disappeared and steamers largely take their place. We have the Allan Line, the Furness Line and others instead. If you talk to the ordinary importer and exporter, he will probably tell you that you live in different times under changed conditions and that the trade of the Colony cannot be carried on by sailing vessels, but only by steamers. If that, then, is so, we ought to own and control the necessary steamers and and not find ourselves entirely at mercy of men who may desire to take advantage of war conditions and charge exorbitant rates and who owing to lack of patriotism part with their steamers for a large price regardless of the necessities of the trade. It is a time for us to work together in sympathy. Not alone have we been threatened with a coal shortage but also a salt and flour famine. I am pleased to be able to say that nearly all these difficulties are fast disappearing. We have nearly all the tonnage in sight to bring the quantity of coal required, which is, as you know, a very important factor in the prosperity of this Colony. I need not dwell on the importance of a sufficiency of salt, as that is a matter vital to the requirements of our trade. But I think from what I know and can learn in connection with this commodity that we will be able to obtain all the salt we require. The same thing I am glad to announce applies to flour and general merchandise. Now my friend the leader of the Opposition referred to several matters upon which I should like to bestow some attention. I note what the hon, Gentleman states with regard to the reporting. I regret that I have to admit that the reporting of last session was far from satisfactory, and notwithstanding every attempt made by the Internal Economy Committee, and the Supervisor of Debates there are still one or two portions of last session's Reports which have not as yet found a place in the Permanent Hansard. The Committee have, however, given the matter every consideration the last two or three weeks, and we now have without any increased expenditure made arrangements by which the reporting of this House will be taken down and type-written, by the Reporters and handed to the Supervisor before they leave the building so that Members may obtain a copy type-written of their Speeches the day after they are delivered. There is one other matter referred to by the Hon. leader of the Opposition, namely the alterations to be made to the proposed City Bill. I would like to say to this House that as far as this is concerned the Government is not as yet in possession of the proposed legislation, although we are aware that considerable progress has been

made in the matter. We hope to have it before us in a week or so. When that Bill is brought down to this House for consideration I propose asking the House to appoint a joint select Committee in order that we may give the measure as full consideration as possible. The first City Bill was introduced in 1888 and since that time we have considerably advanced and expanded in several Municipal Departments, and now that we are making new departures it is important in the interests of all concerned, so to arrange matters that every consideration and attention possible will be given to the proposed alterations, perhaps many suggestions in the new bill will not be required. Some may not be workable or practicable. Others can be suggested but I think it will be found that a good portion of the proposals of this bill will be of use. By adopting the course which I propose it may be possible to have some valuable suggestions from those Members of the Joint Committee who have had considerable experience in Municipal matters.

Now in relation to the important matter of colonial taxation I would like at the very outset to inform my friends on the other side that there is no desire whatever and no intention whatever at the present time to in any way increase taxation. The Finance Minister, after carefully considering our financial position is satisfied now, after nearly nine months of the fiscal year is past that unless something extraordinary and unusual happens that he will have sufficient revenue to meet the whole public annual expenditure, and it may be that there will be a small surplus. That, of course, will depend upon our ability to obtain the necessary tonnage to facilitate importations between now and the end of June.

As to the question of the taxation that may be required following the introduction of prohibition, that is a question that is being enquired into to-day by the Finance Minister and by Mr. LeMessurier, the Sub-Collector. Some persons are of the opinion, and I have heard it stated and read it in the press, particularly during the prohibition campaign, that the introduction of prohibition into this country will not mean increased taxation. It may not mean increased taxation, but it certainly will mean a transfer of taxation from the few who in the past have paid all the taxes on spirits to the general public, who under this head contribute nothing. I never agreed with that principle and I do not think it a sound principle, and I think when we have the figures before us it will be seen that it will be necessary to find new revenue to meet the loss of taxes that have been in recent years collected on the importations of spirits. I do not mean to say for a moment that that is a reason why prohibition should not be adopted; but I am only pointing it out to those who expect that prohibition will not lead to new taxation. Now, in the first place, our drink bill last year was something like one million dollars, somewhere in the neighbourhood of one million dollars. On this point we have not exact figures. You will find some who will be able to make out a strong argument to show that it exceeded that amount; but for the purpose of my argument it is sufficient to say that our drink bill was something like one million dollars. Well now the whole of that sum will not be spent next year on dutiable goods. You will have that million dollars and if the whole amount were spent on dutiable goods at thirty-five per cent. it would mean a revenue of $350,000, and you would not need any more taxation and there would not be any loss of revenue by reason of the introduction of prohibition. But we have got to ask ourselves this question, will the people who last year spent

that million dollars on wine, whiskey, rum, and beer, buy dutiable goods with that million dollars next year, if they did there would be no loss. A very small proportion will be spent in dutiable goods. Take the ordinary man that last year had two glasses of liquor a day, costing him say twenty cents a day, for three hundred days, that is about $60.00. That will be the saving of the ordinary man, the labouring man that last year took two glasses of rum a day. But will he spend all that $60 on food and on clothes and on other dutiable goods. If he does then there will be no shortage in revenue, we will collect as much as if spirits had been imported. But he will not spend the whole of it on dutiable goods. He will probably spend some of it on repairing his house; he will buy more local vegetables; he will go oftener to the Nickel; he may go out on an occasional train excursion; and he may give a little more to his church. He will probably spend the $60, but he may not spend one third of it on dutiable gods. He may spend some of it on imported goods that are not dutiable at all or on which there is very little duty; with the result that out of that million dollars one third of it may not be spent on dutiable goods, or if it is it may be spent on goods that bear a very small duty with the consequent loss of revenue. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am not pointing this out as a reason why we should not have prohibition; but I am pointing it out to serve notice on those who say that we can have prohibition without any consequent and immediate loss of revenue. Now there is another class in the community—the well-to-do—who have been using champagne and whiskey and wine and bottled beer and bottled ale, or what may be called the more expensive kinds of liquors. These people are not going to buy more flour or more provisions or more clothes, or more tobacco, or more furniture, by reason of their saving on the cutting off of their liquor supply, because they had all these things last year. They will probably invest their savings in C. P. R. Stock or some other valuable or attractive or remunerative investment, so that when we analyse the whole question we will arrive at the irresistible conclusion that we will have to find a little more revenue to make up for the loss of revenue on spirits. What that amount is I do not at present know. I only know the amount we collected last year was between three hundred and fifty and four hundred thousand dollars. I think that would be the outside figure for our largest year, and no matter how you look at it we will have a loss of revenue. But you will find on the other side that a very strong case can be made out for the advantages; and increase in efficiency in every department. That will be the answer to the criticism. I think I can say here this evening that no steps will be taken in relation to this till we have all the facts and figures before us to show to the House what the actual loss is.

MR. COAKER—Tell us whether you voted for it or not.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I do not know that I can give you that information. It will improve with keeping. Anyway, I voted. I went to the polls.

MR. COAKER—We know that.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am glad the honourable member takes that much interest in me.

MR. LLOYD—May I ask if you propose furnishing the figures this session.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. LLOYD—And dealing with this question.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It may transpire that the Receiver General will have a sufficient surplus to obviate the necessity of dealing with it this year. I may say that it is not proposed to increase taxation this session unless it is shown that there is going to be a large loss by reason of the introduction of prohibition. There certainly will not be in relation to the general public service of the Colony. Now as regards this year there cannot be a very great loss by reason of prohibition, because there will be six months, from June, 1916 to Jany. 1917 when a certain amount of liquor will be imported, and there is some now in bond that will be taken out and consumed in the Colony between June and January 1917 which will bring in some revenue, and so there will only be the difference between what will be collected in the first half year and what would have been collected if we did not have prohibition. That will not be a very great loss. That may be so small that it may be covered by the surplus that the Minister of Finance will have. The Minister of Finance may not require to increase it this year.

MR. LLOYD—But he may require.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That will appear from the Report, Mr. Le Messurier has been on now for nearly two months.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to longer delay the House except to say in conclusion that I endorse entirely everything that has been said to-day in relation to the titanic struggle in which the British Empire with its Allies is engaged. I can say nothing here that has not been better said elsewhere. What has been said here this evening is but what has been said on other occasions all over the Empire and all over the world. All we can do now is to follow and imitate what has been done and what has been set for us as an example. As members of the British Empire everyone of us would have hung our heads in shame if anything else had been done by the Motherland than what was done. There was no other way out. If we were to continue to live as the greatest Empire the world has ever seen, there was no other policy that could have been pursued than to show our effective resentmen of the violations of International obligations which were committed by Germany. Anyone who has read both sides must see that every effort was made by us to keep out of the war without sacrificing our honour and obligations. We were not prepared for it. We are not a military nation in the sense of Germany or France or Russia. We have merely kept a Navy for the defence of our Empire and the security of our subjects on the sea. We have been only preparing for the last year or so for the conflict we are now engaged in. When the war started we did not have one hundred and fifty thousand soldiers. I speak now of the standing army. To-day we have probably over three million; and while the first year of the war was merely a year of resistance and a year of preparation more than anything else, the second year of the war promises to be a year not alone of continued preparation and resistance; it must be realized that as we have our men and our munitions and are prepared to defend ourselves against Germany it will be seen that the British Empire will be able to do as effective offensive work as it has ever done.

I endorse all that has been said this evening about the splendid work of our own men. They have already made a name for themselves and for their country. I agree with what has been said by my learned friend the Leader of the Opposition, that if there appears to be any lack of desire to join the colours on the part of some of our young men in some of the districts it is due largely to lack

of knowledge and appreciation on their part of the responsibility of citizenship in the British Empire. We here in St. John's, and in other districts of the Colony opened up by railways and steamship communication, with newspapers and travellers going to and fro, more readily understand what is going on in the world and appreciate our responsibilities and more readily respond to the call of King and Country. But there are people in this country so remote from these centres where knowledge is easily obtainable that so far they have not responded in a way we could desire. Here in St. John's, I am proud to say, and in other districts of the country, nearly treble those which we at one time hoped to get have come forward; and I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that the new invitation which has been issued to the young men of the country will be gladly responded to and that Newfoundland, which in the early days of the war held a prominent place in the great Imperial war procession, will keep in line with Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the other Provinces of the Dominion of Canada, which have done so splendidly in helping to keep the Old Flag flying, and that she will continue to be not alone England's Oldest Colony, but England's most loyal Colony.

COMMITTEE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The following Committee was appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the S ech from the Throne, namely, Mr Walsh, Mr. Currie, Hon Mr. Emers n, Mr. Clapp, Mr. Winsor.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I don't think we would be doing justice to our feelings if we adjourned on this, the first day of the session, without recording our sympathy to the families and friends of the three gentlemen who have so recently passed away, and who for many years were associated with this Legislature in its various departments. I refer to the death of the Hon. John Harris, the late President of the Legislative Council; Martin W. Furlong, K.C., Clerk of this House and at one time a member of this branch; and the Hon. Mr. Justice Emerson, Judge of the Supreme Court, who for many years was a member of this House and Speaker of this Chamber, and for over twenty years a Judge of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Harris was never a member of this branch, but for over a quarter of a century was a member of the Upper Cha ber, and for three or four years the President of that body; and the Hansards and Journals of that Chamber afford eloquent testimony to his good work, and the zeal and industry displayed by him in relation to every measure that came before that body. He was one of the heads of a large commercial business, but his activities were not confined merely to commercial pursuits, in spite of his being busily engaged in that work, he was able to fill a very large place in the public life of the Colony. He was a member of the Municipal Council —one of the first Government representatives, I think that were appointed to the Board when the measure was passed in 1888; afterwards he was an elected member of the Council, and at the date of his death he was a member of the present Commission; in fact, he took a more than deep interest in relation to all the public services of the city. As a business man, in all his commercial relations he set an example of probity, honour and principle that have rarely been equalled in this community. He also found time to devote to public sport, to church matters, and to all the other claims on citizenship, a great deal of his time—and a contribution from his purse. For

these reasons, and many others, his loss has caused profound regret in the whole community, as evidenced by the resolutions of grief passed by all the various bodies with which he was connected.

The same may be said of the late Martin W. Furlong. He was an unusual and an exceptional man, a man known intimately only to a few, because although possessed of rare gifts and a high intelligence, he was yet of a retiring character, and disposition. A stranger, seeing him engaged in connection with his work in this Chamber, would hardly recognise in the humble clerk of the House, the man who occupied the first place at the Newfoundland Bar, and who was not alone a great scholar, but probably as well-read a man as there was in this community; because what he read he read to great advantage and to great value. He did not read merely for the sake of reading, but read for the purpose of imbibing the knowledge that the writer intended to convey. Personally, I was connected with him closely for nearly thirty years. The only time he came into this Chamber as a member, and for the few days that he sat here, in the representation of St. John's West, he sat as a colleague of mine, and I have the pleasantest recollections of the couple of months association during which we went through that political campaign in 1893; and I can here testify that what he may have lacked in those ways of the politician for winning votes, which can only be acquired by long years of experience, he more than made up in the irresistible logic of his arguments at the public meetings that he addressed, and the convincing way in which he brought home the truth to those who constituted his audience. His premature death has left a void in the community that it is not easy to fill. I don't know anyone that can take his place at the Newfoundland Bar; I don't know anyone that could take his place in this Chamber, if he were here as a debater and a public speaker. From every standpoint from which he may be viewed he is a national loss, and the only bit of consolation and compensation that we have is that we have known him, and have in some sense benefitted by the high ideals which he set in the practice of his profession and his conduct as a citizen. There was nothing of the bounder, of the self-advertiser about him—quiet and unassuming—more than repaid by the knowledge that he was doing his duty. I have been with him and against him in important legal suits in the Courts, and I know something of his wonderful ability, his marvellous memory, and the exactness with which he could lay his finger on the important point in a case. I know the opinion that the Judges of the Court before whom he practised held of him, and I know also the opinions held of him by men like the late Alfred Lyttleton, a Barrister of the Inner Temple, London, and the late Mr. Blake, who for many years was Minister of Justice of Canada, both of whom came here as the arbitrators for the Newfoundland Government, and who told me afterwards of the very high opinion they carried away of the manner in which Mr. Furlong conducted that work. I might go on for hours, if it served any purpose, extolling his praises.

The late Mr. Justice Emerson was also a type by himself. He was connected with the public life of the Colony and with the Bar for thirty or thirty-five years. He came into this House thirty years ago this very Session. I came in the same year, and of all those who were in this Chamber and in the Upper House at that time, I happen to be the solitary remnant; and naturally I feel this evening a lit-

tle reminiscent, when I remember that with two or three exceptions, all who were here thirty years ago have passed away. I remember the election of Mr. Justice Emerson to the Chair of the Speaker of the House. I know something of the fearless way in which he stood up for what he regarded as the rights of the public, when he was in this Chamber, and what is true of him here, is true of him at the Bar and on the Bench. He had many fine characteristics, a fine judicial mind, by which he was easily able to reduce everything to a logical judicial proposition, getting back to fixed judicial principles, and in that way more easily discovering what was the law and what ought to be the law. Every client that came before the Court could always expect the most careful consideration at his hands. I had, as I say, a very intimate connection with him, both in this House and at the Bar, and in a thousand and one ways had an opportunity of knowing him. I remember he was a member of the delegation to Ottawa in 1895, with the present Chief Justice, Sir Robert Bond and myself. I saw a good deal of him then, and I can testify to the part which he took in those deliberations, and his strong advocacy in favor of getting everything that it was possible to obtain in the interests of the Colony; and I also know of the part that he took in connection with the delegation to England in relation to the French Shore Question.

For these reasons and with that knowledge we all must deplore the great affliction that led to his death, and which shrouded in darkness the last years of his life. We can bring none of these estimable citizens back here. We have no jurisdiction over them now; all we can do is to show to the relatives our sympathy, and place on record the respect, love and esteem in which we held them. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, propose with the consent of this House, the following resolution:

"RESOLVED:—That this House desires to place on Record an expression of its sorrow at the decease of Honourable John Harris, late President of the Legislative Council; Martin W. Furlong, Esquire, King's Counsel; and Honourable George Henry Emerson, Judge of the Supreme Court.

"Mr. Harris had been for over a quarter of a century a member of the Legislative Council, and for some time its President.

"Mr. Furlong had been at one time a member of this Branch of the Legislature and for many years its able and trusted Law Clerk.

"Mr. Emerson had been for many years one of the members of this Branch of the Legislature and for four years its Speaker.

"Their high attainments were a valued acquisition to the important duties with which they were associated when connected wi h the Legislature.

"Whilst mourning their loss, Members of this House desire to convey to their relatives deep sympathy in their bereavement."

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion which has been made by the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister. I think, Sir, that the death of the three gentlemen named in the resolution is an appropriate occasion when this House should express its sympathy to their friends in the great sorrow which has overtaken them. It is seldom that the community mourns at the one time, three men of such prominence as the three named in this resolution, Hon. John Harris, Mr. M. W. Furlong, and Mr. Justice Emerson; and it is most fitting that the House should be asked to place on record an expression of its appreciation for their work. Mr. Harris has never

been here in this House as a member. Mr. Furlong occupied a seat here for a very short time. Mr. Justice Emerson was here for several years. All three were men of strong personality. Every one of them had his own distinct personality. Mr. Harris was, I think, an ideal business man. A man of foresight and absolute integrity, one for whom I always had the highest regard. Mr. Harris will be remembered not only as a business man, but also as a philanthropist and for his interest in the Colony. Mr. Furlong, to my mind, is one of the greatest men that Newfoundland had produced for a long time. As the Prime Minister has said, he was not a man to know unless you knew him thoroughly. You had to know Mr. Furlong well before you knew his real worth. No person, I think, had a better opportunity of knowing Mr. Furlong than had I. I spent some years with him as partner; I remember him as a law student in my father's office, and I remember him right down through the years, during all of which time I had the greatest respect and admiration for his character. Martin Furlong's name will go down in the traditions of the Bar as being one of the brightest lawyers that the Bar has had; and his name will rank with those of Judge Hoyles, Boone and others of similar celebrity whom we look back on but in the future none will be better esteemed than that of Martin W. Furlong.

Mr. Justice Emerson was another person of remarkable ability; he was a man of great character and willpower. As a lawyer, before he went on the Supreme Court Bench, he was one of the foremost at the bar. He had a large mind, with strong legal bearing. On the Bench, the members of the Bar who are members of this House will bear me out when I say that he treated his cases with impartiality, and that his decisions will ever have the respect of the bar.

All will be a great loss. They were men who cannot be replaced. Others will take up the work, but none can take the place of these. The three gentlemen Hon. John Harris, Mr. M. W. Furlong, and Mr. Justice Emerson are men of striking personality, whose places it will be hard to fill. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, beg to second the motion made by the Prime Minister ,that this House record and express its sympathy to the friends of the deceased.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Coaker gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Halfyard gave Notice of Question.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled: Report of the Commission appointed by the Governor in Council to Consolidate the Statute Law of the Colony; Report of the Examinations conducted by the Council of Higher Education for 1915; Financial Statement of the Council of Higher Education for 1915.

NOTICE OF BILLS.

The Hon. Colonial Secretary gave notice that he would on Monday next ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Law relating to Weights and Measures.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Monday next ask leave to introduce a Bill to revise and consolidate the general public Statute Laws of the Colony, and for the Publication of the same.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Monday next ask leave to introduce a Bill to grant extension to the Charter of the Canadian North Atlantic Corporation for the period of the War.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Monday next ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled:

"An Act to amend the War Measures Act."

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Monday next ask leave to introduce a Bill to incorporate the Salvation Army in Newfoundland.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Monday next ask leave to introduce a Bill to enable the Governor in Council during the existence of a state of war to take possession of commerce unreasonably withheld.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Monday next ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Law relating to the prosecution of the seal fishery.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Monday next ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend and consolidate the Education Law of the Colony.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 20th, 1916.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. KENT—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from Patrick Power and other residents of the North Side of Torbay. The petition relates to the road between St. John's and Pouch Cove, and the petitioners ask that in view of the commencement of motor traffic on the road, the road be either widened, or some regulations be enforced whereby the people in that vicinity may use the road with safety. Some very heavy trucks go over the road during the spring, summer and fall months, and the road is not wide enough for traffic of this kind. The petitioners ask that the road be widened sufficiently to enable this traffic to go on in addition to the ordinary traffic in these settlements, or that some regulations be made whereby they may be safely carried on together. I would ask that this matter be taken into consideration by the Board of Works Department, and, if possible, that the wishes of the petitioners be met. It is very important in the interests of these people that this matter should be attended to as the traffic there is dangerous while these heavy trucks are on the road. It would require a considerable amount of money to widen this road in certain parts, but there are other parts, such as along by Gallows Cove, where the road is very narrow and might be widened at little expense. I would ask that this petition be referred to the Public Works Department.

MR. DWYER—Mr. Speaker: I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker: I join with my colleagues, the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Dwyer, in supporting this petition. Owing to the freighting of fish to St. John's by motor trucks—a practice which has grown up recently—and the ordinary use of the road by motorists driving for pleasure ,there is, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, very great reason why special attention should be given to the wishes of these petitioners. I have very much pleasure in giving this petition my support.

On motion, the petition was received and referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Lush's Bight, in the district of Twillingate, upon a matter that was considered at the recent convention of the F. P. U., in connec-

tion with fishery affairs. The petitioners ask, among other things, that steamers exceeding 500 tons net, be prohibited from prosecuting the sealfishery; that auxiliary motor vessels, over 25 tons, be prohibited from engaging in the Labrador fishery; that the Government bonus for encouragement of shipbuilding be increased fifty per cent; that a guaranteed dividend of 10 per cent. be paid to all companies or individuals engaged in shipbuilding for ten years. The petition is largely signed by the inhabitants of Lush's Bight. I also have petitions on the same subject from the inhabitants of Birchy Bay, Little Harbour, Exploits, Pilley's Island, Comfort Cove, Lewisporte, Nipper's Harbor, New Bay, Springdale, Stanhope, Boyd's Cove, Botwood, Summerport, Twillingate and Salt Pond. The various matters referred to in these petitions will be dealt with as we proceed with the business of the House, and in all probability will be taken up by us in connection with the Address in Reply, so that I will not now delay the House by referring to the several matters dealt with.

On motion, the petition was received and referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

Pursuant to Order and leave granted, and on motion of the Hon. Colonial Secretary, the Bill, "An Act to amend the Act relating to Weights and Measures" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

STATUES CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill, "An Act to revise and consolidate the General Public Statute Laws of the Colony, and for publication of the same" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

CANADIAN NORTH ATLANTIC CORPORATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill, "An Act to grant extension to the charter of the Canadian North Atlantic Corporation for the period of the war" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

WAR MEASURES BILL.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Rt Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill, "An Act to amend the War Measures Act, 1914" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SALVATION ARMY INCORPORATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill, "An Act to incorporate the Salvation Army in Newfoundland" was introduced, and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

ARTICLES OF COMMERCE POSSESSION BILL.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill, "An Act to enable the Governor in Council, during the existence of a state of war, to take possession of articles of commerce unreasonably withheld" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SEALING BILL.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill, "An Act to amend the law regulating the prosecution of the sealfishery," was introduced and read a first time and or-

dered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

EDUCATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill, "An Act to amend and consolidate the Education Laws of the Colony" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether the Fishery Board has considered the proposal of the Fishermen's Union Convention regarding inspection of herring and halibut, if so, what conclusions were arrived at, if not considered, when will consideration be given?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply to the question asked.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon the Premier whether the Government intends to take any action during the coming year regarding the establishment of Bait Depots, to provide a bait supply for fishermen.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I may say that no special action has been taken up to the present beyond the contracts that have been made from time to time of which the hon. member is aware, and from which unfortunately nothing of any particular value has sprung, except in the case of Harvey & Co. who have erected a large plant at Rose Blanche. I may say that although up to last year it had not paid so far, it looked to me when I went over the plant at that time as if it were going to pay some day. There is a vote of $5,000 passed every year for this service, but it is not availed of. This year the whole amount will be a drop balance. There were two establishments, one owned by Mr. Hodge and one by Mr. Earle who received small amounts, but Mr. Earle has dropped out of the business. I think Mr. Hodge operated this year, but so far has made no demand. The Government will be glad to see this $5,000 paid out to any individual or company that will avail of this subsidy. That is what it is voted for.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister who is Inspector of Logging Camps? If any reports have been received by the Department of Agriculture and Mines from the Inspector, if so, to lay same upon the table of the House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table this information.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister whether the Government will introduce Legislation at this Session providing a guarantee of dvidend for moneys invested in ship building yards in this Colony, and whether the Government will increase the bonus for shipbuilding in order to re-establish this industry.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member I may say that at the present time there is on the Statute Book an act relating to the encouragement of shipbuilding. Under that act there are various grades of bonuses or bounties, the highest of which is $1,000 on a 100 ton schooner. In addition to that, everything for the construction and equipment of a vessel comes in duty free, but the Government would be prepared to entertain any proposal from a reputable company or individual along the lines of giving a guarantee for an establishment of a shipbuilding enterprise in the Colony, provided the proper safeguards in the interest of the public are given, more particularly with regard to continuous operation. I should not suppose that there would be any objection to that; it would only be a question of the amount of the guarantee. Of course, there would have to be a clause guaranteeing continuous op-

eration. It would not do to give a guarantee for the establishment of such an industry, and find that after a couple of years the company had stopped building, and yet the Government remained liable for an annual guarantee on the capital. Any reasonable proposal made by any company or individual the Government will be glad to consider, and to enact legislation this session. I may say that I have already discussed this matter very fully with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has considerable knowledge of the matter, and it may be possible that something satisfactory may be put on the Statute Book during the coming session.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister whether the Government proposed to provide a suitable tug for rescuing life and property driven to sea by gales, as recommended by the recent F. P. U. Convention.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, that is a matter that has already been before the Government. At present it would be difficult to do anything in the way of having any suitable ship constructed or purchased on account of the extraordinarily high rates now prevailing, but I can assure the hon. member that the matter is under the consideration of the Government. The matter was very fully discussed last year, at a time when three or four of our vessels were driven to sea, but up to the present the Government has not considered it easy to get a suitable vessel. I have no doubt that when things become normal the matter will be taken up again by the Government.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether any enquiry was instituted respecting the alleged neglect of Light-keepers at Western Bay and Cape Spear respecting the schooner "Blanche M. Rose," if so to table the same.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, that question has already been answered.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing what settlements sending in returns of elected Road Boards have not been gazetted, and why?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr .Speaker, I beg to table the information asked for.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House copies of all correspondence re pit prop cutting of green timber issued or received by his office, and copies of circulars sent out respecting this matter.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I am having that correspondence looked up, and will table it next sitting.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister whether the Government intend to introduce the Sealing Bill turned down by the Legislative Council last Session.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the Government to re-introduce this Bill.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister whether the Government intend to introduce legislation dealing with the surveying and measurments of pit props.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in relation to that question I would like the hon. member to elaborate what he means. Up to the present time no representations have come to the Government that any injury has been done to our people by reason of the present mode of dealing with the pit prop industry. It may be that some real grievance and something wrong may be occuring of which we know nothing, but the Government has had no represen-

tations whatever from any parties dealing with pit props.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I may say that it is a question between the buyers and sellers of pit props. The men contracting for the pit props take various amounts for a cord. Some say 135 cubic feet, some 140, some 145, and some as high as 150. Now a cord as a rule is 128 cubic feet, and the fishermen want to know what is a cord? They want a cord decided by Statute. Why should one man take a cord of 130 feet and another of 150 feet. They are all in the hands of the buyers and they have to take what the various buyers give. Another matter is the question of the shipping. Last year in shipping pit props shippers lost as much as 200 cords on a ship load. It is not always measured on the banks. There is no recognized method of measuring pit props. Some of the surveyors representing foreign buyers insist upon having it measured when on board ship, and there is no reason why it should not be measured on the bank. I know last year we lost 200 cords on one steamer. It was not measured on the bank because the Surveyor representing those companies would not measure on the bank. If there is to be any fair play the Government will have to take some steps in the matter to protect cutters and shippers. The Department of Agriculture and Mines ought to take up the matter and some inspector or inspectors be appointed to measure pit props. You could authorize the Inspectors of lumber to do this. You will have to protect the cutters and sellers. There is quite a lot of dissatisfaction over these matters and considerable loss to the advantage of foreign buyers.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, this question is a matter that will be dealt with probably in the Weights and Measures Act. It will be defined in the measure 4 X4 X 8 or whatever it is. It may be but I am not quite sure of it that it is already defined in the Crown Lands Act, however I think that is a matter that will easily be got over. Now as to the other matter it strikes me that is in the hands of the seller himself. He could get a receipt for the number of cords that he has there. As to the measuring on the banks that will be easily handled by legislation, making it illegal for the Customs to clear any vessel until the quantity on board has been agreed to by the owners of the property, however I shall take a note of both these points and they will be considered by the Government.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a copy of the report of the telegraph operator of Change Islands or of any other Government official re the interruption of communication by telegraph during the month of November, 1915, showing the following particulars:—(1) when communication was stopped; (2) when communication was re-established; (3) when the repairer reached Change Islands; (4) what was the cause and nature of the trouble; (5) how long did it take to effect repairs.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I have given instructions to the Post Master General to prepare the information asked for and I am expecting it down this afternoon if not I will table it at the next session.

The Minister of Finance gave notice that on to-morrow he would move that Supply be granted to His Majesty.

The Hon. Minister of Finance gave notice that he would on Thursday next move the House into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Coaker 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, Tuesday, March 21st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 21st. 1916.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present this afternoon a petition of more than ordinary importance; and, in order to enable the members to more thoroughly grasp its import and to give its prayer due consideration, I ask that it be read to the House.

The Clerk then read the petition, as follows:

To the Honourable the Members of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland, in Legislative Session Convened:

"The petition of the undersigned fishermen of St. George's District between Highlands on the West and to Kippen's River on the North, which boundaries will cover nearly all our Spring herring fishermen, viz:— Crabbe's West, Crabbe's East, Middle Barachoix, Robinson's Head, Bank Head, Fichells, Flat Bay, Shallow Cove, St. George's, Seal Rocks, Sandy Point, Main River, Stephenville Crossing, Stephenville and Kippen's East, which settlers of these places are most interested. These fishermen and many others of St. George's District ask that Your Honourable House in its wisdom make such enactment as will in their opinion save to them and their children the valuable herring fishery which is prosecuted every spring in St. George's Bay. We, the fishermen signing the petition, claim:

"First: That the use of motor or steam boats should be prohibited entirely during the fishing season from Crabbe's West River Brook on the West, and Kippen's River on the North Side, this to include all coves and harbors between, for the reason that in the experience of us signers of this petition these boats have everywhere when used amongst the herring schools, in the past frightened and banished the herring shoals, and their noise tends to keep the fish from making in on the spawning grounds as they usually did in former years before the use of these motor boats.

"Second: These boats working by their engines at all times, especially at night, and running over amongst and through the set herring nets, not alone scare off the herrings, but have already cut, torn and destroyed a large lot of their neighbours' nets, and as these parties cannot be by any means detected, as people even if they stayed up nights would have to be on their nets continuously, a position Your Honourable House will know impossible for the fishermen to maintain, should impress on your Honourable Body the need for such legislation to be enacted for the fishing of year 1916, in order that no recurrence of last and previous years can again take place.

"Thirdly: It is the opinion of all your petitioners that were it not for these boats and their constant and careless use during the herring fishing of 1915, there would have been a full and successful herring voyage killed in locality named, in place of the very short one had, (not more than half the catch being had) as owners of these motor boats chased the herrings from place to place with these boats, and this action and noise principally caused the shortage.

"Ample evidence and testimony of this can be had by Your Honourable Body when needed.

"Again your petitioners respectful-

ly ask that the owners of fish traps and salmon traps in Bay St. George, within the proscribed limits, may be restricted from setting any leader of such cod or salmon traps nearer than five hundred yards from high-water mark, and that owners of same should be made to have a large floating buoy on such end of leader—"the shore end"—so that net fishermen could see same, and so avoid setting their nets foul of such leader. Your petitioners do not in any way interfere with the method or law of salmon nets, only cod traps and salmon traps who now put the ends of their leaders almost ashore, and by such means prevent the herring from running in the shoal water—on to the spawning beds—as formerly, and as is in our opinion necessary for their spawning time.

"Your petitioners, all fishermen, are only anxious that Your Honourable House will do this in theirs and in the interests of all our people, as already we see that from above causes our herring fishery is about to be ruined, and so we ask you to help us and make the law, so that a violation of same can be punishable, as are such other laws of our fisheries—and Your Honourable Body by so doing will confer on your petitioners a boon for which as in duty bound they will ever pray."

MR. DOWNEY—The purport and prayer of the petition are so clearly set forth in the phraseology, that I do not think I need say anything further to emphasize the necessity for the House giving very careful consideration to the petition. I ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, where I hope it will be given that careful consideration and attention to which it is entitled.

MR. PICCOTT—We have had one or two petitions bearing on this matter of Motor Boats operating in Bonne Bay and Bay of Islands and the complaint made by these people was as to the mufflers of the motor boats some of them were not muffled, and some had only one muffler in. So the Fishery Board took the matter into consideration two years ago and inserted in the Fishery Rules (at the back of the book) a clause asking fishermen to muffle the motor boat engines and to be careful of noise when getting on the fishing grounds. You can hardly tell where this petition originates. I have no doubt that in a few days more a counter petition will come in. One lot of people wants motor boats and is getting them, another lot does not see the use of the motor boat and claims they frighten the fish. A good many fishermen whom I saw on the Labrador, said motor boats frighten the fish out of the traps and that is why more fish was not trapped last year. Whilst I was in Gloucester a short while ago I made enquiries as to what they thought of motor power and found that quite a number of schooners going out of Gloucester have motor power, and I talked with some of the prominent skippers in that place and asked them if they considered the use of motor power by the schooners was harmful to the mackerel fishing—if in their opinion the noise of the motors frightened the mackerel away from the coast. Their reply was that they considered the introduction of motor boats a great improvement on the old method and they did not consider that they frightened the mackerel away and thought that the fishery was not suffering through this. Schooners with motor power have been sailing over the regions where mackerel schooled, and as a matter of fact for half a century steam boats have been going back and forth around these localities, and some of the finest hauls that have ever been made have been captured off Cape Cod—and in that neighbourhood where al-

most every hour steamers have been plying and making noise. This petition from St. Georges has, I have no doubt, been signed by people up there. They believe the motor boat is an injury to the herring fishery but we find some more people living in that vicinity who say that the motor boat is an improvement. So it is very hard to arrive at a conclusion; but the matter will be given every consideration when it comes down to my department and we will do the best we can with it.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present petitions from the following places:—Summerford, Boyd's Cove, Birchy Bay, and Comfort Cove upon rather an unusual matter. They ask for the protection of the native seal found in that neighborhood. That seal is not of much commercial value at the present time, but unless it is protected it will be completely exterminated. Those seals on the south side of Notre Dame Bay have their breeding grounds in the neighhood of Dildo, and the people up there hunt the young ones a few days after they are born. These people ask for some rule to be made to protect the seal from May 1st to August 1st. I have talked this matter over with them and I understand the habits of the seal, and I can realize the necessity for some measures to thus effect this rule. I would ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, the matter refered to in this petition has been already brought before this House within the last year or two. I presented some petitions on this matter some two years ago. These seals happen to breed very near Coakerville. This Dildo referred to by Mr. Jennings is a place near where Coakerville is situated. Hon. members may not be aware that there is an archipelago in this neighbourhood containing about 365 islands, and upon this archipelago these seals breed. There is no doubt that there is a great necessity for their protection. They will surely be destroyed unless they are protected. They pup about June 1st and on the rocks, and it is an easy matter for the fishermen to get after them. They can kill a dozen or so in a few hours. The people want the seals protected. They give them a certain amount of oil and the skins. They do not often sell the pelts, but they are very convenient for making bags for taking food around and other useful articles of domestic use. If something is not done they will be exterminated. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ought to be able to arrange for the protection of this native seal by the passing of some rule by the Game and Inland Fisheries Board. There would not be any objection from any other part of the country as the matter is entirely a local one.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a number of petitions upon various matters. As they deal with so many matters, I think I had better read one to the House. (Hon. member here read one of the petitions to the House). There are a number of these petitions, Sir, from Catalina, Elliston. Foster's Point,New Bonaventure, Port Rexton, Trinity East, Little Hearts Ease, St. Jones Within, Burgoyne Cove, Long Beach, New Perlican, Winterton, New Melbourne, Hants Harbor and New Chelsea. All these petitions are along the lines of those presented by Mr. Coaker, so that no comment is necessary from me. I trust that they will receive the consideration which they deserve.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present two petitions from my district dealing with similar matters. One is from La Scie, the other is from Brig Pay.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a number of petitions from the district of Bonavista upon the same matters. These petitions are very largely signed and they come from various places namely; Flat Island, Squid Tickle, Red Cliff, Newtown, Wesleyville Jamestown, Salvage, Gambo, Broad Cove, Princeton, Glovertown, St. Brendan's, Fair Island, Charlottetown, Safe Harbour, Greenspond, Shalloway Cove, Musgrave Town, Portland, Kings Cove, Valleyfield.

These petitions cover the same matters that have been referred to already by hon. members.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker: I beg to give these petitions my support. The matter of shipbuilding has already been considered by me at great length. I am well acquainted with the difficulty that arises in buying tonnage at the present time, both in Newfoundland and outside of it, and I know that the price asked for vessels in the States and Canada is enormous. I do not think that I would be far out if I said that during the last nine months there has gone out of this country to Nova Scotia and the United States $250,000 for the purchase of vessels. I am sure, Sir, that we are able to build equally good vessels in this country, made of better wood, and with as good workmanship. The material may not be so fine, but I do not think that it would be very difficult with the expenditure of a little money to get models from other countries, and if the Government could see its way clear to guarantee a percentage to one or two companies to operate shipyards, in a few years this business would grow to such an extent that the Government would be free from any claim. We could protect the shipbuilders by placing a duty upon every vessel imported into Newfoundland. That duty is levied already by Canadian and American vessels going into Nova Scotia. They levy this tax in order to encourage the building of ships in that country. The Americans do the same. If an American buys a vessel on the other side, a tax is levied when he brings it into the States. This encourages people in the States and Canada to go into ship-building. A man goes from here every year and takes away from us ten or twelve thousand dollars to buy a vessel in Nova Scotia. None of that money ever comes back to this country. Shipbuilding means benefit not only to the builder but also to the outfitter, tinsmith and the carpenter. This money which we spend on vessels every year should be kept in the country. The Canadian vessels only last about ten years sea-going. The insurance people would not give you any rates on a Nova Scotia vessel over ten years old. American vessels are not built in that way, but it is impossible to get an American vessel for our trade unless you pay a great price. I hope the Government will be able to take this matter up, and I can assure the hon. member who has introduced these petitions that it will receive my greatest consideration. Our object should be to keep all the money we can in the country, and this is one of the ways in which it is going out. I was speaking to a gentleman belonging to Lunenburg, and I asked him if he could get me the model of the Ich Dien, and he told me that he did not think that he would have any difficulty, and that it would cost about $40.00. That is not a great sum of money to pay for a model of such a fine vessel for our trade. People on the West Coast go up every year and leave thousands of dollars in Shelburne. There are two vessels building there now, costing in the neighbourhood of $80 per ton. We could get the same vessels built down

here. The West Coast people want nice lines and good sailing quality, and they go up there to get the vessels built. If we could get the models we have everything else in great quantity and better materials. As to the question of the tug mentioned in the petition, I may say that I have discussed this matter very fully with Sir E. P. Morris and there is no doubt but that we need a tug for that purpose. You would find, I think, that in a few years such a vessel would pay for itself. You pay out every year seven or eight thousand dollars for carrying around light house supplies, and if we had a vessel of this kind we could send round our light house supplies in that way, furthermore the Inspector of light houses would be able to use this vessel for inspection purposes, and thus be able to keep the light houses in good condition. Then again she could be used for the laying of gas buoys and bell buoys. It is no good for the Department to buy these things now unless we have some way of laying them. The money spent in the purchase of such a vessel would be ap proved of by all the country. On the coast of Nova Scotia they are lit up almost as if you were going into New York City. Every ten or fifteen miles they have a light, and all you have to do is to get your bearing, steer in until you pick up a buoy, and you know exactly where you are. Year after year you spend thousands of dollars in sending out steamers for shipwrecked sailors and vessels blown off the coast. Frequently you have to ask one of the steamers that are under contract by the Government to go a little out of their way. If you ask the 'Portia' to go from Battle Harbour to Bell Island, it costs $60, although it is almost in her way. Of course, that is not very much money for one item, but in the course of a year it amounts up quite a lot. Years ago, before I became a member of this House, I spent a year on one of the Canadian Light House Tenders, and the work it did made it pay for itself. I am sure that even the "Fiona," although it is talked about quite a lot, pays for itself. You have never known what she has earned, because no account has been kept of it, but I know what it costs to hire a steamer for any of these purposes. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, heartily support the petitions.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker: Coming from a district where shipbuilding was carried out on a large scale at one time, I would like to place myself as supporting these petitions. One feature that appeals to me is that since shipbuilding has died out, we have lost a class of men that are a loss towards the upkeep of a country such as this. Blacksmiths, sailmakers, tinsmiths, etc., these people are a great loss to the country, and I hope that this industry will revive again. I remember seeing very small vessels built here going to the ice, and some few years ago a vessel of only 25 tons went from Harbour Main District and made quite a success of the voyage. Now that this matter has been discussed in the newspapers, I hope that I will live to see they day when shipbuilding will be brought up again. I heartily support these petitions.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present a number of petitions similar to those presented by my hon. friend, Mr. Stone. They come from Musgrave Harbour, Joe Batt's Arm, Barr'd Island, Ladle Cove, Doting Cove, Fogo, Seldom Come Bye, Carmanville and Tilting, all in the district of Fogo; also petitions from other districts: North Harbour, Point au Gaul, Colliers, Avondale, Northern Bay, Grate's Cove, Western Bay Red Head Cove, and Bay de Verde. I give my hearty support to these

petitions, and I am glad to see that the Minister of Marine & Fisheries and Mr. Parsons so heartily support them. I hope that they will be given the support of the Government, and that they will materialize in some way

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present some petitions upon a matter which has been before the House already, from Exploits, Rattling Brook, and Triton, Port Anson and Lewisporte. I am very pleased to see that they have called forth such hearty support from the Government side, and I hope that something good will come of them now.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker: I have much pleasure in giving my hearty support to all these petitions which have just been presented.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Mr. Walsh on behalf of the Select Committee appointed to draft a Reply to His Excellency's Speech presented the Report of the Select Committee as follows:

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND.

To His Excellency Sir Walter Edward Davidson, K.C.M.G., Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Island of Newfoundland and its Dependencies.

May it Please Your Excellency:

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

W. J. WALSH,
J. S. CURRIE,
CHARLES. H. EMERSON,
R. G. WINSOR.

Assembly Room, March 20th, 1916.

On motion this report was received.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, before the adoption of the report I would like to make a few observations. The report is in reply to the Speech made by His Excellency in which he reviews the year just passed and outlines the programme for the coming session. The Prime Minister has been honouring two classes in the community, lawyers and journalists. I see by a Government organ that the Leader of the Government has been honouring members of both branches of the Legislature. I do not know whether this rumour is correct, but I make the statement on the authority of a Government organ. The Prime Minister is about to deplete this side of the House of its leader. If it is a fact that we are to lose our leader, we can honestly congratulate the appointee on his elevation to the Bench. There are other legal members of this House who have aspirations. They are not on this side of the House, but we are none the less interested in them. I notice that my hon. friend opposite is smiling in anticipation, and that another member has retired in modesty to cover his confusion. I hear that the latter is to receive his appointment at the close of the session. When this House met we were invited to make a visit to the other Chamber. When we got there we looked around and saw many doleful faces. But there was one in particular with a smile of satisfaction, and we knew what had happened. A new member had been raised to the Presidency of that Chamber, a newspaper man. When we got back to this House we found that another newspaper man had been honoured with the office of seconding the motion for a Committee to draft the Address in Reply. I refer, of course, to Mr. Currie, the member for Burin. As the latter when he made his speech to this House, took no occasion to refer to the honor conferred on a newspaper man, I must repair the omission. I am quite sure Mr. Currie will concur in congratulating the journalist, who has

thus been honoured with the Presidency of the Council. I know, of course, that there is a journalist who writing under the caption, "Under the Clock," has expressed strong disapproval of the appointment, but I am sure that Mr. Currie does not agree with the observations of this gentleman. Now, Sir, I wish to express my congratulations to Mr. McGrath on his appointment. I am glad that a journalist has been honoured with the appointment, but I am afraid the appointment is not entirely approved of by the members of that House. The spirit, however, in which the appointment has been accepted, shows the extraordinary influence the leader of the Government has got over that House. It must have struck you, Sir, that the composition of the Upper Chamber has changed very materially during the past few years. Out of twenty-four seats in that House, the Leader of this House has had the opportunity of filling twelve, so that at all events the complexion of the Upper House is a distinctly Morris complexion. That fact leads us to hope that when the Leader of the House brings in this year the Sealing Bill, which at the last session was thrown out, he will use his influence to pass this measure as successfully as he did to get that appointment of Mr. McGrath's concurred in.

Leaving the matter of the Upper House, I would like to add my testimony as to the pleasure I had in listening to the addresses of the mover and seconder of the motion about the address in reply. Mr. Walsh's speech was a relevation, Sir. Certainly a revelation to me, as I had no idea he was so gifted. I did expect a good speech from Mr. Currie, and I was not disappointed.

Coming to the Speech itself, I find it refers mainly to the great question of the day, the war. The war looms big over every other question we can think of; and we find that almost every topic contained therein is in some way, more or less, largely a matter affected by the war. I was pleased to observe that the Governor placed the gravity of the war squarely and plainly before the people. This Empire is not yet out of peril, and we have to win this war and clear the Empire of her peril to conserve our own resources here in Newfoundland. A report on recruiting in Newfoundland naturally follows. The response has been as great as the appeals. It may not be as great as the needs. It is a remarkable fact that up to a few months ago, no appeal had been made for twelve months, and yet in spite of that recruiting kept up very well all the year, and only slackened off early in this year, when another appeal was made. We have enough information before us to know that the response from the different places is diverse and unequal. This is not because some places are less patriotic than others, but because some places have not been so well informed as others, and it is the duty of the members of this House to do what they can to remedy this condition, and to help the Empire to win in this great struggle. It is natural to expect the father to hesitate to let his son go. It is natural for the mother to hesitate to let her son go. Naturally they try to influence them to stay at home. But this is an influence with which it becomes us to deal. It is the natural affection that a parent has for a son. Just the love that cannot bear to think of the son killed, maimed and disabled for life; but paramount above this love of son is love of country, and the need is great. If those who remain behind are to have the full enjoyment of life, somebody must go, and somebody's son must go.

I have no patience with employers

who from a business interest refuse to allow their employees to enlist. I have heard of such cases, and I want to say, Sir, here now, even if my voice goes no further, I wish to issue a warning that my influence will go to combat the influence of any such business concern which attempts such unpatriotic conduct.

I am exceedingly pleased to hear that the financial condition of the year is sufficient to warrant the Government in the belief that they will be able to square accounts by next June 30th.

I remember that last year I made considerable play in reference to similar matters. This year I am pleased to be robbed of the means of making that play, because it is satifactory to be able to feel that the colony has weathered the financial storm, that threatened but a few month ago, with a good prospect of coming out well at the end of the year. I only hope that when the Budget comes around that the rosy hopes of the Hon. Minister of Finance will be borne out, but that is a matter on which I would yet reserve my own opinion. I am also glad to note that the Government intends making suitable provision for the requirements of the public service. I hope that this is not the ordinary expression that we come across year in and year out. For the words relative thereto in the speech from the throne are of more import than usual and this service has largely been increased by the pressure of war. It would be idle for us to blind ourselves to the fact that this war is going to make a tremendous difference to us from a financial standpoint. The Government has not yet informed us that any second sum of money has been borrowed from the home Government. Already we are indebted in the sum of one million dollars solely on account of this war We have not yet learned if any other borrowings have been made. But it is clear that whether any other borrowings have yet been made or not they soon will have to be in order to meet the expense necessitated by our placing soldiers in the field In proportion as the number of our soldiers increases so will the expenses also increase. So far we have been fairly fortunate as regards the number of casualties of our soldiers. Not so fortunate perhaps as regards the number of those who have been put on the sick list. Our battalion that was sent to the Gallipolli peninsula has had to combat disease rather than the Turks, Quite a large proportion of them have been placed on the sick list but although on the sick list there is every hope and expectation that by far the greater majority of them will recover and be of use in the field again. But information is already coming to us that the regiment is going into sterner fields of battle where though they will not have to combat disease so much yet they will have to fight on the strongest front of the enemy, and it is therefore idle for us to blind ourselves to the fact that when this regiment goes into battle, larger casualties will occur and this, sir, will mean larger obligations imposed upon us and we will have to prepare to deal with them. We shall endeavour to meet them cheerfully. I notice that during the course of the remarks of the hon. member for Burin that he dwelt upon the tonnage question in his reference to this Speech. Very properly so. His observations with regard to certain owners of steel ships meet with the fullest approbation that I can give them. I recognise the fact that the tonnage question is one that does not affect Newfoundland alone. It is a question that is occupying the attention of every country, whether belligerent or neutral. If you refer to the dispatches of to-day you will

find a statement has been issued from the Washington Congress in reference to this matter, and dealing with those difficulties which we are forced to contend with just now. The main trouble arises from several causes and particularly from the fact that about one third of the whole British tonnage has been taken, requisitioned by the Admiralty for war purposes, and when you speak of one-third it means considerable. For it is also to be remembered that one-half of the whole tonnage on the waters of the ocean are British. It means one from every six ships in the whole world has been requisitioned by the Admiralty. Necessarily this must cause great trouble to commercial shipping. Consider again the fact that for the past two years the British yards have not been occupied for any purpose save that of Admiralty work and that the building of commercial tonnage has therefore been insignificant. Five-sixths of the world's tonnage are turned out in British ship building yards, built mainly on the Clyde and the Tyne,and in a few other places. In ordinary course the new ships would have been utilized for the purpose of world trade. It is needless to offer comment on the internment of German shipping, and on the loss the Allies have suffered by reason of raiders, submarines etc. It is vain to expect transportation to go on as usual. Those here who yielded to a chance of making a few dollars were the men who were to carry on the transportation of Newfoundland produce. I do not know exactly what happened. But I do know that some of them had the effrontery—for I can call it nothing else to ask subsidies from the Government to carry on what it was their business to do before the war. As far as I can learn the Government has handled the question without agreeing to any subsidy. If any suggestion of that kind is brought before the House it will meet with every opposition from me. These people have already made gigantic hauls out of the war. Indeed I hope the hon Minister of Finance will treat such profits as profits of war and will take a large slice for the Treasury. These profits are due solely and simply to the fact of the war and nothing else. I hope the utterance of these views will not be lost on my friend, the Minister of Finance.

The Government took in hand the question of handling coal. On this side of the House some of us helped the Government up to a certain point; but I wish here to express my dissent from certain things done by the Government which were not done with the consent of anybody on this side of the House. I refer to the agreement with Messrs. Harvey and others in reference to future supplies. I dissent from it. I was no party to it and I am no party to it. I think it was a mistake. I have no doubt that the Government made it with good motives, but I think it was a mistake, and I cannot in any way endorse it. I am glad, however, that the Government proposes to take powers from the House to deal with like problems in the future. That is what I understand is meant by the notice of the amendment of certain Bills given by the Prime Minister.

There is another matter that I would like to make some observations on. It relates to the question of pit props. Last year a measure was before this House and obtained the sanction of this House, and one of the features of this measure was that those cutting pit props should not be allowed to cut on the three-mile limit anything except burnt wood. Now, I am given to understand, Sir,—and how correct I am in making the observation I leave to those in authority who may follow—that either the Government or the Department concerned gave authority for the cutting of grow-

ing timber on the three-mile limit in spite of the law passed last year; or if they did not go as far as that, they agreed to wink it out of sight and take no notice of it being done. Much dissatisfaction is felt because of the cutting of growing timber on the three-mile limit. I hope that some explanation will be forthcoming which will dispel the impression that is abroad. The matter of a standard cord was dealt with yesterday. Another aspect of the matter which cropped up to-day. is new so far as I know. I received certain correspondence from the hon. member for St. George's, in which he pointed out what he considered a hardship in relation to the prices paid on the West Coast in connection with the cutting of pit props. That correspondence contained no intimation as to the action the Government had taken on the measure. The member for St. George's asked that the matter be the subject of departmental enquiry, and the Premier intimated that he would bring it before his Executive at the next meeting. The date of the letter was March 1st. It may be that the Government is now in a position to make some statement and he can tell us what resulted from that enquiry, or whether such enquiry has been made..

There is another matter that occupies a prominent place in the Address of this House. This is a statement that in accordance with an Act passed here last session, and owing to the results of an election a Proclamation will be issued in due course to bring the Prohibition Act into force. Now I suppose it was very proper, Sir, to put in that paragraph as a matter of information; but I wonder, Sir, whether that was the whole object of the insertion or whether it was not to quiet certain misgivings on the part of certain members on the other side of the House, because I note it was made the matter of some comment in the public press. The idea apparently prevails that the Proclamation is a cure-all. May I point out, Sir, that this statement is all well enough in its way if it is properly understood but the issue of the proclamation under certain circumstances may not be worth the paper on which it is published. The issue of the Proclamation amounts to nothing unless the election stands. If the election falls the Proclamation goes with it. Certain allegations have been made in a petition before the Supreme Court and on which I do not intend to comment beyond pointing out that certain charges are laid against the Government as to the way they carried out the Act. If these charges are sustained and the election is set aside the Proclamation is of no avail. That, Sir would be by the default of the Government. If the election stands, the Proclamation stands and we shall have prohibition; but if the election is set aside because the Government has wrongly carried out the Act, then the Proclamation is no good and there will not be prohibition and the whole election is gone; I regard the insertion of this paragraph as notice to the world at large that the Government intends to do nothing. If the Court sets aside the election the Government intends so far as this Speech from the Throne is concerned to let everything stand.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks regarding the matter now before the House; and first, Sir, I think I should congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the information which he afforded the House this afternoon with regard to the petitions presented in connection with shipbuilding and tugs. I am glad to notice that the Minister during his visit to the United States was observant and that

he has taken notice of things that concern his department. We know that in the United States they are up to date; and we cannot expect for the next fifty years to approach their condition; but I hope that the result of his visit there will mean some improvements in Newfoundland.

Now the Minister spoke about the amount the Americans and Canadians pay in the way of duty on vessels going into their countries. If an American buys a vessel in Canada and brings her into the United States he has to pay a very heavy duty to have her registered; and if a Canadian buys an American vessel he has to pay a duty of 33 per cent. The consequence is there are no American vessels in the fisheries of Canada. We, on the other hand can find no other way of filling up the gaps in our fishing fleet than by going to America and Canada and buying the offals of these countries and using them in our fisheries. It is true that this year we are getting some new vessels from Nova Scotia. But that is the exception and not the rule. As a rule the vessels that come here are those that are too old to be used in the Canadian or American fisheries. Now if the Americans and Canadians find it necessary for the protection of ship-building to put on a duty of thirty-three per cent. I do not see why we should not take some step in the same direction. Now we intend to do something with regard to shipbuilding at Catalina. To establish a shipbuilding plant at that place will not cost more than twenty thousand dollars; that is to establish a plant like they have at Shelbourne, Nova Scotia. I found at Shelbourne the best plant in Canada, much better than the one they have at Essex in the United States. Twenty thousand dollars is quite sufficient to establish a first-class ship-building plant in Newfoundland.

The Minister said that the sum of $250,000 will go out of Newfoundland this year to purchase vessels in America and Canada and I don't think he was very far wrong. Now, this is a very serious problem, and I think we should consider the advisability of prohibiting our people from going to the States and Canada and spending such a large sum of the hard-earned money of Newfoundland in purchasing vessels which are only regarded in this country as second-class vessels. We have material to build schooners here just as good as they have there.

We probably won't be able to utilize oak here as much as they do in America but we have juniper, which a builder in Nova Scotia told me he would just as soon put into vessels as he would oak. Now, if that is so, I don't see why we should not go into ship-building on a vaster scale than was ever contemplated before in Newfoundland. There is a large wastage in vessels here. I should say that we would require to build a hundred schooners a year to keep up the fleet.

If we don't build vessels we cannot expect to get the income from the fisheries, at least as far as the Labrador is concerned that we have got in the past. During the last eight or ten years the number of vessels going to the Labrador have decreased something like 600, and during the last three years there have not been twenty vessels built in Newfoundland. If you ask why they don't build vessels, they will say that it is too expensive; it costs too much money; it is difficult to get material; labor is higher; and all that sort of thing; and they contend that it is cheaper to buy a second-hand vessel that will last eight or ten years. I submit that it is time for the Legislature to wake up and say to the people: You have the material, and you have the men,

and all you have to do is get to work and establish ship-yards, and we will put on a duty of 25 or 30 per cent. on all vessels that will be brought into Newfoundland from abroad after, say, two or three years. If that is done, and some encouragement is given the people to go into the business, you will find that this vast amount of money which has been going out of the country for this purpose will probably be kept here. There is no reason why it should not be kept here. The man that I took with me through those shipbuilding yards, Capt. Jones, said: Mr. Coaker, I have learned nothing by coming up here; we can do the work in Newfoundland just as well as it is done here." Of course the difference up there is that every man engaged in those yards is a professional in his own line. They make it a business. There are sometimes two vessels in a dock. There are two or three men doing the planking; two or three more doing the caulking; two or three more placing the deck frames; and every one is a professional in his own way; and that is the reason why they do the work so well and so quickly and cheaply, and make such good profits on it.

.We can do the same thing if we will only get down to business and go about the matter properly. At the present time nearly all our work is done with the axe, and that is why the vessels which are turned out in Newfoundland are a little rougher than those turned out abroad. We can build in Newfoundland just as cheaply and just as neatly as they do up there if facilities are provided. They pay their men $50 and $60 a month for doing work which we can get done for $40 a month; but machines do the work much better than it can be done with the axe. I do hope that the Government will do something to encourage the re-establishment of this industry. The time has come when something must be done. If we don't supply a hundred vessels a year, our fishermen will in a few years, have to do without about a million dollars worth of produce that they now bring from the Labrador.

They cannot all engage in the fishery in Newfoundland—they cannot all have traps along the Newfoundland shores; some must go to the Labrador or else we are going to lose twenty or thirty thousand of our population. Even if we don't increase the number of schooners, we must keep up the fleet to its present number. It is no good for the Government to say we will give this matter consideration, and we are satisfied, if any company comes along to take the matter up with them. That is not good enough. I have no use for that sort of thing. I want to see a bill on the Statute Book that will be open to everybody that will come along. Let the Government, with the advice of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries bring in a good, fair measure, open to anybody who cares to go into the business. For instance, there should be a ship-building yard at Harbour Grace. There is no reason why there should not be. They have a dock there but they won't make a success of the dock unless they have a shipyard in connection therewith. We are having a yard at Catalina, and they at Harbor Grace could do the work just as cheaply and effectively as we can at Catalina. One of those yards would give employment to 150 men, and in that way $100,000 a year will be spent in the country for each yard that is in operation. This is too serious a matter to overlook. Why should we continue to send away $250,000 a year that we can keep in the country?

Now. the Government must wake up and put a bill on the statute book that will be fair to everyone. Lay

down your proposition as business men, and guarantee a dividend of say ten per cent. on money invested for ten years if operated. I agree with the Premier when he says that this dividend should only be paid if the plant is in operation. Certainly, don't pay any dividend if the business is not operated, but if this dividend is guaranteed the business will be in operation; and I am not afraid to say that after two or three years the business would be paying 20 per cent. and therefore would not cost the government a cent. I hope that as the Minister has gone into this matter so seriously, and spoken so clearly that this House won't rise this session without some measure is enacted that will be acceptable to the whole House. We must deal with this matter. I want to see five or six of those docks established in this country, and vessels turned out here equally as good as anything that is built in Nova Scotia.

Now, as regards the tug matter, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has made a very clear statement as to the necessity of dealing with this matter. If the Government is prepared to close this session without providing an amount in the estimates to cover the expenditure to provide for a tug, the necessity for which has been so clearly pointed out in the petitions presented to-day then I say that they will be false to their duties as a Government. The necessity is there. Last year forty lives drifted to sea, on two vessels and they were only rescued by a miracle; and every year we have the same thing happening. Then, as the Minister pointed out, if we want to spend $100,000 to provide a tug, she would certainly pay her own expenses and a nice interest on the amount of money invested in her. The Minister stated that between eight and nine thousand dollars a year was spent in taking around supplies to light-houses. Now that is an eye-opener to me. Eight or nine thousand dollars would go quite a long ways towards paying the expenses of one of these vessels. Then there would be towage here in St. John's. We should not care what the Tug Co. says, or how they protest, our duty is to provide a tug capable of meeting every emergency.

There is another matter that will have to be dealt with soon in connection with the Fisheries Department, and that is the matter of scientific research. The tug could be used during certain months of the year for this purpose. That is a matter which has been entirely neglected by all Governments and it must be taken up if we are to keep our place as one of the great fishing countries of the world. One of the things that I was most ashamed of during my trip to Canada and the States was having to confess that we were doing nothing in this connection. I was ashamed to say that out of the $4,000,000 which is collected yearly from the people of this coutry, not twenty cents is devoted for scientific research in connection with our fisheries. I visited the Department of Fisheries at Ottawa and was there shown page after page, and book after book of research work in connection with the fisheries of Canada. On every branch of the fishery they could lay volume after volume of information before me. Why, the Superintendent of Fisheries, a Mr. Froude from Prince Edward's Island, knew more about the fisheries of Newfoundland that I did. He could tell me how much fish was exported from this country during the last twenty years without referring to anything. Now, I hope that the Government will take this matter up

also, and do something in connection with it. I believe the value of the fisheries of this country can be doubled or trebled. There is no reason why we should not be able to export to the States all our Lobsters alive, and all our salmon and turbot fresh, apart from codfish,. For every one of these three sorts of fish that can be caught in Newfoundland splendid prices can be obtained in the States, if we had facilities for transportation. We have been exporting fish for three hundred years, and we have not a single cold storage plant on the Island. We have something west that Mr. Harvey put up.

The Premier says that the matter is under consideration; but it has been under consideration for a long time now, and I think the time has arrived when action should be taken. It is no use to say that the matter is under consideration unless we get down to business and do something. How are we going to increase the catch of fish in Newfoundland, if we don't provide the fishermen with bait? Was it not the cry last year and the year before and every year: "We have no bait?"

Something must be done in connection with cold storage next year. How are you going to increase the number of quintals of fish caught in Newfoundland without a proper bait supply? Is the cry of no bait to be raised every year? No bait and plenty of fish on the grounds means that last year we lost 250,000 quintals of fish which we would not have lost if we had the bait. We are losing 250,000 quintals every year because we won't spend from $100,000 to $200,000 to provide a system of cold storage. If you are going to wait for private companies to come forward and establish cold storage depots in Newfoundland, you will wait for ever. $200,000 expenditure will accomplish much in the way of bait depots. Are we going to hesitate because we are afraid to spend $200,000? Even now, in this time of war, when everything is upside down you ought to be prepared to come here and say we want $200,000 to provide bait depots. If you cannot find the money, appeal to the people and ask them to buy debentures in a proposition that has for its object the establishment of bait depots. Do as I am doing in our own business,and ask the people to invest in interests that will mean the proper development of the fisheries. Are you going to do anything or are you going to sit still and do nothing in connection with this bait depot question? If you cannot find money now, at least appoint two or three men as a committee to consider this bait depot proposition, get them to formulate some plans and bring something before us next session so that next year we will have something to do with regard to providing this long-felt want.

The petition presented here to-day refers to the prohibition of steamers above 500 tons net prosecuting the seal-fishery. We discussed this question last Fall at our convention, and we arrived at the conclusion that we ought to cut out these large steel ships from the seal fisheries. They are out of the fishery this year and there is no reason, that we see, why they should come back. The following are some reasons against their reintroduction: They use a lot of coal and the coal they use comes from Sydney, a great deal of money earned at the sealfishery therefore, goes to Sydney to purchase coal. The ordinary expense of running such steamers is enormous, and further, the cost of cleaning them up when the fishery is over is very heavy. They secure only the same quantity of seals as would be taken by steamers one-third their size and expense. The S.S. "Florizel"

is the only steel steamer out this year. The Bowrings could have found use for her by allowing her to ply between St. John's, Halifax and New York. Steamers are in constant demand on the freight routes, and of my own knowledge I know that at New York there are eight steamers loads of freight awaiting shipment to this port. But the Bowrings took that steamer off the route because they thought the Florizel could grab fifty or sixty thousands seals this season. I say, "cut out the whole thing." If steel ships are to engage in the sealfishery don't permit them to be larger than the "Sagona" Where will we secure such ships you ask? What use can they be put to in the trade after the sealing voyage is over? I do not think the "Sagona" pays during the summer under normal conditions; but the day will come when you will have to make another coastal contract for the North and another for the West—there should now be two steamers in place of the "Prospero"—one leaving every week. The same could apply West. Here would be use for four steamers, and three of them could be sent to the sealfishery in the winter, and thus be made to pay very well. But supposing you do not get these steamers, suppose they could not be made a paying venture, we can get back to the old sailing vessels type and fit them with motor engines. If the steamers do not go to the sealfishery, the wooden ships can do so. The wooden steamers will not be replaced by vessels of their type, and we will soon have to fall back on the sailing vessels. These wooden vessels will not cost very much more to fit out, and the sealers will get a larger proportion of the voyage. I feel sure the day is not very far off when you will see a fleet of sailing vessels go to the sealfishery agan. We intend to build ten of these vessels to engage in the Brazilian trade, and they can also be used for the sealfishery in the winter. If they can be used that way far greater returns will be obtained from the sealing voyage.

The prayer of the petition seeks the prohibition of 25-ton motor boats from engaging in the Labrador fishery. Many men do not want to see motorboats of 25-tons engage in the Labrador fishery; they want to see motorboats no larger than 10 tons employed in that industry. In placing 25 tons as the limit, we thought the day would not be very far off when motor boats would supplant the craft now in that business—collecting fish around the coast, etc. Conditions under which the Labrador fishery is at present carried on must be improved for the sake of the industry itself, but more particularly for the sake of the men engaged therein. You will not get Conception Bay men to go down there and labor under the old system as they did in the past. The equipment of these people must be considered and the best appliances supplied to them. You must fit these men out with trawls and with all the other facilities for the successful prosecution of their avocations. It is absolutely necessary that you supply the hook and liners and trawlers with a plenteous supply of bait; and in a word, let nothing remain undone that would contribute to the successful prosecution of this great industry. Follow this advice, supply these fishery requisites be prompt in your rectification of existing evils which are draining the life-blood from that once profitable factor in the fisheries, conform to the wishes of the people in this respect, and tangible, far-reaching benefits will accrue, greater reforms from this industry will follow, and you will have accomplished two great things—the enhancement of this great fishery, and the betterment through the modernizing of the methods under which they

labor, of the people who engage in it. I would not like to see anything done to bar 25-ton boats from this fishery, because in the years to come we ought to be able to find lots of use for such boats on the Labrador.

As regards the tonnage question, in my opinion, the most astonishing thing in connection with this matter is that the men who sold the ships that supplied the local market demands, securing in the transaction net profits of $600,000, were the men that come back and declare they intend to ask the Government to give them a subsidy in order to get flour and other produce from Montreal this year to meet their trade requirements. Think of it, the sum of $600,000, over and above cost, was realized as net profits by these men! They knew the freight business better than anybody else; they had first-hand knowledge of the local market requirements; and they must have known that when these ships were withdrawn from the routes the trade of the Colony was going to suffer. I think the seriousness of the tonnage situation generally no longer exists and most of the difficulties have been surmounted—for instance, steps have been taken to secure stocks of coal, and to ensure supply of salt, flour and seeds; but there is one phase of the situation that seems to have been forgotten—the marketing of our fish in the Fall. I very much doubt if you are going to find it an easy matter to arrange for the transportation in the autumn. I endorse Dr. Lloyd's remarks in regard to these profits, to which I have just referred. Let the Minister of Finance and Customs bring down a budget and take 50 per cent. off the $600.000 profits. If he does that we will back him up. The amount thus realized may be used for the establishment of bait depots. I understand that the treasury is, at the present time overflowing with milk and honey. I am glad that it is so, and I am glad that the revenue is showing up so well. But I do not anticipate that the prosperity so apparent in 1915 will be in evidence in 1916.

Our fishermen will not make so much out of the fishery in 1916 as they did in 1915, besides the cost of necessary supplies will have gone up; flour will advance from $1 to $1.50 on the price per barrel, and there may be an increase of $1 on a hhd. of salt. Then, again, the price of fish is not going to keep up, we will get less for our fish the coming Fall if the present freight rates prevail. We are not going to get $7.60 for our fish next autumn—but we may get $7. To-day fish is costing $1 more per qtl. to export than it did when fish was bought last year. Fish purchasers who bought 100,000 qtls. of fish last winter and stored it, are losing $100,000 on freights—a loss they did not anticipate when they bought that fish in October or November. That is a serious problem. The fish buyer cannot get the extra freight value from the foreign market, therefore, if conditions continue, the value to our fishermen the coming Fall will be that much less.

Our friend, Mr. Walsh, member for Placentia, has congatulated the Government and Mr. Dee on the splendid results of their endeavors to save the lobster fishery. I am sorry I cannot endorse his remarks. The lobster fishery has gone from bad to worse, and nothing the Government or Mr. Dee can do on the lines pursued by them at present can save it. There is only one way to prevent the collapse of this industry and to restore it—and that is by adopting a close season. That is what you should have done last year. You had your choice of doing this when the war broke out, because the prices fell from $25

to $12 per case. Last year only 6,000 cases of lobsters were taken. At $15 per case, this represents $90,000; and for the sake of the industry we could easily have done without that amount. Close down this fishery for a time and then we will get some decent returns, but if you are going to expect the fishermen to catch the she lobsters and throw them away you are making a mistake. I am glad to see that very few lobsters were canned in Green Bay and other places North last year. I expect that in five years' time the people North will reap great benefits from their action in not engaging in this fishery the past year, and I trust also, the coming season.

I wish to congratulate the Government upon the new system of reporting. I was pleased today to find that a report of the few words I uttered yesterday were laid on my desk today. For two years we have strongly advocated a change in reporting the proceedings of this House, and I am pleased to find our efforts crowned with success. I trust the good work commenced will continue throughout the session and all will endeavour to do their best to carry out the improvements. If more money is needed to ensure complete success, it should be granted. The old system was but a waste of money. The things I pointed out to you this afternoon can all be accomplished if you put the same energy and spirit in your endeavour to grapple with them as you have done in regard to this reporting business.

In Canada the report of the previous day are on the members' desks by 10 a.m. They change reporters there every ten minutes, which gives considerable time to rewrite. Here we are now changing reporters every fifteen minutes. If this is possible, then it is all right, but if ten minutes reporting would be better, have it by all means. If you have to spend a thousand dollars more, spend it, as long as you get value for your money.

Another matter I want to refer to is that of printing the debates. At the present time you are paying two papers to do this. I saw in Saturday morning's "News" the official record of Thursday, and the same appeared in the "Herald." If both papers must have a share of the plunder, let some arrangement be made for alternate reporting, and don't make yourselves ridiculous by having the same matter published twice.

There is another matter I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to, and this is a matter which I feel quite sure will have his immediate attention. That is the condition of the Opposition rooms down stairs. They have now been for a long time in a miserable condition, and I am quite sure the Prime Minister will have them fixed up. Nobody seems to have dared to ask to have them improved; with the result that at the present time they are not fit to be attached to the Poor House, and I believe even the Poor House must be more comfortable. They are certainly in a poor condition. There is no lavatory accommodation connected with it. I think this is a matter which ought to be of very great interest to the Government as they will undoubtedly be the next occupants of that chamber. This, then is a remarkable chance for them to fit up a nice place for themselves. If I were leader of the House, I would resign before submitting Opposition members to such treatment. It wouldn't be a hard job to find a room large enough for the next Party in Opposition, because there will be very few of you returned, nevertheless, give attention to the matter, for the present room is too bad to be longer tolerated.

I am very much interested in the petition which was presented here to-day by my friend, Mr. Stone, and hope that the matter will have the immediate attention of the Fishery Board. That Board ought to remedy this herring business by having but one class of herring exported. At New York I found our best herring selling at $15 per barrel, yet thousands of barrels of our herring are selling at $6 or $7 per barrel, and unsaleable at that price. Newfoundland herring has a poor, a very poor name in the markets, and something ought to be done at once to improve the cure. You ought to examine every barrel that goes out, and refuse to allow a man to export inferior herring. If he wants to pack number two, make him mark it number two; and if he wants and insists in filling up the centre of the barrel with poor quality fish, refuse to allow him to export at all. We have a great heritage in this fishery, and it is up to us to keep it and make it as valuable as possible. We cannot be too careful of this industry. An example occurred just last year. There were some barrels of herring north which could not be sold. A representative of some American firm bought them and exported them to New York, where they were left to rot. Why let these men do that with our fish? They are destroying any reputation it ever had. We ought to have a commission to look into this matter, and the question ought to be very easily settled by establishing an inspection and treating it the same as it is treated in Norway and Scotland. A commission, such as I am thinking of would remedy this matter, and insure honest treatment to the buyer and to the seller alike. Have every barrel marked, and refuse to permit other than that marked Government Brand to be exported. A measure like this was introduced in Nova Scotia last year, and worked well. If you spent one-fifth of the money you have spent on your railways in the development of the fisheries of the Colony, the results would have added 100 per cent to the value of the fisheries.

Now I have a proposal to make. I know the Prime Minister will not consider it favorably. It is this. Take five members of the Government and five members of the Opposition, and send them abroad as a deputation from Newfoundland to see how things are done in connection with fishery matters in Canada and America. I can guarantee them that there would be a great welcome extended to them, and the whole trip would not cost much I know how kindly I was treated and how much I learned from my visit, and feel sure that a deputation would learn much and be treated even better than I was.

Another thing has been forgotten in the speech from the Throne. You will remember in 1909 we were promised a standard cull for our fish. I hope when the Premier takes up the question of bait depots, he will devote some time to this matter. It is very important to the country.

Then again something further ought to be done to open the French market for our fish. In past years something was done in this direction, but I don't think that it was successful. I think now that the war is on, something ought to be done to get the French to amend the law preventing the importation of Newfoundland fish. If this law could be repealed Newfoundland might export two or three hundred thousand quintals of soft fish. This is also a very important matter, and one which ought to be taken up immediately.

Now there is another matter that I must refer to, it is this pit prop business. I do not think it is right

for this legislature to pass a law one session and three or four or five months after to have the Governor-in-Council sending out circulars telling the people to break the law. Let them cut pit props on the Labrador by all means, but don't permit the cutting on the three-mile limit in Newfoundland. All our timber will be very valuable in time if we save it. We passed a law last session to forbid the cutting of green timber on the three-mile limit, and we find instructions have been issued permitting the cutting. In Green Bay the people do not want to cut this, but they will do it and are doing it if it is going to be done. In some places now, as a result of this action, you cannot find a tree within a mile or two of the water long enough to make longers, so much has the supply been cut down. This is something that should be stopped right away.

I would like the men who gave that order to go North and hear what the people up there think of their actions. There are men there who have been cursing the Government ever since they got in power, but now more than ever over this business. There is no money in this pit prop business for the men.

There is a large body of men that curse the day on which this Government went into power. There is not a place where our men can cut an oar or a beam for their use. I, myself, have just travelled all along the shore in Green Bay for forty miles and the whole shore has been depleted of all its timber, thanks to this pit prop business. The men receive $2.60 to $2.80 per cord. They make about 40 cents per day. How can such work benefit the fishermen when it robs them of their timber supply for operating the fisheries and building schooners. We should be getting eight to ten dollars for every cord put on board the steamers, instead of $6 to $6.50. All those men who represented the ring in England got their pit props at $6.50 delivered on board the vessel. They willingly would have given three dollars more had the Government fixed such a price. But when they saw how many were willing to make contracts from $5.50 to $6.50, they saw they would be fools if they paid more.

If the Government had come in and put the price on every cord that price would have been paid, and the people would have received a far greater return for their labor and timber. Two hundred and twenty shillings sterling is the price pit props are selling at in England. Everything we handle in Newfoundland we seem to make a bungle of and only awake to the fact when the horse is stolen. Then we lock the door. The result of all this fooling is you will have the curse of the people upon you for the next ten or fifteen years. The curse of the Northern men will be upon the Premier's head. Ask Mr. Jennings who just came from that coast. Ask Mr. Stone from Trinity. Yes, Trinity. That is the place that has, perhaps, suffered most of all. Why? Because there was only a little forest left there and they made good use of it. The fishermen used this little forest sparingly and economically to turn out cooperage, for it was all they had. It would have lasted them a long time. The pit prop business came, and now for ten years at the very least they won't be able to secure lumber to operate their little mills.

Then, again, why was the Florizel allowed to sail before her time on the 13th? There was no occasion for her to sail at four in the morning instead of eight. Had the thirteenth come on a Sunday I could understand why, and the Government would have been justified in allowing her to sail perhaps on the Saturday night. Are you going to violate your laws, the very

laws you frame yourselves, almost before they are published? If so, how can the people be blamed for doing the same, which is only following your example. This is the sort of thing that demoralizes the people. There seems to me to be no apparent justification for the Florizel sailing at four in the morning, when a few hours delay would have been within the law. You should not allow these things to go on from time to time and then bring in a bill of indemnity to cover over your weaknesses.

I hear that our friend for Placentia is looking out for the vacancy at the Magistrate's Court. Are you going to do the same for him as you are doing for Mr. Kent? As for this latter appointment I must say that I am surprised to find that you have not appointed some man from your side to fill this vacancy. As for Mr. Kent, he would be a fool if he did not accept the position you have offered him. Our friend from Placentia has, however, been waiting a long time. If he had only been on this side of the House he would have received the appointment long before this.

If there had been no F. P. U. in this country you would be offering the Judgeship to some of your friends. Then again, there is our friend representing Fortune Bay, Mr. Emerson. He will never be returned from Fortune Bay again. Since we have been here in this House I do not think that we have had occasion to find fault with Mr. Emerson once. If you have a man on your side ready to take the position open in the Supreme Court as chief clerk, he should be appointed at the close of the session. If you do not choose to open the district of Fortune Bay, well, I for one, will not quarrel with you. Give Mr. Emerson this position, as he is so anxious about it. Your delay only creates a false impression amongst the people. They are losing their respect for law and Crown and for the administration of the laws of the Colony.

I do not desire to delay the House any longer. I have not said one half that I wanted to say with respect to the Speech from the Throne. But I have no doubt that there will be ample opportunities later to discuss it in all its bearings when we get down to the real solid business of the session.

QUESTIONS.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to the questions asked yesterday by Mr. Halfyard.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the information asked for by the hon. member for Twillingate ,Mr. Coaker, in relation to the pit prop industry.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to table a list of Old Age Pensioners in Twillingate District.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg to table required information.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Public Works whether the Main Line Grants are to be expended by the Elected Road Boards.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg leave to table required information.

MR. COAKER—asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary whether a courier has been appointed to convey mail to the Logging Camps at Red Indian Lake.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the hon. member I may say that last session he reported this matter to me with a view to seeing if it was not possible to organize some system of couriers to deliver mails to the logging camps at Red Indian Lake and other places. Immediately after the close of last session I took the matter up with the

Post Master General and asked him to make enquiries as to the practicability of organizing such a service. I subsequently had an interview with Mr. Scott, who is Manager of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co. in reference to this matter. I understood from him that the system at present in vogue was in his opinion as good as it was possible to organize in that direction. At present and in the past the mail is sent up over the lake to the lumbering camps in the early part of the season by steamer and from thence distributed to the headquarters of the different groups of camps.

After the lake was frozen over it was sent by team, and delivered in a similar manner; Mr. Scott after making a very careful enquiry into any suggestions that might bring about an improvement in this work, reported that if the Government intended to take over this mail service it would involve a considerable outlay of money. I have had considerable correspondence on this subject, and I have instructed the Post master General to prepare all this correspondence, and I hope to be in a position to lay it on the table of the House to-morrow or the following day. I wish to assure the hon. member and the House that this matter has not been neglected or passed over lightly by me. As I pointed out last year in a case like this where two thousand men are concerned they should be given facilities that would give them satisfaction.

I shall be very pleased to table the correspondence when prepared, and if there are any suggestions that may be made by the hon. member or any member of the House, I shall have much pleasure in having them duly considered.

MR. WINSOR asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement showing cost of Postal Office erected at Salvage.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—That information is being prepared.

MR. WINSOR asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if any arrangement has been made, or any amount given, for building a Post Office at Hare Bay; if so, with whom were the arrangements made, and what was the amount; also, copies of all correspondence objecting to the Post Office been put in the centre of that locality.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—No arrangement has been made, and no money has been voted for that purpose. The correspondence that has taken place in relation to this matter I am pleased to be able to lay on the table of the House.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and leave granted and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, Supply was granted to His Majesty.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill respecting the Control of Trdaing in Certain Commodities.

Rt. Hon the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill to amend the law respecting the Naturalization of Aliens.

Mr. Abbott gave Notice of Question.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 22.

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

PETITIONS.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Mose Ambrose and English Harbour West in the district of Fortune Bay, asking that a public wharf be erected at Mose Ambrose, and that that place be made a regular port of call for the coastal boat. The petition points out that the coastal boat calls there only about once a month, and that great inconvenience ensues in consequence. Under present conditions the people had to take to and bring their freight from St. Jacques about three miles away, or pay another freight to the owners of the Bay boat. Not only would Mose Ambrose be benefitted by the coastal boat calling there, but Coombs' Cove Boxey, and other places would also derive great advantage from the adoption of such a plan. In moving that the petition be received and referred to the department to which it belongs, I trust that it will receive every consideration.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a number of petitions from the following places:—Boyd's Cove, Exploits, Springdale, Triton, Campbellton, Lewisporte, New Bay, Comfort Cove, Summerford, Little Bay, Pilley's Island, Port Anson, Fortune Harbour, Leading Tickles, Morton's Harbour and Twillingate. All these petitions deal with the same subject, namely the cutting of pit props. As I intend at a later stage to make some remarks on this matter, I will not make any further comment on them at the present time, but I would ask permission of the House to read one of these petitions for the information of the House. (The Hon. member here read the petition.) These petitions are signed by over one thousand people, and I ask that they be referred to the Governor in Council, and I hope they will receive the consideration due to such an important matter.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker: I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petitions that have been presented by my friend, Mr. Jennings. I may say that I have had from my constituents a considerable number of letters on the same subject, all pointing out that there is a lack of system in regard to the measuring of these pit props, as to how much is contained in a cord. I understand that a cord is 128 cubic feet, but by some means devised by the purchaser of these pit props they insist upon getting 134 cubic feet and sometimes many more feet. The price that they are paying is totally inadequate to the amount of timber in a cord, and on the whole, there seems to be numerous causes for complaint. These petitions ask that the cutting of pit props be prohibited, but while they are being cut I see no reason why the interest of the people should not be guarded by some legislation. I hope that these petitions will receive the early attention of the Government, and some steps will be taken to remedy the evils complained of.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker: In regard to this matter, my opinion has already been fully expressed. If the Prime Minister will notice, these petitions ask that immediate steps be taken in order to save the amount of green timber that now remains. I wonder whether it is too much to ask whether the Government will accede to the wishes of the petitioners, in this regard. The season is pretty far advanced now, but if Mr. Phillips of the Department of Agriculture and Mines were dispatched to the principal places with instructions that the Government did not want any more cutting, it would result in stopping any further slaughter on these areas. All these petitions point to the seriousness

of the situation. These petitions are not got up by the F. P. U. but are simply the voluntary expressions of the opinion of the fishermen themselves. I do not think that any injury would be done to any interests if the Government were to take steps to stop the cutting right now. It is too late to talk about stopping the cutting at the end of the season. The law has been broken, and the Government is responsible for this breach of the law. The pit prop contractors evidently got on the good side of the Government, and now there is a howl from Cape John to Catalina. The Government ought never to have relaxed the law in this connection at all.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: In reply to the hon. member, I may say that I shall be very glad to take up the matter of the petitions that have been presented, and the whole subject matter of pit props between now and the next sitting to-morrow, and I will discuss this matter with the Minister and the Inspectors, and see if any measure can be devised. I may say further that the permission given to cut was not given to satisfy some pit prop contractors. The Government was faced at the beginning of the season by a demand for labour in certain districts both by the representatives themselves and in the public Press, and it was pointed out that thousands of people would be in want if an opportunity was not given to cut pit props. The Government had no negotiations or correspondence with parties interested in the purchase of pit props, except the local contractors, and in the case of local contractors permission was only given on the representation that a great many people were in need; in one instance it was stated that half a million dollars would be needed to carry the people over the winter. I do not know whether this representation is true, but I know that a large expenditure would have been necessary if this industry had not been carried on. That of course does not justify the denuding of the 3-mile limit, and I can only hope that the damage referred to is not so extensive as it is thought, but I will take the matter up between now and to-morrow, and I hope that I will then be able to make a statement that is satisfactory.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Croque, District of St. Barbe, asking that a ferry be placed there to operate and convey travellers from Kearney Cove to the Southwest of Croque. This is only a fair request on the part of the people of that place. They have no railway and very little steam communication, and the fishermen find it very difficult to get backwards and forwards between these two places. If a ferry were put there it would be very convenient for the travelling public. I trust that the Colonial Secretary will take this matter up and accede to the requests of the petitioners. I also have a petition, Sir, from the inhabitants of Rocky Harbour asking that it be made a port of call. Rocky Harbour is a growing settlement with a population of some 350 people. The fishing is prosecuted there extensively, and ranks next to Bonne Bay on that part of the coast. They now ask that the Reid Newfoundland Co.'s steamer call there during the present season. I was under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that Rocky Harbour was a port of call for the R. N. Co.'s steamer, and trust that it is not the intention of the Government to make any alteration to the contrary. I also beg leave to present a petition from the same place respecting telegraphic communication, and asking that a telegraph office be opened there. It would cost the Government but a small amount to

extend the lines to Rocky Harbour. It would afford communication with Bonne Bay, as well as St. John's, and would be of great advantage to the people of that part of the district, both in the carrying on of their business and otherwise. I trust that the Government will give the matter its earnest consideration.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Speaker, I am entrusted with the presentation of two petitions, one is from Lark Harbor asking for a sufficient sum of money to complete the Public wharf there. This wharf was begun some years ago and $1400 was spent on it, but the depth of water there is insufficient for a coastal boat to draw into, and a very limited expenditure of money would remedy this. The other petition is from Port au Port and the peninsula generally, asking that the Beacon Light there be made a Fog Alarm. Since the erection of the Fog Alarm at Cape George the people have realized the great advantage of a fog alarm in contrast to a Beacon light. There is frequently fog in this vicinity and in the past fishermen have found it very dangerous getting round from place to place and this unfortunately in the past has sometimes been attended with loss of life. The beacon light is sometimes invisible and the fog alarm would offer some protection to the people.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the electors of Victoria Cove and Rogers Cove in the District of Fogo, asking that the cutting of pit props and logs for milling purposes be prohibited in that section of the country containing green timber, situated on the north side of the Gander and on the three mile limit, outside of a line running west, north west from Wing's Point, and extending to Dog Bay Point. The petition is largely signed by Mr. Esau S. Record and others, and the petitioners set forth that there are only one or two small belts of green timber left in this vicinity, all the rest being burnt a few years ago, and further the residents of these places are nearly all fishermen and are depending upon this spot of green timber to supply themselves with the material for fences, flakes stages and boat building. I need not say, Sir, that if this section is denuded of all its green timber, the people will be deprived of the chief means they now possess in making it possible for them to prosecute the fishery. This question, Sir, is a very live one at the present time, and our people view the situation seriously, when so much green timber on the three mile limit has been destroyed in the cutting of pit props. It is very encouraging to note the tone of regret from the members of the Government that the cutting of pit props has been so disastrous to the future of our country, and I feel sure that no further comment is necessary from me in order to get the Department of Agriculture to give the petition the consideration which its importance deserves. I have also a petition from Island Harbour and Carmanville. This is the third time I have presented a petition upon this subject from this place. It requests that Island Harbor be made a port of call for the Fogota or Clyde. Every session these people have sent along a petition on this subject. They have no communication by telegraph or otherwise and they might as well not be in Newfoundland at all for what attention they get from the Government. I understand that there was a revision of ports of call in Twillingate District last year so that the people would get better service from the Clyde. But Fogo being a one man district, no attention was paid their request. This matter not only concerns the people of Island Harbour but the

places adjacent. There are 200 signatures to the petition and I trust it will not receive the fate of other petitions that have come in on this subject. On several occasions great loss has been suffered and great pain also by lack of this communication. On one occasion a man broke his leg. They had to go to Fogo for a Doctor by boat and then had to take the man across in a boat to Fogo to be sent to St. John's. I trust that I will not be called upon to bring in another petition on this subject at the next sitting of the Legislature.

MR. COAKER. - I beg to support the prayer of the petition. It would only mean an hour or more for the Fogota to call at Island Harbour. It is only a mile or two out of its course, and while on this matter I would like to say that I am very grateful to the Colonial Secretary for the interest which he took in the Green Bay service last year. The rearrangement of ports of call resulted in its getting five more ports. Only the other day I was speaking to some of the people of Boyd's Cove and they were immensely pleased with the change and it did not cost very much more. Altogether it was a great boon for a thousand people .

MR. TARGETT.—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Winterton asking for a new postal and telegraph office at that place. Winterton, Mr. Speaker, is a place of upwards of one thousand inhabitants. There is a rule that no person whatsoever is to go into a telegraph or post office, but in this office which the inhabitants of Winterton are objecting to one must go in to transact his business. If one doesn't go in one cannot transact his business. The people there are probably the most industrious in Trinity Bay if not in the whole of Newfoundland. They have communicated with the Postmaster General and the Colonial Secretary in relation to this matter, but nothing has yet been done. Having got no satisfaction they thought they would send in a petition to see if some arrangement cannot be made and I trust that the Colonial Secretary will see that there is a reasonably satisfactory and suitable postal and telegraph office placed there.

A person going to get mail must go in the office ,and if he wants to can read all the messages. I hope that this petition will have the full attention of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. STONE.—Mr. Speaker the petition presented by my friend Mr. Targett in connection with the Postal Telegraph Office is one which in my opinion should have attention at the hands of the Colonial Secretary The one there has given a great deal of dissatisfaction. Winterton is a thriving settlement and the people are not satisfied with it. Therefore I think the Colonial Secretary should try to arrange to have this matter attended to. I have great pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, Winterton is one of those thriving places inhabited solely by fishermen and is one which has always been neglected by Governments in the way of public buildings. Being an industrious people they naturally desire everything they can get in the way of good public services, and I hope that the Colonial Secretary will see his way clear to have a suitable office supplied there for postal and telegraph business.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Speaker, I would call your attention to the fact that for several years I have presented petitions from the inhabitants of Groais Islands, District of St. Barbe, asking that that place be made a port of call for the coastal boat. The peo-

ple do not ask to have the steamer sent there every trip, but would appreciate her calling several times during navigation. I would draw the attention of the House to the abandonment of the schooner Blanche M. Rose, from which 26 persons were rescued by a passing vessel. This schooner was fish laden and returning home from the Groais Islands at the close of the fishing season. Had it not have been for this timely rescue all hands must have lost their lives as she was in a sinking condition. What a disaster this would have been to the families of these fishermen. If the Prospero had called there no doubt the majority of these people, for there were some women among them, would have taken advantage of the opportunity and taken passage by her. There is no reason whatever why the coastal boat shouldn't call at the Groais Islands. There is plenty of water, in fact a man o' war could anchor there with absolute safety. This is the opinion of the fishermen. I consider it is the duty under the circumstances and in the interests of the fishing population there, to order the Messrs. Bowring Bros. to put the Groais Islands on the schedule as a port of call the coming season.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled the annual returns of the Reid Newfoundland Company covering a period from June 30th, 1914, to June 30th, 1915.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill, "An Act to amend the Law respecting the Naturalization of Aliens," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow .

CONTROL OF TRADING BILL.

Pursuant to order and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill, "An Act respecting the Control of Trading in Certain Commodities," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTION.

Mr. Abbott asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing why and by what authority, Mr. Christopher Haines, Jamestown, B.B., who formerly carried the mail from Lethbridge to Winter Brook, was replaced by Mr. Thomas Blunden; also all correspondence in connection with the transaction.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I will table that to-morrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. CLIFT.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two observations in relation to the matter of the Address in Reply; but before doing so I desire to add my humble tribute to the resolution or resolutions of sympathy and condolence passed upon the opening day in relation to the passing away of Mr. Justice Emerson, Mr. Furlong and Hon. Mr. Harris, the President of the Legislative Council; three gentlemen who were held in the highest esteem in their various walks of life in this community. Mr. Furlong was more intimately associated with this House having filled the office of Law Clerk for the past fifteen years or more, so we were more acquainted with him and his work and I am sure his early demise has left a blank in that office which will be felt for some time to come.

In the passing of Mr. Justice Emerson, a vacancy is made on the Bench of the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court can ill afford to lose the services of a man who so ably filled that dignified office. Mr. Justice Emerson was a jurist of no mean order. He was one to whom the profession always looked as a man of great legal attainments.

In the opening paragraph of the speech with which His Excellency opened this session of the legislature, naturally the first reference was to the terrible struggle between the warring nations of Europe which is now going on. The war which is now taxing the resources of the great Empire, has now been going on for a period of eighteen months, and no man can as yet tell when it will be over or what will be the result. We, however, Sir, have as British subjects only one duty to perform, and that duty we must perform to the best of our ability.

Our duty is to aid the empire so far as we can by sending men to join the fighting ranks. We have been congratulating ourselves on what we have done in this respect. We have sent over 2,000 men to augment His Majesty's forces, and some 1200 or 1500 as an addition to the Navy. But shall we stop at this? Are we going to measure up to the standard set by other of His Majesty's dominions beyond the seas? Is it to be said after the war is over that Newfoundland has not contributed her share in proportion to the other dependencies of His Majesty's beyond the seas? I have every confidence Sir, that our young men will respond to the call that has recently been made, that they will rally around the old flag, and do the duty required by their King and Country. That is the paramount and most important matter which we must consider at the present moment. A further effort is being made at the present time to stimulate recruiting, and I hope it will have the desired effect. It is very gratifying for us to know that our men who have gone forward have been doing their work well and have had high encomiums passed on them for the manner in which they have done their work. That is all very gratifying. But I hope that before very long we shall be able considerably to increase the number we sent. The Speech tells us that the estimates for the coming year will be laid before the house at the earliest date and we are also told that at the end of the fiscal year on the 30th day of June next,it will probably be found that the revenue received will be in excess of the expenditure. That also will be very gratifying indeed. I assume, since no reference whatever has been made in this speech to any retrenchment, when the estimates come down they will be similar to those which were placed before us last year. I submit Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Government, that before any taxation is imposed upon the people to meet any extraordinary expenditure in connection with this war or to meet the short revenue that will naturally occur from same cause every effort should be made to economise and reduce our expenditures. I hope that when the Minister comes down with his estimates that there will be some effort made in this direction. There is lots of room for improvement and for retrenchment without affecting in any way the Civil service. You can get a better and more efficient Civil Service by increasing some of the salaries of the present officials and doing away with others altogether. By these means you will get a more efficient and less expensive Civil Service. There are many things in connection with the public service that might well be done without. And I would like to see some effort made in this direction. I grant you that it may be necessary to impose additional taxation to meet the increasing expenditure brought about by changed conditions and this terrible war. It may be necessary to increase taxation to some considerable extent. But my point is that before any increase should be made in taxation every legitimate effort should be made in the direction of reducing our expenses. I sincerely hope that these things will be brought about. When the estimates

come down I shall take that advantage of dealing further with these questions. I referred Mr. Speaker in the beginning of my remarks to the fact that the demise of the late Mr. Justice Emerson left a vacancy on the bench of the Supreme Court, That vacancy, we are informed to-day through the Official Gazette, has been filled by a gentleman who has occupied during the past six or seven sessions the position of leader of the Opposition. I think that I am but voicing the sentiment of every Hon. member of the House when I convey to Mr. Kent the hearty good wishes of this House on his elevation to that distinguished seat. Mr. Kent during his term as leader of this side of the House has fulfilled his duties conscientiously thoroughly and effectively. He has performed his work in such a manner as to commend him to the whole House, unostentatiously and efficiently has he endeavoured to perform the high and important duties that devolved upon him as leader of the Opposition. And a leader of the Opposition has duties to perform which are just as important perhaps as those who are charged with administrative offices. While we all regret very much the absence of Mr. Kent from this House yet we all unite in extending to him our warmest congratulations upon attaining the dignified office of a judge of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. Not only is Mr. Kent himself to be congratulated upon the appointment to this office. but the whole country is also to be congratulated upon having secured one who is so eminently fitted to fill this important post. I trust that he may be long spared to enjoy the office to which he has been appointed and which I am sure he will ably fill. His appointment to that post leaves a vacancy in the distinguished office which he so fittingly occupied on this side of the House. It will be for those who sit here to elect his successor. I am not at liberty at this moment to say who is likely to have this great honour thrust upon him. Personally I do not aspire to any such position. If this position were offered to me I should have to decline it with thanks because I feel that I cannot take upon me any more responsibilities than I have at this present moment with regard to my political life. I find that it takes me all my time to attend to my own business and as much as I would desire to serve my country in that position yet I feel that were I asked to assume the office I should ask to be excused. The occupant of that office may in the near future perhaps have devolving upon his shoulders the more important office of Premier of the country and that is an office that would require a man who would be able to give more time to it, than I feel I should have at my disposal. I can assure you however that we shall have very little difficulty in selecting one to fill that chair who will commend himself to the whole house.

MR PARSONS—Mr. Speaker. I feel that I cannot still still and remain silent while we are discussing matters relative to one or two paragraphs contained in this Speech. Before however offering any comments I should like to pay my tribute to the family of the late Mr. Furlong. Mr. Furlong sat here in this House at the table near me for the past eight or ten years and on every occasion that I came in contact with him in any way I found him most affable and courteous. I should also like to express my condolences to the family of the late Mr. Harris. He was a comparative stranger to me up to a short time before his death. But I always found him affable and kind in every respect. Also with regard to the demise of Mr. Justice Emerson though living here in St. John's he was a native of the town in which I was

born. At school we always knew him to be strong-willed and able to take his part in the games and plays of schoolboy-life; and even though he was strong-willed he was always open to conviction and ready to be on the side of right. And to his memory, I, as a Harbor Gracian, wish to pay this tribute. Now, Sir, there is another paragraph in the Speech to which I would like to make reference. It is this:

"I have every confidence in the invitation now being addressed to the young men of the Colony to do their part in the fighting line, and to the rest of our people to recognize what is required of those that remain at home, that there will be a response that will keep Newfoundland where she was at the outset, in the very first rank in proportion and resources".

I know, Sir, that in this crisis of our Empire that a great responsibility rests upon a Government. It requires deep thought and keen oversight on their part; and we must also realize that a great responsibility also rests upon each one of us as members of this House, whether in the Opposition or on the Government side; and I am sure that the members of the Government and the members of the Opposition have endeavoured to do their duty in these stirring times. There is also a responsibility that rests upon every community and upon the parents of our lads; and I agree with what Mr Lloyd said to-day, that these parents, particularly the mothers, naturally shrink from parting with their boys and girls, but they should remember the conflict that is before us to-day and that the Empire needs more men. I am not here to-day as an alarmist; but I can read between the lines and see from victories and advances of the Germans that we will need more men, that the Empire and this country will have to put forth their best efforts; and we should do everything in our power to encourage recruiting. We read to-day in the press about peace, but I am convinced that peace is not yet; and to obtain that peace of a permanent nature, Newfoundland has to do a lot more. Some men may say that the outports have not done their duty, and while I am not going to excuse the outports, yet it must be remembered what the environments are in which our young men in the outports are brought up, and men are governed by the environment in which they live; and it must also be remembered that here in the city you have brigades and other military influences governing the boys from their earliest years. But with all respect to St. John's I believe that the same patriotic spirit prevails throughout the country.

Now, Sir, I do not mean in any way to parade my family before the public, either in this House or through the Press, and I merely refer to one to make a point. To-day we ought all be imbued with the spirit of patriotism and remember that England expects every man to do his duty. I had a letter a short time ago—and you will excuse me, Mr. Speaker, from looking at this matter from a personal standpoint, but as I said I only do it to make a point—from my daughter who has been five months in Belgium. In that letter she says: "Father, the time for which I have volunteered has elapsed. I am now going to join the Canadian Army Medical Corps. I am going to ask to be sent to the East, and if I possibly can I will get where the Newfoundland boys are, and if I cannot nurse them I will endeavour to nurse some other mother's boy." Now, I say to the country at large, encourage your son to go forward, and if any of those there fall, let him take the place of some other mother's boy, and help to uphold the Empire. To-day I see before me the Flag,

"Proudly I'm borne o'er the billowy sea,
And far distant nations have trembled at me."

These would be the sentiments of our Flag to-day if it could speak in this House. Its position is that it is floating over the billowy sea to-day, and far distant nations are trembling at that flag. That is where we want it to remain. We mean to maintain and uphold it, and by the help of God we will. But we cannot be lax in our duty. Every man is needed. I say, Sir, and I wish it to be placed on record to-day, that the outports east and west and north and south should come forward and not keep back. It has been said to-day that the boys who are now volunteering will never see the front. That, however, is only a secondary consideration. It is, perhaps, a selfish consideration. But whether they do or not they will do their part, and increase the numbers and show the world that Newfoundland is doing its part in this great struggle.

A little while ago I received letters from Mr. Frank Morris and Mr. Lloyd, Chairman and Secretary of the Patriotic Association. They invited me to come over to St. John's; but being unwell at that time I had not the pleasure of coming over. However, the Branch Committee held a meeting at Harbour Grace, and even though we do not see much result from it at present, I believe that the meeting had a good effect. Five or six young men came forward, but unfortunately four were turned down as being medically unfit. I believe that the Patriotic Association should provide these young men with badges to show that they were willing to do their duty and they are not slackers.

As I said before I am not alarmed as to the outcome of this war, because I believe that Newfoundland and the Empire will come out on top, but we will have to do our part. We must be prepared to give our boys and girls to the Empire; and if it comes to home defence some of the men of sixty years of age are prepared to go ahead and do what they can. Now, Sir, I do not wish to delay the House any longer, and I hope and trust we will see further recruiting. I have been glad to see the great numbers that have been coming forward the past week or two, and I hope that will keep on.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to make a few remarks in relation to the subject matter now before the House. It seems to me that the Speech from the Throne this session makes the task of the Opposition rather easy, because to a superficial observer like myself it seems that there is not a great deal in it to criticise, even if I were inclined for that kind of work. I wish in some measure to endorse the sentiments expressed by other honourable members as regards those public men who have passed to the Great Beyond since last session. They have gone the road we have all to travel, and it should be a lesson to each of us that in the days to come we have to give an account of ourselves, and we should endeavour to put in our time so that we will not be ashamed when that time comes. You will excuse me for introducing that little sermon.

Now, with regard to the part of the Speech dealing with the great conflict that is going on over across the waters, to my mind there should be only one opinion as regards our duty to the Empire of which we form so small a part. I say here to-day, and I say it deliberately, that it is a matter of regret to me that the District that I represent has not responded to a greater extent than it has. I believe we stand fairly well with regard to the land forces, but I am perfectly well aware

that the figures are made up to the extent they are because of the response made by Grand Falls; but we all know that the men who are coming from Grand Falls are not all natives of the District of Twillingate. However, as regards Twillingate, there are reasons that it would not serve any purpose for me to mention in the House. Living in the District I have had occasion to find out the reasons why the response has not been greater, especially in Twillingate proper. As far as I am concerned I have used every means that I considered proper on my part to show the position as it appeared to me. Personally I say this to the country that if I were a young man, medically fit to go to the front, and with no higher duty claiming my services and I did not enlist, after this conflict was over I should be ashamed to lift my head and look into the faces of those who had been out at the front.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that a greater response will be made to the needs of our Empire. I would like to suggest here in this House a measure which I think would bring about a greater degree of success in the District of Twillingate, and that is, if it could possibly be managed, to have a small recruiting station at Twillingate proper. I believe that would have the effect of bringing our young men there face to face with their duty to the British Empire.

I am very pleased to see from the address that this session will probably close without any additional taxation being placed upon our people. I hope that this pleasing impression will not be disillusioned before the session closes. I am not so foolish as to think that our responsibilities are not growing. I know that the greater the duties which we undertake on behalf of our Empire the greater our financial responsibilities will be, and I don't believe that any right-thinking man in the country will grumble if his individual financial responsibility is increased on that account. At the same time I heartily endorse the sentiments expressed by Mr. Clift, when he says that it is the duty of the Government to see whether it is not possible to bring about some retrenchment, and by saving money in that way exclude the necessity of increasing taxation, if the need arose.

I do not think it is creditable to any man to gloat over his country's difficulties, financial or otherwise, and I am sure for my own part I am quite pleased to know that we are in a far better position financially this year than we were last .

I will pass on now to the last paragraph of the address, that referring to prohibition. It was very pleasing to those who supported prohibition in the recent election, to see that pronouncement from the Government. It was generally understood, I think, outside, that all the litigation in connection with this matter had been withdrawn, and it was an unpleasant surprise to me yesterday to hear the statement by Dr. Lloyd that litigation was still pending. However, I hope the Government will do the square thing. I think the country has made a distinct pronouncement on this matter. Of course, we could not expect that all the people would be of the one opinion, but the conditions were fairly hard and they have been met, and it is up to this House to conform to the wishes of the people in this respect, as they have already promised. I trust that the Government will act sincerely and properly in this matter.

In a little paragraph in the middle of the Speech I find a statement to the effect that owing to the high prices obtained for our staple products, and our forest and mineral resources, our working classes have been enabled to enjoy a high degree

of prosperity. Now, I am afraid that I shall have to take exception to that statement, so far as forests are concerned. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we have under present conditions obtained anything like the highest value from our forest products that we should, or that we might in the immediate future. I was pleased to hear the Premier,on the presentation of those petitions, promising to take up the matter. I can assure the House here to-day that this is a very vital and important matter, and anything that I have done in connection with it is too important to be passed over lightly. Now, it seems to me that there has been a mix-up over this business. The situation as I understood it last spring, after this House closed and had passed that measure prohibiting the export, was that there would be no green timber cut on the three-mile limit. We were all satisfied that the burnt timber on those limits should be cut up and used to the best advantage for all concerned, but we had no green timber on those limits that could be spared for export, unless the Imperial Government came to us and told us deliberately that it was necessary to have that timber for the safety of the Empire, and then we would part with every stick of it. But that did not happen. Some time during the month of October news reached me that camps were being erected on those green timber limits. I was told that men who had some time before gone into the interior and settled on burnt timber limits had left those locations and came out to the seashore and located outside. When I heard the situation I wrote to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I wrote two letters, and I have here on my desk his reply. In my letters I almost begged him that he would see that those particular reserves under the Saw Mills Act should be respected, and that the cutting of pit-props should be prohibited there, at any rate. This is his reply:—

2 November, 1915.

W. B. Jennings, Esq., M.H.A.,
Exploits.

Dear Sir,—

I have your letter of the 22nd ulto, with reference to cutting green timber for pit-props on what is known as the Three Mile Limit.

Representations were made to the Government from various parts of the country as to the necessity of providing employment for the people during the coming winter owing to the failure of the fishery at the Labrador and in other parts of the Island. After due consideration it was decided that permission to cut pit-props on the Three Mile Limit should be given, and an order to this effect has been made.

In doing this it was not thought practicable to restrict this permission to any particular section of the country, so that it applied generally to all places in the Colony. I cannot see, therefore, how I can advise the prohibition of such cutting in the particular place you mention.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) SYDNEY D. BLANDFORD.

Minister of Agriculture and Mines.

When I received that I said, well, I suppose what is done cannot be helped, but I made up my mind that if I were spared to attend this session of the House I would ask for the correspondence relating to this matter. Who were those people who made those representations, particularly from the District of Twillingate? Mr. Coaker asked for the correspondence, and I have it before me here to-day. I have gone through it carefully, and I can only find eight persons, contractors in every case, who asked directly or indirectly for this permission, with the exception of a few persons at Point

Leamington who signed Mr. Yates' petition. Probably the Government believed that those were representative people, and were in need; but I want to tell the House here to-day that 80 per cent. of those engaged in this work in the district of Twillingate this winter did not go there because they were in need. They went there because they saw a chance to earn a dollar. Hundreds went there because they looked at the matter in this light: Well, if it is going to be destroyed it is just as well for me to go there and earn a dollar as anybody else. Over half the men who went there were young men, who had done well at the fishery and had money in their boxes or in the banks—to their credit be it said. I merely state this to show that there was no necessity for this cutting. The Hon. Premier expressed the opinion that perhaps the destruction was not as great as it seemed. Well, the first winter that I attended a session of this House, in order to get to Lewisporte I had to walk over a neck of timber (reserved since under the New Saw Mills Act) about six miles long and three wide, and I was surprised to see the splendid timber that was on that neck of land. There were possibilities of building probably a dozen vessels there, from fifty tons down. I came through that neck just a few days ago, and you could hardly get enough timber there to build a trap-boat. Men who were on that neck this winter told me that they cut sticks there and sawed them up for pit-props as large as a barrel in the butt, and long enough to make a mast for a 30-ton vessel. Now, that is the condition of affairs on the south side of the Bay, at any rate. Now, what makes it all the more important that this timber should be reserved is that two-thirds or more of our timber limits have been destroyed by fire, and it will be generations before we get a growth there of any commercial value.

I have here before me to-day letters from two different individuals, in reply to some correspondence. I gather either from the Prime Minister or the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. The first one that I shall read is dated October 9th, and is signed "M. E. Martin." It is as follows:

52 Freshwater Road,
St. John's, Nfld.,
Oct. 9th, 1915.

Rt. Hon. Sir E. P. Morris,
St. John's.

Dear Sir,—

I am in receipt of your letter of Oct. 5th and in reply would say as far as I know there are no pit props being cut anywhere North this autumn nor are there any contracts made for cutting this winter.

The reason for this at least as far as I am concerned is because of the new law prohibiting the cutting of green wood on the three mile limit.

I will have shipped by the end of this season about 30,000 cords about 70 per cent of which is green wood. Every lot of dry wood shipped has been a cause for complaint and this Company have advised me that unless I can supply green wood they will have to go to Canada and look for next year's supply.

Respectfully yours,

(Sgd.) M. E. MARTIN.

The first one that I shall read is a letter dated Oct. 9th, and hon. members will notice that he (Martin) says there were no contracts made at that time. This next letter is dated October 8th,—one day before.

Lewisporte,
October 8th, 1915.

Dear Sir Edward:—

In reply to yours of Oct. 5th, I beg to say as follows:—

M. E. Martin of St. John's or J. O.

Williams, representing Evans & Reid of Cardiff is, I am informed, arranging to cut pit props at Lewisporte, Loon Bay, Birchy Bay, Boyd's Cove, Lord's Arm, Scissor's Cove and Norris' Arm. P. LeGrow of Springdale, and Richard Quirk of Fortune Hr. are also contracting for this wood, and it looks as though operations this year will be more extensive than last year. J. Manuel of Exploits has also arranged with T. Manuel & Co., of Loon Bay to put numbers of men in the woods soon at this work.

The Horwood Lumber Co. will operate again at Lord's Arm, Scissor's Cove, Loon Bay, Dog and Gander Bays.

The Birchy Bay Lumber Co. I am also told are getting ready for this work too.

There has been no pit props cut in this neighbourhood since August 31st, but I am told Richard Quirk of Fortune Hr. has men now cutting, others are about starting and in all probability by Nov. 1st pit prop cutting will be in full swing on a very large scale.

I don't know that I can inform you further just now, but as operations develop, I will be in a position to give you more definite information.

I have the honour to be,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) W. W. BRADLEY.

To Rt. Hon. Sir E. P. Morris, K.C.,
St John's

Now the puzzle to me is—but perhaps I am going too far, I do not know whether I am very puzzled over it at all—which of these men is speaking the truth. There it is in black and white; it is not my proposition, there is something astray. One denial is dated Oct. 9th, and the other dated Oct. 8th. I am very sorry that condition of affairs is as it is, but it appears to me that there has been some —(I do not wish to use un-Parliamentary language) — un-straightforward work in connection with this business. I am safe in saying that in the district of Twillingate nine-tenths of the people residing there are against this business. The district of Twillingate has no timber to spare; and in any action that the Government will take with regard to this matter (viz, the preservation of timber), they can be confident that the people of Twilingate are behind them. I do not speak for other districts; I do not know so much about the affairs in other districts; I have not had the opportunity to know what condition of affairs obtains there; but when I speak for the district of Twillingate I speak of what I know, of what I have seen; and I trust that the Government will see that this matter is stopped now and for ever. I am sorry to say that it is too late to save most of our timber; a lot of the timber is gone, never to return; the ship-building industry down there is in large measure ruined—for instance, it is impossible to build vessels like the "Nellie M." "Checkers" and other vessels that were built down there some years ago. It is an utter impossibility to build these vessels down there now, because the timber is not there. I am very much afraid that we have arrived at the end of our resources now, and it is too late (as somebody has before remarked), to lock the stable door after the horse has been stolen. I am not talking about this matter just to fill in time, or to put up a bluff or anything of that nature; but I speak because the reforms and remedies asked for are vitally necessary; and I have expressed the opinion time and again that the men who misled the Government in this matter were contractors and not bona fide fishermen; and that opinion has been proved to me since I looked over this correspondence.

There is one more matter in connection with this that I would like to refer to, and that is conditions connected with the measurement of this wood. There are two conditions existing down there with regard to the cutting of this wood. Some of the large contractors who employed men paid them by the month, (or according to the nature of their contracts,) and these employees are not concerned at all with the measurement of the wood. They go and do their day's work and are paid for their labour. The other condition is that there are some independent men (one or two or half a dozen) who cut this timber, and they have perhaps a kind of agreement with some contractor to buy the lot when it is cut. A number of complaints were made to me about the conditions surrounding the measurement. The men have had to give 135 to 145 feet per cord, and they have had also to be subject to measurement by contractor; which means that the contractor who bought the timber made his own measurement. One particular crowd of men, five or six men who were engaged for a month or two, told me they cut 15,000 sticks; when the contractor who was to buy this timber measured it he gave them 90 cords. It is easy for anyone acquainted with this matter to see that there is something astray. I trust the Government will take immediate steps to remedy this state of affairs. I have been told by the men thus employed that they have not been able to maintain their families—even living on the worst kind of grub, and the poorest kind of clothing—because of conditions surrounding their employment,—and this in spite of the fact that they worked from dawn to dark. If that state of affairs is to continue then the business is not as much of a blessing as it appears on the surface to be. I do not blame the Government for not seeing at the outset that this would be the result, or for not anticipating this trouble when this matter was brought up at the War Session in 1914. Nobody thought it would turn out as it has, and many thought that it would be a blessing for a great many poor men; but the proportions the disadvantages and harmful results of the policy have assumed since the introduction of the measure prove that the enactment is not the blessing that it was at first thought to be. I trust the Government will take the necessary steps to change this condition and introduce remedial measures immediately.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker. Just one or two words in closing the debate in relation to the points made by the previous speakers. In the firstplace I would like to congratulate the various speakers who have taken part in the debate for the very high class character of their various speeches; and although some of the references and some of the statements may appear to be a severe criticism of the Government and its work since we last met here, I think a little explanation from time to time during the Session, as we proceed, in relation to the various matters touched upon, will be likely to place matters in a more favorable light and make them more clearly understandable by these honourable members on the other side of the House. I find no fault with the criticism that has been made, because, it will remain objectionable only, until a little explanation is given. To judge from ap pearances—not waiting for explanations—is an error into which we all fall daily and hourly. Sometimes we never can understand why a certain thing is done; but when we come to have all the information concerning it laid before us, when we come to have all the evidence connected with it brought to our notice, then the mat-

ter assumes an entirely different aspect, and we become immediate and lasting converts to the work that we had earlier and more recently condemned.

First, I would like to congratulate Dr. Lloyd on the very able speech that he delivered yesterday. It was one of the finest speeches that I have ever heard him deliver—if not the best—in this House; and my remarks particularly refer to his comments on the war and the other serious problems in which we, with the rest of the Empire, are so vitally interested; and what I say of his speech can, I think, be also said of the address of my friend who has just sat down—Mr. Jennings, a man of whom I have a very high opinion, and a man whose sincerity, I do not think, any one in this Chamber will question. I also extend my congratulations to my friends Mr. Parsons and Mr. Clift upon the excellence of their remarks in relation to this debate. Now there is only one point, dealt with by Dr. Lloyd yesterday, that I should like to refer to, and that is the question of prohibition. On almost all other matters referred to by him we are at one. But on this question of prohibition he left (perhaps unintentionally) the impression that there was something of a misleading character in the Speech from the Throne on that important matter; and it has also been referred to by Mr. Jennings here this afternoon, and he expressed the opinion that the matter should not be left in uncertainty. I agree with him the matter is too important and the issues too serious, and the interests involved too important to have any doubt as to where the question stands to-day. I submit the statement in the Speech from the Throne is critically exact and no self-respecting government or legislature would desire to see any other statement there. It simply states the fact that an Act was passed by the Legislature asking for an election to decide the question as to whether intoxicating spirits should any longer be imported into this country for sale, that the election took place, that the required majority and the percentage of votes were obtained, and that at an early date the proclamation bringing the law in force would be issued.

If any legislation should be needed, and I claim there is none, then that legislation will be introduced. The paragraph in the speech from the throne merely states what is now history The people of this country asked the Legislature last session for the right to vote on this question, and the Legislature gave them the right to vote as to whether or not they would have prohibition. Every man in this chamber voted for that, and went further and said that if the majority vote was for prohibition and that majority vote exceeded 40 per cent. of the total registered voters of 1913, which was 61,000 in round figures, then the measure would become law. And if there are or were any technical defects in that act; if in any way the provisions of that act were not carried out, if the administration of the election was defective, or if there was any faulty drafting of that act; then it is the duty of this legislature to see that the election held thereunder is not nullified. But Mr. Speaker, I am of opinion that there is no necessity for legislation. The election act called upon the government to carry out the election. I submit that there is no reason why the Government should do anything but that which that act calls them to do. I think the government is taking the proper course, and I fully justify the position taken that they should not have in any way prevented a recount. Had this government taken any step in these recount proceedings, and had they stopped them by any pronouncement as to legislation or otherwise it would ever afterwards

be said that the government forced it on the people, and bad feeling would prevail. There is nothing like proceeding decently and orderly. The result of that recount showed how perfectly and legally the election had been carried out Although all the ballots underwent the closest scrutiny of a judge of the Supreme Court the decision first reached was not altered to any extent, a matter of half a dozen votes. You cannot get judicial trained officers all over the country to act as deputies, and it was consequently necessary to appoint many men who never had any experience in work of this kind. The small honorarium paid does not tempt the qualified, and I think the department of the government which carried out this election ought to congratulate themselves on the manner in which it was done. Had the recount never gone on, had the government by any action of theirs stopped it, you would never have heard the end of it. The fact that the votes were carefully scrutinized and still a majority of some three or four hundred favored prohibition, made the election more acceptable to all and will do much in carrying public opinion in favor of the carrying out of the measure. A petition is before the Supreme Court in which certain charges are made by petitioners against the way in which that election was carried on; charges of bribery and corruption, charges embracing nearly every offence in the corrupt practice act. I know that this petition has been filed and served, and the Attorney General has been instructed by the government to defend that petition.

DR. LLOYD—Why not refer to the claim that you did not carry out the specifications of that act; not the treating part?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —I was just coming to that. The Attorney General has been told to defend the whole action.

MR. COAKER—Don't get vexed.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —I am not vexed. My friend mistakes earnestness for vexation. That's the last thing I would think of doing, getting vexed with an honourable member on the other side of this House. The position the government takes first is this:—The plebiscite act was as perfect as it was possible to have an act; and if by any review of it before the Supreme Court defects are apparent this legislature will be asked to make them good. If that election petition ever comes on, the same result in my judgment will follow as did in the recount. I go as far as to say that that petition does not lie at all. In other words you cannot have a petition. Under that act there is no power given to petition. It was never intended that that act should come under the general election law of this colony as regards trials for corrupt practices. This is a legal question, which is before the Court, and I agree with Dr. Lloyd in the position taken by him on yesterday, that our proclamation will not be effective if the court afterwards held that the election was null and void; but I repeat it is not the intention of the government that this legislature should close without having this question settled once and for all. The position is this. The election was held last November The election petitions before the Court were taken out in January, and there has been ample time for the matters contained to be dealt with by the court. Our duty as a government is to assume that the provisions of the act are in full force and effect. It is not for us to assume defects in our own acts. We must conclude that the act is good and has been correctly carried out. We must take it for granted that there has been no corrupt practices committed until proven. If

it is found that there is any legal defect in the act; or if it is found that the government did not carry out the provisions as set forth therein, it is the duty of the Legislature to correct this. There has never been any suggestion either from the government side of this House or from the opposition that there are any defects. But it is important that we don't commit ourselves, and that we don't do anything that will defeat the object we have in view; namely the passage of the measure legally without curtailing the rights of anyone. It is not for us to discover defects. What are the facts: The last general election there were 64,000 or thereabout, voters in Newfoundland. Perhaps sixty five may be nearer. Now of that 64,000, only about 28,000 or 30,000 went to the polls, in the prohibition election which means that there were about 36,000 voters who did not vote. I do not say whether they were in favor or against prohibition. We do not know it. We do know that only 28,000 went to the polls. This matter is before the courts, and it is only right that the matter should be dealt with if possible so that for all time it will be known that this election was held legally and carried out properly. This is the only way you can get public opinion, and thoroughly carry out the law when it comes into operation.

I followed very closely the argument of my friend, Mr. Jennings, the member for Twillingate, in relation to pit-props, and I want to repeat here what I have already said, that the Government was in no way actuated by the request or the clamourings of those interested in the pit-prop business. In the first place we were in a position to supply pit-props. The British Empire needed pit-props. Our Allies had great need of them. That was one of the chief considerations. My friend went on to say that he would give every stick if he felt that the Empire needed them. I can tell my friend that at the time that order was made the British Empire needed pit-props as much as she needed munitions and men. I do not want to stand on this alone as an excuse for the order. To do such would be undignified; but I would say that that was one of the main reasons the Government had before them when this permission was issued, to have effect for the present season. The Government was also influenced by the fact that everywhere, poor fisheries,—not universally bad fisheries, but in nearly every portion of the country there were those who had done poorly.

I must point out, however, that no contracts would have been made unless it was for green wood, and further that it would not pay at all, save in the case of the three-mile limit. The pit-props could not have been cut, the men could not have been employed. We had that well driven home to us,not by one, or by ten, or by twenty, but from many sources, and it was particularly emphasized by my hon. friend in his paper that it might take four or five hundred thousand dollars to provide for the destitution arising out of the failure of the fisheries. I remember my hon. friend proposing that the Government should send two or three thousand men into the woods to cut pit-props to meet the threatened north, south, east and west, there were destitution. It does credit to my hon. friend. It does credit to his heart and head. When he saw that the people were in what he termed great destitution, he felt that some means should be found by the Government to meet this difficulty. And this I may say was the only way the Government knew of. The only way that presented itself to meet the demands of the Empire as well as local demands of our people, was the one we adopted,

and I only hope that it will transpire that no permanent injury will be effected by this pit-prop cutting. My hon. friend, Mr. Clift, also made a very interesting speech here this afternoon, and the main point in his arguments was in relation to retrenchments. He was of the opinion that we could retrench considerably with regard to the public service, and in particular the civil servants. And he said that a considerable amount of money might be saved by increasing the salaries of some of the civil servants and by the dismissal of others, and in that way considerable amounts would be saved with regard to the public service. I cannot follow this line of argument. I do not agree with it; but I can say this much, that if the hon. member will give me a list of those whom he thinks ought to be dismissed, I can assure him that I will be most glad to consider it.

MR. COAKER—Will you actually do that?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is a different proposition. It seems to me that the policy of the Opposition is that certain members should be dismissed.

MR. COAKER—That is not quite true.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Well, you have expressed the opinion that the salaries of certain civil servants should be increased and that certain others should be dismissed.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Clift does not speak for me there.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well, that is something gained. I am glad to know that my friend on the other side of the House does not favour this proposal. But will he let us know who should be dismissed? Of course any name submitted for dismissal shall be subject to strict investigation. I do not desire to bind the Opposition to any stray statements that may be made in debate, because as they are at present without a leader it is but fair that the rule should be relaxed somewhat in their favour, and that they should not be bound by the same restrictions as when fully organized with a capable leader, who, we understand, has been chosen.

I would like to join with Mr. Clift in his sentiments of congratulation to the leader of the Opposition, who has just been appointed to the high and responsible office of Judge of the Supreme Court. I had intended deferring these congratulations until we were aware of the name of his successor, so that my remarks might have dealt with both matters at the same time, and have welcomed the coming and speeded the parting guest. I fear, however, that I might be misunderstood if I did not refer to this matter this afternoon in a few words. With what has been said I entirely agree. Mr. Kent possessed all the requirements for the high office to which he has recently been appointed. For four years we were in the same political party. Now for the past four years I have had the opportunity of meeting him as leader of the Opposition in this House. Occasionally we have not agreed. Sometimes his criticisms were severe, but I think he always tried to be fair and just. It is of the greatest importance that a Judge of the Supreme Court should possess public confidence. I think the outside public regard this appointment with approval, and it will meet with their approbation.

Yesterday, Mr. Coaker referred to several matters in the course of his short, but interesting speech, and I would like, if I might, to say a few words in connection with these.

As regards shipbuilding, that is a matter that I have already expressed

my views upon this session. We intend to take this matter up at an early date along the lines which the petitioners have been discussing. As I stated yesterday, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries hopes to submit a measure to this House, which will be an inducement to capitalists to embark in an undertaking of shipbuilding on an extensive scale. As regards the tug, that is a matter a little more difficult to deal with, and practically impossible to touch this present session. It is practically impossible to get a ship built at this time, and of course equally difficult to purchase one. But we are all agreed upon the desirability of having such a boat. If we cannot get one specially built, we shall have to wait a while. It is better to wait a little while and procure the best boat, than to hurriedly purchase a vessel which would not meet our requirements. We may be able to do something special, and have some temporary arrangement here in the autumn.

There is just one other point. As regards the importation of fish into France and the restrictions imposed thereon by the French Government, I would beg to say that the matter has been placed before the French Government. They, however, replied that the question was one which vitally affected their fiscal policy, and that they were totally unable to remove the present duty. I saw the French Consul here at the time, and he specially invoked the aid of the Department under which he works in relation to this matter, but it was all in vain.

Now, there is another matter referred to, that is in relation to the sailing of the Florizel. That position arose in this way: It was not a special concession to the Florizel, being allowed to sail a few hours earlier. The day for the sailing of the wooden steamers under the law was Sunday. They did not care to sail on that day. In fact the crews did not want to sail on Sunday. Very many of them very properly have a prejudice against sailing on Sunday. Now, the owners of these steamers approached the Government and asked permission to sail on Saturday, and we gave them that permission; and we gave them an undertaking to indemnify them them against any suits taken on arrival; and then Bowring Bros. naturally asked that we put the Florizel in the same position as we had put the others. We only preserved the same proportion between the times of sailing between the wooden and the steel ships.

There is another matter that my honourable friend referred to. I do not know if he is serious. That is, the condition of the Opposition Room.

MR. COAKER.—I was serious.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—All I can say is that I took the matter up with the Internal Economy Committee immediately after I came out of the House, as you will remember, Mr. Speaker; and if the Rooms require any decoration, or any painting, or any repairs, or carpets or furniture, or anything like that, it will be attended to.

MR. COAKER—Why not give us a room upstairs.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I do not know of any objection, if there is a room vacant. The Opposition Room has always been downstairs. I can remember away back in 1885, when the Opposition was led by Sir Ambrose Shea, we were downstairs there for four years, and found it very comfortable. We never made any objection.

MR. CLAPP—I think the Opposition Room should have a telephone.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—If the hon. member will take my advice he will not have one. There is a great danger of their secrets leaking out.

But as far as I am concerned, if the Opposition want a telephone they have merely to ask for it. I may say the same in relation to any other conveniences. My friend also referred to the fact that there was no lavatory connected with their room. There is none in any of the rooms occupied by the Government members. The lavatories in the building are for all the members of the House and are used by all the members, and are not in any way in connection with the rooms occupied by the Government. I make this explanation now because it might look as if the Government were small enough to deal differently with the Opposition than themselves. Anything in reason that the Opposition suggest in relation to the proper fitting up of their room will be promptly attended to by the Government, and now that they are going to have a new Leader, I think it is only right that they have a little improvement in their surroundings in order to cheer them up.

On motion the report of the Select Committee to draft a reply to the Speech from the Throne was adopted.

LABRADOR RAILWAY EXTENSION BILL.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to amend 3 George 5, Cap. 14, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador.'"

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. I may say that the Bill is introduced on the petition of the Directors of the Canadian North Atlantic Corporation, Limited. The petition sets forth that they have done their best to carry on their project, but have been unable to do so owing to war conditions.

Now, the proposal is that in computing the times for the commencement and completion of the railways as provided in sections 3 and 18, and the furnishing to the Government of a map or plan as provided in section 17 of the Act 3 George V, Cap. 14, entitled "An Act Respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador," and also the time limited by section 11 of the said Act with regard to the importation of supplies, plant, exclusive franchise and determination of rights respectively, the period between the 4th day of August, 1914, and such date as His Majesty shall cause a proclamation or proclamations declaring that a state of war no longer exists between His Majesty and the countries with which hostilities are at present pending, and a period of six months thereafter, shall not be counted or taken into consideration.

It seems to me that that is only a reasonable concession, and if the railway through Labrador ever becomes a fact it will be of considerable advantage to Newfoundland. We are giving no subsidy. It is only a question of giving them a right of way and some small concessions which were set forth in the Act of 1913. I have some copies of the Act here, and I shall be glad when we go into Committee to provide members with a copy of the Charter of 1913 which it is now proposed to give the extension of till the close of the war.

The Bill entitled: "An Act to amend 3 George V., Cap. 14, entitled, 'An Act respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador,'" was read a second time and ordered to be reported to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

WAR MEASURES BILL.

Second reading of a Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the War Measures Act, 1914".

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: It will be remembered that Section 3 of the 1914 Act provided for the continuance of the Act only during the continuance of a state of war. It is suggested that this Act

follow the form of the Articles of Commerce Act which is to be enforced for the duration of the war and six months afterwards.

Then again, under Section 6 of the War Measures Act it is doubtful whether the first part of the section gives the Government any power to deal with the tonnage question, congestion of freight and other matters dealt with in this present Bill. That is why it is proposed that this amendment be made.

MR. LLOYD—Is that a local draft?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes. Now the amended section is as follows: "The Governor in Council shall have power to do and authorize such acts and things, and to make from time to time, such orders and regulations, as he may (a) by reason of the existence of real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection; (b) reason of the shortage of tonnage, congestion of freight, limitation of passenger, mail and freight accommodation, increase in marine insurance and freight rates, shortage of stocks in and increase in the price of flour, coal, salt and other articles of commerce of every nature and kind, which have resulted, shall result or shall or may be expected to result during the continuance of war from the fact that a state of war has existed or does now exist; and (c) by reason of any other cause, condition, circumstance, set of facts, or things which may be attributed directly or indirectly to the fact of the past and present existence of war, and the possible continuance thereof, deem necessary or advisable for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Newfoundland, her people, industries and commerce; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms, it is hereby declared that the powers of the Governor in Council shall extend to all matters coming within the classes of subjects hereinafter enumerated, that is to say:—"

MR. COAKER—Why not leave out that word "insurrections." You do not expect to have one.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—You never can tell what may arise.

The Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the War Measures Act, 1914" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

SALVATION ARMY INCORPORATION BILL.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to incorporate the Salvation Army."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: The object of this Act is to declare that the General of the Salvation Army for the time being shall be deemed a corporation, in whom shall be vested all the property owned by the Salvation Army in Newfoundland. The various provisions of the Bill will be explained as we go along. I may say that I think that this is the only religious community that has not a regular charter. In the old days very few of the Church organizations had charters, but of late years the policy has been to avail of the advantages of these charters. I am sure that every one of us who come in contact with the good work done by this body all over Newfoundland, and the unassuming way in which they do their work—the entire absence of aggressiveness and the splendid amount of good that is being accomplished by them—will be glad to avail of any opportunity of favoring any measure that will make it easier for them to carry on their work. This bill has been framed by the Army officers, I believe, on the most improved charters granted in the Canadian Provinces. When we go into Committee I shall be glad to give some explanation in relation to similar bills in other countries. I beg

to move the second readng of this Bill.

The Bill entitled: "An Act to incorporate the Salvation Army" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

ARTICLES OF COMMERCE POSSESSION BILL.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to enable the Governor in Council, during the existence of a state of war, to take possession of articles of commerce unreasonably withheld."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: It is proposed that this Act shall take the place of Chapter 2 of the Acts of 1914. I have some copies of that short Act which I shall have distributed. It was known as the Foodstuffs Act. On the 10 August, 1914, the Imperial Parliament passed an Act known as Chapter 5 of the Acts of 1914. This Act was entitled "Unreasonable Withholding of Food Supplies Act of 1914," and dealt solely with foodstuffs, and our Act was a copy of that Act, practically. Now, the Imperial authorities found it desirable to enlarge the scope of their authority, and on the 28th August, 1914, Chapter 65 of the Imperial Acts of 1914 was passed, entitled: "The Articles of Commerce Act, 1914." The Act now proposed practically follows that Act. I beg to move the second reading.

The Bill entitled: "An Act to enable the Governor in Council, during the existence of a state of war, to take possession of articles of commerce unreasonably withheld," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

SEALFISHERY BILL.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to amend the Law regulating the prosecution of the sealfishery."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: That is the Bill which was passed here last year and which was not passed by the Upper Branch. I won't delay the House now by going into the details of the Bill, and merely ask to have it read a second time. I propose to have it referred to a Select Committee of both Branches, so that we may try and ascertain what are the objections, if there are any real objections to it in the Upper Chamber. This matter is so important that we cannot have it made a football of from one Chamber to the other, and I think that if a Select Committee from both branches sit down early in the Session, while there is time, that a Bill will be reported which will be satisfactory to everybody. Then, the various other matters in connection with this industry that have been referred to here since we opened this Session can also be gone into and dealt with. I move that the Bill be read a second time, and referred to a Select Committee.

The Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the sealfishery" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

EDUCATION BILL.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to amend and consolidate the law relating to Education."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: I am afraid it will take me a little while to explain this Bill fully. I may say,in the first place, that it is a consolidation of all our education laws. If members will follow the Bill, as I go along, it may be useful to note the changes in the previous law and what is proposed. There is no alteration of the Bill in principle at all.

MR. LLOYD—Might I suggest that you read the Bill a second time and defer the explanation.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That will be satisfactory.

The Bill entitled: "An Act to am-

end and consolidate the law relating to Education," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask whether the Government has taken cognizance of the extraordinary series of larcenies and robberies that have been going on of late, and whether the police or the Department of Justice have taken any steps to deal with the matter. I am told that business firms are finding it necessary to engage special watchmen to look after their premises.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: In reply to the hon. member, I am not aware that the Government has any special information, but I will make enquiries at the Department of Justice and have a reply to-morrow.

MR. COAKER—I think the Premier should confess that he is treating this matter with a certain amount of indifference. The whole town is alarmed over the robberies that have been going on in this town during the last few weeks. Every night they seem to increase. Down in our section of the town the people have become so alarmed that they are going to put on special watchmen to protect their interests—people who never had to employ watchmen before; and some of the firms along Water Street are going to put watchmen in their stores to see that robbers don't break in. That condition of things must certainly be known to the Premier. We want to know what action the Government proposes to take in this matter. We know that you have one or two detectives, and they are doing good work, but they are not sufficient to meet the present situation. This matter will have to be looked into and dealt with immediately for the protection of the city.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is precisely what I propose to do. I have already replied to Dr. Lloyd that by the next session I will have a report on these larcenies or burglaries or whatever they are, and also know what action is being taken by the Department of Justice or by the police. Beyond what I see in the papers from time to time, of course, I know nothing; I cannot be supposed to know. I was not aware but that every one of those thieves were being successfully prosecuted.

MR. COAKER—The trouble is that they cannot be captured.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: I may say for the information of the House that on to-morrow at 11 o'clock a parade of Volunteers will be held at the C. L. B. Armoury for inspection by His Excellency the Governor, and the members of the Legislature are cordially invited to be present and see the men and the work that they are doing. The invitation is from the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Clift.

Mr. Lloyd gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until three of the clock to-morrow Thursday afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 23rd.

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

QUESTIONS.

MR. LLOYD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence between the Government and the Reid Newfoundland Company in relation to the suspension of construction work under the Railway Extension Act, 1910, and amendments thereof.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the correspondence in connection with

this matter, but have given instructions to the Department to have it looked up.

MR. LLOYD—Couldn't you give an oral answer. What I want to know is under what arrangement the work was stopped.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —There was nothing said or done. Work was not resumed when the season opened, that is as I remember.

MR. COAKER—That is not the usual way to do business. I understood there was an obligation to do so much per year.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No.

MR. LLOYD—Can I have a formal answer to-morrow.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. LLOYD asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence relating to the Tonnage Shortage.

This was tabled.

MR. LLOYD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House the Auditor General's report under the Audit Act, and his special report under Section 33b of that Act.

This was tabled.

MR. LLOYD asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister whether any loan or financial assistance has been received by the Government of the Colony from the Imperial Government; if so, what is the amount thereof, for what purposes, and on what terms and conditions was the same received; has any expenditure or appropriations been made therefrom; if so, for what amount and for what purposes; also, to lay on the table all despatches, correspondence and other papers relating to the same between the Government, the Imperial authorities, or any person else.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, there was one million dollars obtained in December, 1915. Of that I think about twenty thousand has been expended. The Finance Minister says entirely on the war. Only absolute war expenses have been paid out of this. The only correspondence is the formal application for the money. The British Government advanced it in the same way as they did last year, and in the same way as they are doing to other Dominions. I may say every cent of interest has been paid to date by the Government. There is no set interest, but it is understood we are to pay whatever the Mother Country has to pay. I will let the member have a memorandum on to-morrow.

MR. STONE I would ask the Prime Minister if anything has been done in connection with the Postal Telegraph enquiry which was to take place after the close of the session last year.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Just after the session closed a commission was appointed to undertake this enquiry. Mr. Herbert Knight was appointed and opened the commission. Just towards the end of November, however, he unfortunately became obliged to leave the country to go to New York for medical treatment, and as he has only just come back, no report has yet been received. We expect a report, however in a very short time.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— There was no report at all in reference to the matter. While I am on my feet, I may say that the article in the Mail and Advocate yesterday in reference to the conduct of certain officials was noticed, and the matter referred to the Post Master General. Just before lunch he telephoned me that while some of the report was true there was a great deal that was not true, but he will let me have a report which will be placed before the Governor in Council for consideration.

A report will be given as soon as anything is done. The Commission-

er ought to report in a week or ten days.

The Minister of Finance tabled the Report of the Auditor General for the year ending June 30th, 1915; also Report of Auditor General under Section 33 (b) for the period ending Jan. 31st, 1916.

LABRADOR RAILWAY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend 3 George V. Cap. 14, entitled "An Act respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

WAR MEASURES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend the War Measures Act, 1914."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, this gives the Government power to suspend the issue of any paper, for a period of six months after the termination of the war; and while I concur with these restrictions during the actual period of hostilities, yet it seems to me that the occasion does not demand that the Government should be given this power when the circumstances which would exact those restrictions have disappeared. That is, I may say, the only objection that I have to this bill. Up to date I do not think that it can be said that the Government has abused in any way this power, although in one or two cases the Colonial Secretary had occasion to repress the Mail and Advocate for some frivolous remarks in reference to the war. I may say in connection with this matter that I do not think that anyone had any intention to do anything deliberately wrong in the matter. The matter passed through the editor's hands without his giving special attention to it and I do not think that it was quite fair and just to the paper that such drastic steps should be taken as the cancelling of the mail issue of the paper. It was not a matter of serious consequence. Indeed, it is because the remarks were of such a frivolous nature that I consider that the Colonial Secretary treated it rather harshly. Here we continue to empower the Government to place restrictions upon our papers for six months after the termination of war and I confess that I can see no reason that the Government should ask for these powers.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the remarks of the hon. member, I may say that I gladly avail of the opportunity to express my high appreciation and gratitude, as Press Censor, to the editors and proprietors of the Press in Newfoundland for the very courteous and loyal co-operation that they have at all times displayed with respest to the publication of all matters relating to the War that were considered undesirable to be published and particularly in matters relating to the movements of His Majesty's forces. The paper with which the hon. member has been associated has not been one whit behind the other papers in the Colony in this connection, and, whilst it is true, as he pointed out, his paper

was on one occasion detained in the mails for the publication of some small incident relating to the foregoing, his was not the only instance of this, because other papers were similarly dealt with. Whilst a trivial item may be considered as such, still, at times like these, small matters may develop into greater ones and far-reaching consequences may often arise from a small beginning. I was reluctantly compelled, therefore, in the discharge of my duties as Press Censor, to hold certain papers on one or two occasions for a few days in the mails until any danger from the circulation of said publications was over. I can assure the hon. member that I was not actuated by any prejudice or personal feelings in the matter, as all papers were treated alike when occasion for censorship arose.

When the Censorship was established here, it was laid down very emphatically by the War Office Authorities that no information should be given as to the movements of His Majesty's forces, either on land or sea, nor yet anything appertaining to the forces of His Majesty's Allies. One can readily appreciate the necessity for such orders and perceive how strictly they must have been carried out in the different parts of the Empire when we know of the large and immense numbers of troops that have been moved from place to place without one single ship being molested or interfered with. At the outset of the War an incident occurred here in which information was innocently given out as to the movements of some of His Majesty's forces. This information reached the War Office in London and I was immediately brought to account as to why such information was allowed to be given. The incident was traced to the news message sent out daily by Mr. McGrath, wherein one of the Wireless Operators transmitted same to one of His Majesty's ships, which was in contravention to the Censorship Regulations More recently a great deal of wonder was expressed by people as to the whereabouts of the Newfoundland Regiment. This information was withheld under strict orders from the Secretary of State for a certain period. Various other instances are known where it was contrary to instructions to publish matters that were prohibited and, whilst there was evidently not the same observance of instructions in the neighbouring provinces of Canada, still I think we can lay claim that, since the outbreak of War,Newfoundland has stood loyally by the desires and wishes of the Imperial Authorities in this as well as every other direction. As to the continuation of the Censorship six months after the conclusion of the War, I think that may safely be granted, as it may be desirable, in the interests of the Empire, to even then have certain control over publications, but I can assure the Hon. member and the House that no curtailment of the liberties of the Press will ensue, provided they do not in any way clash with the best interests of the Empire.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the hon. member, I would like to point out the undesirability of making the amendment he proposes for many reasons. Firstly, it is I know, very unlikely that the Censorship should be required to be kept up six months after the cessation of hostilities but it may be very desirable indeed to have these powers there as no one knows for what period it may be necessary to use them. Of course it is quite apparent that the Government has not the least intention of continuing these powers for a day longer than is absolutely necessary in the interests of the country and the Empire. To allow this amendment might in my judgment be

dangerous. I do not think that there will arise any case such as the hon. member contemplates, as these restrictions will be used only in fair and reasonable circumstances. Looking at this matter from this point of view I think that we may safely extend the period to six months. In fact I think no Government could do otherwise than as we are doing. I feel absolutely certain that everyone understands that this Government or any Government would not continue those restrictions for a moment longer than the demands of the Empire justified. We are only the humble imitators of what has been done in England and elsewhere.

MR. COAKER—Will you tell us your reason for this?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have only one motive which I have already explained, namely to take such powers to the Executive Government as may be required by them in relation to Censorship and other like matters during the continuance of the War and for six months after, so that if at any time incidents arose when we should require to act promptly in the interest of the state and the Empire we would be clothed with the necessary authority. I trust this explanation may be regarded by the hon. member as sufficient.

MR. COAKER—I notice you are taking control over freight and other matters a great deal more than in the past. May I ask if the Government are in a position to state what the rates of the Reid-Newfoundland Company are across the Straits, say for a barrel of flour. What is the maximum amount they can charge under the contract. I have been told that there is a limit. I understand that at one time they charged 33 cents, now it is 83 cents. They may contemplate making them higher. Can they do this?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Right off I would not be able to say what the freight rate is across the Strait, but it is all laid down in the 1898 Contract, and I will have the hon. member furnished with a copy before we meet again. My present recollection is that the 1898 Contract fixes the rates for everything save in that one connection. I am only speaking from memory. The rates on the railway are fixed. The rates at so much a ton are fixed. The rates for the bay boats are fixed, and they are regarded as part of the railway and the one rate goes from steamer to train and train to steamer. The rates for the Labrador were fixed by the Government in 1898. There is a special provision in the 1898 Contract in regard to the rates for Labrador. These are to be fixed by the Governor in Council and after that they are unalterable. I think, however, that the rate across the Gulf was left open, as I suppose it was thought that this would have outside competition and would have to compete with the Montreal, New York and Halifax boats. That of course is only my impression. It is all set out in the Contract, and I will see that my hon. friend is furnished with a copy.

MR. JENNINGS—May I ask the Rt. Hon. the Premier if he is aware that the travelling rates were altered on the Bay boats in the District of Twillingate last season. The boats, before the "Home" was taken off, were supposed to make two trips a week, and on one of those trips—on the South Side of the Bay—the rates were doubled from what they were in other years. The reason given was increased mileage on account of calling at extra ports. Now as I happened to be one of those who were very much interested in the matter the Colonial Secretary very kindly granted me an interview, and we together went over the map and arranged those matters in the Colonial Secretary's Office,

and we came to the conclusion that by giving an alternate port, that is leaving out one port alternately the rate of mileage would not be increased more than ten miles per trip for all the ports taken in, and I fail to see that that can be any reasonable excuse for increasing the rates. Now, if I have rightly understood the Premier's statement these rates have been fixed by the Government. That is how the matter stands. I intended bringing it up later when the Estimates were being discussed, but now that this matter has arisen I take this opportunity of doing so.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In reply to my hon. friend I may say that I was not aware that any alteration had been made in the rates to which he refers. I will have the matter enquired into to-morrow. I shall give the information that the hon. gentleman has given me this afternoon to the Government Engineer and have an immediate enquiry as to what rates were charged, and have the Department of Justice report as to whether it was permissible or not. The passenger rates are fixed in the Contract.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

SALVATION ARMY INCORPORATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act to Incorporate the Salvation Army."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

ARTICLES OF COMMERCE POSSESSION 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 enable the Governor in Council, during the existence of a state of war, to take possession of articles of commerce unreasonably withheld."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out, so that this matter may be clearly understood, the difference between this Bill and the Act as it is to-day. This Bill gives the Governor in Council power to deal with any article of commerce, which, of course, includes articles of food. Under the Act as it is to-day that power is limited to foodstuffs.

MR. COAKER—Are there any other alterations?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No.

MR. LLOYD—That brings up a point upon which I would like to have some information. It is notorious that during the past three months one article of commerce, coal, was dealt with in a certain way. Would it not be well to make some provision to insure the legalty of what the Government did?

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reported that the Committee had considered the matter 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 to-morrow.

SEALING BILL.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill, "An Act respecting the Seal Fishery," was reported to a Select Committee consisting of Mr. Coaker, Mr. Piccott, Hon. Mr. Cashin, Mr. Young, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Abbott, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that body to appoint a Committee to confer with the Committee from the House of Assembly respecting the said Bill.

EDUCATION 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 and consolidate the Law relating to Education."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT .HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman in relation to the Bill now before the Committee I would like to make a few explanations in connection with the amendments which have been made, so that as we go along the Committee will understand. I may say that the whole bill has been re-enacted and consolidated. For the arrangement of the Bill we have to thank, very largely, the Inspectors. They have been at work on it for some time, and the Bill as it now stands comes to the Legislature with the recommendation of the various Inspectors. The old Act was so gloriously mixed up that it was difficult to find anything that you wanted, but it is now so arranged that each section is under its proper heading. Section 1, it will be noticed, is merely the title of the Bill. Section 2 includes sections 65 and 91 of the old Act. Sub-section (c) of section 2 is new. It gives a wider meaning as to what a public school is, and makes the term include schools authorized by a Board or Boards although not actually and entirely under the management of a Board. It is easy to understand that cases of that sort may crop up from time to time. Sub-sections (1), (2) and (3) deal entirely with technical education. Those are new sections and appear for the first time in the Bill. Sub-sections (h), (i) and (j) are, it will be noticed, necessary in order to secure a proper understanding of the terms. Section 3 merely deals with the parts into which the Act is divided. Under the old Act there was no division at all. Now everything is properly and appropriately placed under proper headings. For instance, Part I. deals with the various educational districts of the Colony. Part 2 deals with colleges; Part 3 with the Council of Higher Education; part 4 with scholarships; part 5 with the training and classification of teachers; part 6 with the engagement, salaries and duties of teachers; part 7 with the inspection of schools and superintendence; part 8 with the teachers' pension fund; part 9 with educational finance; and part 10 with miscellaneous matters. So that, under these various headings, you will find anything you want without any difficulty. Now, coming to the first part. Section 4, sub-section (a) you will see is a necessary addition following on that amendment. Sub-section (b) of the same section is section 35 of the 1913 Act and has been transferred. That merely deals with the alteration of the boundaries of districts. Section 5 deals with Boards of Education. That one section includes the old sections 20, 26, 31, 32, 33 and 34 of the Old Act and section 2 of the 1913 Act.

Now the next section that there is

any important alteration in, is sub-section B of section 5. This sub-section is a slight amendment of the former Act in that it permits the re-appointment of any retiring member of the Board who held office for a certain time and was not eligible for re-election. It was, very often, not a very easy matter to get a satisfactory person to fill the position; and it was thought desirable by the Superintendents that retiring members should be eligible for re-election. Sub-section C is new; it merely enacts, to expedite the transaction of business, that a majority of the members shall be a quorum. Section 6 is important because it deals with the duties, functions, and powers of the Board of Education; it sets out what these duties are; gathers together all the functions relative to the working of the Board and categorically arranges them; besides which many additional ones have been added to those that were in the old Act—for this new Act embraces all the sections in the old Acts that formerly dealt with these matters. Sub-section J of the same section, deals with the curriculum for the schools. Sub-section K of the same section provides each school and separate department under its control with a register of form to be approved by Superintendent, a log-book and required chalk and ink. Sub-section M is a new section and deals with medical inspection. This provision is not compulsory, but it is suggestive and it is highly desirable that it be given effect to. Sub-section N deals with the erection and maintenance of sanitary school-buildings. Sub-section O makes arrangements for proper supply of fuel for schools and for cleaning of the schools. Sub-section P will see that as far as possible all the schools are provided with suitable furniture and the prescribed apparatus. Sub-section Q deals with the arrangements for the general care of the school property. Sub-section T is important, because it gives authority to subsidize schools in other districts or maintain any school for elementary education within its district not directly under the control of the Board. Sub-section U deals with the period of vacation or holidays to be allotted to the schools. Up to the present time nothing positive has been done in relation to this business, because it was nobody's definite concern. Sub-section W refers to the preservation of all title deeds and other property of the Board; and sub-section X deals with the collection of fees. From this section down to section 14 there is no change; and the latter deals with the substitution of a new board for one removed. Sections 16, 17 and 18 are important, because, as you will notice, they deal with what are known as "common schools," and have been introduced with the hope of enabling Boards to co-operate in the working of these educational establishments in sparsely populated settlements where the individual denominations, represented by the Boards are too small to justify their respective Boards in establishing separate schools. It is hoped that where such conditions exist, this enabling section may be taken advantage of. This portion of the consolidation is practically a re-enactment with some slight changes, of the old Act. Sections 19, 20, 21 and 22 remain unchanged. With reference to section 23, I may state that it practically embodies section 93 of the old Act, and is merely the method of nomination of the Board of Directors of the Roman Catholic College, and was inserted at the request of the Head of that Church. Section 24 has not been changed—except that the quorum is fixed. There is no change in sections 25 and 26. Section 27 provides amongst other things for the medical in-

spection of the Colleges half-yearly; I quote it as follows:

27.—The said Boards of Directors shall have the power to appoint a headmaster and other teachers of their respective denominations for their respective Colleges, to prescribe the various branches of learning to be taught, and the terms and vacations to be kept in the said Colleges; to arrange, if possible, for the medical inspection of the College each half year.

This provision is not compulsory, it is purely suggestive, but the good results accruing from its being carried out are manifold. I have been talking it over with the various College Directors, and from my conversations with them I believe that no great difficulties surround its practical working, and that once the idea fructifies here in the city, its influence will be felt and its example followed all over the country, until the day may not be far off when we will be able to say that even in the most remote sections of our country everything possible is being done to safeguard the health of the school-children, and there will be no settlement in the Island where inspections will not be carried out at least once every month, once every three months, or once every six months. Once the suggestion is taken up, I believe its advantages will at once become apparent. Sections 30 to 39 represent sections 80 to 90 of the Old Act, and no substantial change is made therein. They deal with higher education and its conduct under a Council appointed for that purpose. The subject of scholarships is treated under section 40 which is analagous to section 102 of the old Act. There is no substantial change herein, except, as you will notice, the introduction of a clause making the senior Associate in Arts examination the test for the Jubilee scholarship. As a consequence following this alteration, there will be a slight change in sections 41 and section 42—with both of which I shall deal when we go into Committee. Section 43 is new. That was section 53 of the old Act, and is "new" in this sense that there has been added the clause following.

I do not think there will be any objection to that If there is, the Act may at any time be amended Section 45 is new and I think interesting. Under that section the following is proposed:

45.—If at any time two or more Boards of Examiners shall agree to work conjointly as one Board of Examiners for their respective denominations, the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the heads of the denominations directly concerned, is hereby empowered to grant authority to such Boards so to do, under such title as he shall think fit.

There is no change in section 51, and similarly no change in sections 57 and 58. The latter deals with the duties of teachers and its provisions for the first time set out clearly and distinctly what these duties shall be. This enactment, it is thought will prove valuable. Sub-section (c) deals with the maintenance of order and discipline; sub-section (j) with the keeping of a time-table; sub-section (k) with the keeping of a log-book; and the other sections which I have not mentioned are equally necessary. From section 61 to section 65 inclusive, there is no change of any importance. As a matter of fact a great many of the new sections represent what really is the practice but what has never been set out definitely before. Section 66 is slightly altered; and the next section that deserves particular notice is number 70 subsection (i) which reads as follows:

(i) Any teacher who shall become disabled or incapacitated from further efficient service after ten years of

service, and who shall have obtained a certificate of such disability or incapacity signed by a medical practitioner, the chairman of the proper Board of Education, and the proper Superintendent of Education, shall be entitled to receive,during the remainder of the life of such teacher, such fraction of the pension provided by sub-section (f) above as the number of years during which the teacher has taught as a certificated teacher and contributed to this Fund is of thirty years; Provided always that the annual amount of such pension shall not exceed the pension provided by subsection (f) above.

That section (s. 70., ss. (i)) is certainly an improvement. Section 72 is new and recites that:

72—For the purposes of apportioning and distributing the grants for education, the population of the several denominations and districts shall be taken as in the return of the last public census.

In none of the sections from that one down to 79 is there any change. Section 79 is new.

Section 79 provides that teachers who have too many pupils to teach satisfactorily may exclude the younger, to make room for older students. The section reads:

80.—Teachers may, subject to the approval of the Board, refuse to admit to school any child under five years of age, and, when the number of children seeking admission to school exceeds thirty in the case of the primary or junior departments of schools in which there are not more teachers than one employed, children under six years of age may be refused admission.

The schedules to this bill are not yet here but I hope to have them before the committee rises.

The Committee passed Sections 1 and 2 of the Bill.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again next Tuesday or Wednesday? We have done quite a lot.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. 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 Tuesday next.

On motion, this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on Tuesday next.

STATUTES REVISION BILL.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to revise and consolidate the General Statute Laws of the Colony, and for the publication of same."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this bill. Some two years ago, the Governor in Council appointed a Commission to consolidate the general laws of the Colony, and that Commission sat and consolidated the Statute Laws for the last 25 years, or the period since the last consolidation. I think this is the third time the Statutes of this Colony have been consolidated. The first was in '72, the second in '92, or I believe it was '96 before it was printed; and now the present. The report of that commission and the draft Bill was laid upon the tables of the members on the opening day of the session. The present bill is to give validity to that work by an act, and was resolved upon after consderable care and study so as very best measure. It is adopted from the act with which the Canadian Government consolidated their laws in 1906.

A large portion of the bill is copied verbatim from our own Bill of 1892, and also a section or two from the Nova Scotia Act of 1900, which has been found very successful, several

parts of it having been adopted by the Dominion, in drafting their 1906 consolidation. The Attorney-General, the late Mr. Furlong, Mr. Dunfield and myself went over this Act very carefully in the month of November, and had some correspondence with the Clerk of the House of Commons in Canada, in relation to the manner in which this work was done there, and I think it will be found that the present measure will work out satisfactorily. It is not proposed to read the whole of the Consolidation, as was attempted in 1892. The result was that the Act was not read through. The Committee of that day merely dealt pro forma with the sections. Now, if the hon. members will follow the Bill, I will explain the various paragraphs as we go along. Section 1 of this Act is taken from the Nova Scotia Act, dealing with the revision of the Statutes of Nova Scotia, 1900. It is practically verbatim. The only change is in the words, "Chapters contained in the report of the Commissioners." In the Consolidated Statutes it read, "The Act entitled an Act for Revision and Consolidation of the General Statutes of Newfoundland," which Act was itself the Consolidation. The section reads:—

1.—The Governor in Council may select such Acts, and parts of Acts, passed during the Sessions of the Legislature in the 5th and 6th years of the reign of His present Majesty, and such Acts and parts of Acts passed during the present session as he may deem it advisable, to incorporate with the Chapters contained in the report of the Commissioners, and may cause them to be consolidated and to be incorporated therewith, adapting their form and language to those of the said Chapters but without changing their effect, inserting them in their proper places in the said Chapters, striking out the said Chapters, any provisions expressly or in effect repealed by or inconsistent with those so incorporated, and numbering the said Chapters and the sections thereof.

Now, as to section three. That is a verbatim copy of the Nova Scotian Act, with the words "Governor in Council" in lieu of the words "Commissioners." We have made this change because the "Governor in Council" is to have this power on the system whlch we follow here. The words "may make such alterations in its language as are requisite in order to preserve a uniform mode of expression, and may make such minor amendments as are necessary to bring out more clearly what he deems to be the intention of the legislature, or to reconcile seemingly inconsistent enactments, or to correct clerical errors by inserting provisions now in force which have been omitted from such chapters, or to omit provisions therefrom which are not now in force," are taken from the Canadian Consolidation of 1906. As regards that phrase which says, "combine two or more chapters into one, or divide any chapter into two or more Chapters," I do not think that this will likely be availed of, but it is better for the sake of convenience that it should be put in.

Section 4 is a verbatim copy of our own act of 1892, Section 3. Section 5 is Section 4 of our own Act, except for the word "Roll" instead of the word 'Copy."

Sections six and seven are taken verbatim from our own Act.

Sections eight and nine deal with schedules. In 1892 these schedules were annexed to the Act. Now the more modern practice is followed by having them annexed to the Roll

The remaining sections are taken from our own Acts verbatim.

It is provided that we may by virtue of this Act combine the work of both this session and the last two sessions

with the matter already consolidated; and the complete finished printed work ought to be easily in the hands of hon. members when we meet again. It is anticipated that the whole work will be finished and in the hands of the printers in four or five months' time.

The Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

Second reading of Bill "An Act respecting the Naturalization of Aliens."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I may say that this arises out of a dispatch from the Secretary of State. As yet the Bill is not printed, but I think that hon. members will be satisfied with the explanation I am making and will not require to have printed copies in their hands for the second reading. It is an amendment to the Bill that we passed here last year in relation to the naturalization of aliens. For the better explanation of this matter I will read the despatch from the Secretary of State.

(Prime Minister reads despatch).

I may say that the same difficulty would have arisen in Canada had not the preamble to the Canadian Act of 1914 recited that by the Naturalization Act of 1914 the Dominion of Canada adopted Part 2 of the Imperial Act. In the case of our Newfoundland Act there is no such declaration or intention to adopt the Imperial Act, and it is to prevent the possibility of having any question raised hereafter as to the effective adoption of this part and of its importance to naturalized person an dtheir issue, and that there should be no doubt that this section has been adopted by us that this Bill has been brought forward. It may be argued that there is a sufficient adoption, but this amendment will remove all possible doubt. The amendment is to remove all doubt and to conform and make perfect that which we have already adopted in our legislation. I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

The Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Law respecting the Naturalization of Aliens," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and 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.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I have had placed on the desks of honourable members the book of the Estimates for the next fiscal year. By reference to the summary on the first page it will be seen that the total Estimates for the fiscal year which ends on the 30th of June next, were $4,051,690.37, and the Estimates for the coming fiscal year, which I shall now ask the House to vote, will amount to $4,079,907.63, showing an increase for the coming fiscal year of only $28,000, but it will be noted that in the statement for last year is included the total of additional Estimates, namely, $89,415.00, so that there is, roundly, an increase in the Estimates this year of $120,000. Of this increase, $94,726.00 is represented by increase in interest, mainly due to the war loans raised for the purpose of maintaining the Newfoundland Regiment in the field, and for the other administrative purposes occasioned by the European struggle. Going on to the other sub-heads, it will be seen that the increases are very trifling in the various Departments, and as I deal with them in detail, I will describe the

causes that have occasioned the advances.

The first alteration will be found on page 9, a keeper being provided for the departmental building at Channel at a cost of $100. This building has only been completed during the past year, and it has, of course, been found necessary to have some man to take charge of it, and such a man has been obtained for this very moderate figure.

We next come to page 11, where there will be found some new pensions. The total vote for pensions last year was $22,217.31. This year it is $23,337.64, or an increase altogether of $1,120. The new pensioners are Stephen Janes, formerly mailman of the S.S. Ethie, $200. This man has got beyond his labour owing to ill-health, being crippled and unable to work. The next is W. H. Preston, of Twillingate Lighthouse, who gets $230. His case is somewhat similar, so also is that of A. W. Earle, the Collector at Clarenville, another man who, through increasing age, has got past his labor. The next two men are the light-keepers, Wilcox at Brigus and Gillingham at Penguin Island, both in the same category and each receiving $388. Andrew Ryan and Francis Fanning are two officials of the Lunatic Asylum whose retirement has been recommended because of increasing age. Everybody will recognize that it is undesirable to have men in such a position lacking their full physical faculties.

We next come to Misses Southcott and Cashin, of the General Hospital, whose retirement has been recommended by the Board of Governors, the former because of increasing age and long service, and the latter because of ill-health. I will deal more particularly with this subject when we come to the vote for the General Hospital. Finally, Mrs. Caroline Best, the postmistress at Cape Broyle, has been retired with a salary of $66. She was one of the oldest officials in the public service, and the small allowance granted to her is well deserved on the ground of long and faithful service.

The next alteration will be found on page 13, under the vote for the Supreme Court. Until last year both these officials, Roil and Cross, though in the service for many years, were paid out of contingencies of the Court. Then we included them in the additional Estimates, and now we transfer the vote to the regular Estimates. It will be clear, of course, from this that there is no actual increase in the payments.

There is no further change now until page 25, where, under the head of Education, sub-head Inspection, it will be seen that the salaries of the assistant superintendents to the Church of England and Methodist School Inspectors are increased from $700 to $800. With respect to this I might say that last year these increases were made on the recommendation of the educational authorities, and included in the additional Estimates, so that, as with the Supreme Court officials, there is no actual increase of outlay represented by these votes.

We now go on to page 26, where there is provision made for a Relieving Officer at Upper Island Cove at $40. The explanation of this vote is that Upper Island Cove is a considerable distance from Harbour Grace, and it was found last winter, when there was a degree of distress throughout the district, that the people concerned were put to the great inconvenience of having to walk to Harbour Grace to get orders for relief which, in their circumstances and at that season, was a hardship which the Government felt they ought not to be any longer subjected to, and therefore it was decid-

ed, on the representations of the members for the district, to establish this office at Upper Island Cove and allow $40 to the official to take charge of it.

The next changes will be found in the General Hospital. As honourable members will remember, the Legislature at the last session passed an Act transferring the administration of the General Hospital to a Board of Governors, and these, as a result of their investigations, have recommended a certain number of changes. By reference to the total for the General Hospital on page 30, it will be seen that the increase in the expenditure for that Department is only $200, although a very considerable rearrangement has been effected under the direction of the Governors. They advise that Miss Southcott should be pensioned at an allowance of $620, and that Miss Cashin, hitherto matron of the Nurses' Home, be retired at an allowance of $375. They suggest, then, that the offices of matron and kitchen superintendent be amalgamated under one official at $400 a year; that the salary of the housekeeper at the Nurses' Home, now made a subordinate of the Nursing Department, be reduced from $350 to $300; that the salaries of the seven head nurses now in service be increased from $240 to $270 each, and that an additional head nurse be appointed for night service at $270, that the vote for staff nurses be reduced from $960 to $480, that on Miss Scott vacating her position as Assistant Nursing Superintendent, the office shall be abolished; that the seamstress be increased to $12 a month; and that the salary of Henry Tucker, the second male attendant, be raised from $230 to $372, the result of all these changes being a saving of $435 per year, but, on the other hand, the Board of Governors have recommended the appointment of a storekeeper at $720, who enjoys full charge of all the articles obtained for every branch of the service of the Institution, who holds these in his custody and issues them only on requisitions to the various Departments signed by the heads thereof and countersigned by the resident physician. The Governors are confident that the appointment of this official will result in the saving annually of a far greater amount than his salary involved, and also an increased efficiency in the administration of the Hospital. His salary is $720 and the net result of all the changes in the Hospital is, as previously stated, that the vote is increased by $200.

Now, on page 31, it will be seen that provision is made for an addition of $70 to the salaries of the male attendants at the Poor Asylum. The previous officials had resigned owing to the inadequate salary, and it became necessary to make this increase in order to procure men to undertake the work.

The next changes will be found on page 32. The first item is that of the food analyst, $1600. Mr. D. J. Davies was appointed to that position more than four years ago. His salary was provided in the additional Estimates and the vote is transferred to the regular head. Another new salary is provided here, that of the Assistant Inspector of Public Health at $730. This position is filled by Acting Sergeant Lawlor, of the Police Department, and Inspector-General Sullivan has supplied a statement showing that his pay and perquisites with that rank in the police force would amount to $683 per annum as follows:—Acting Sergeant's pay $475; uniform, $40; allowance for rent, $48; special duty at theatres, $10; serving legal processes, $10; Vegetable Garden, $25; fumigating and disinfecting infected houses, $75. Mr. Sullivan adds that

on the 14th of April next Lawlor will have completed thirty years of good service in the force, and would then be entitled, if invalided, to a pension of $356 per annum, and further, should he die in harness, his family would be entitled to compensation of $850, which may also be looked upon as a life insurance. Seeing, therefore, that on Lawlor's transfer to the Public Health Department, his family would lose this $850, his salary has been increased by $50 a year and made $730 as a sort of offset and to enable him to provide an equivalent insurance.

The next item we come to is on page 35, where provision is made under the head of lighthouses for the station at Change Islands. This is a leading light maintained during the summer months, and this item provides for its maintenance. On the next page will be found an alteration at Puffin Island, where now there are both a light and an alarm, and $360 is provided for the former and $600 for the latter. On the same page is a new light, provision is made for a keeper at Jean Head, Trinity Bay, a new light, and the salary voted is the ordinary one usual in such cases, namely, $360. On page 37 is provision for another leading light at Cupids at $50. On page 38 there is provision for a similar leading light at St. George's, and on page 39 for yet another at Lance au Loup. Now, in the maintenance of lighthouses, we find on the same page $36 for the light at Lance au Loup. On page 40 there is provision for maintaining the leading light at Change Islands, $50; for maintaining the new light at Coffin Island, where there was formerly only an alarm, $240; for maintaining the leading light at Cupids, $250; and on page 41 provision is made of $120 for maintaining a leading light at St. George's, the amount in each case being calculated on the basis of the cost of operating similar lights during recent years in other parts of the country. The next change is on page 42, where provision is made for an Inspector under the Logging Act, salary and expenses $700. This official was rendered necessary by the Act passed last year providing for the inspection of logging camps.

Our next change is on page 43, an increase of $40 in the salary of the Harbour Master's boat man.

The votes for roads, bridges and ferries are unchanged, and we find the next change on page 52, where provision is made for $250 for a stenographer at the General Post Office. This is really not an increase. As a matter of fact, the vote was made for this purpose, but last year, by a typographical error, it appeared as $50, where it should have been $250. In the Registration Department provision is made for an additional Clerk at $500, Mr. Hayes. The appointment of this official became necessary owing to the increased volume of work in this Department, which is now proving a large revenue-producer.

On page 53 we find an additional clerk for the Trepassey Branch at $400. This has been rendered necessary by the extension of the railroad to Trepassey, and the impossibility of the officials formerly doing the service, being able to carry it out owing to the fact that the run is the longest of any in the country, and one of the officials on this service is frequently taken when they are short-handed otherwise, for duty across the country and on other trains. Furthermore, the first item on this page providing for branch railway mail clerks, shows a drop of $200, due to a readjustment of the officials, and therefore there is only a net increase of $200 instead of $400, as the Trepassey branch item might show. These are the only changes under that head.

The next changes will be found in the votes for outport postmasters, which run from page 54 to 67. Badger Quay shows $20, but this place was formerly named Valleyfield, and on page 63 it will be seen that the vote for Valleyfield is dropped. Bay Roberts is provided with an assistant at $240, and Bell Island with a messenger and collector at the same amount. Both these items were voted in last year's additional estimates. At Daniel's Point the salary is increased from $8 to $16. This was formerly a way office and now created a Post Office. Donovan's has a vote of $15 for post office. This is the well-known railway station about seven miles from St. John's, where it has been found necessary to establish an office. At Duggan's Cove, on the northeast coast, an office has also been found necessary at $10. Hay Cove gets a new office at $15. Mainland appears for $10, but this is only an altered name, ascribable to the activities of the much-discussed Nomenclature Board. Mother Rex is dropped, but appears elsewhere under its new name of Regina .

On page 64 Trepassey will be seen to have been increased from $50 to $100, and Trepassey station is a new vote at $50. These changes have been made necessary by the opening of the railroad to that important town.

Our next changes will be found on page 68, under the items of "Couriers." All of these, as honourable members will readily understand, have been rendered necessary by changes arising from the opening of the new railroads, and also from the fact that contracts for the work of couriers have in many places called for increased amounts. Bay Bulls and railway is increased from $60 to $80. Bell Island tramway is a new service at $100. Biscay Bay on the Trepassey railway and Blackhead on the Bay de Verde railway, Broad Cove on the same railway, are all new services due to the opening of branch railways; Burnt Point on the railway, Caplin Cove on the railway, Cavendish on the railway, Collier's Bay Cove on the railway, Daniel's and Grate's Coves on the Railway, Green's Harbour on the railway, Hant's Habour and Lead Cove, Happy Adventure on the railway, Heart's Content and Carbonear, Heart's Content and Cavendish, Heart's Content and Hant's Harbour, Heart's Content on the railway, Heart's Delight on the railway, Heart's Desire on the railway, Islington on the railway. All these services are due to the opening of the new branch lines. On page 72, La Manche on the main road, is another railway vote. The two items for Leading Tickles merely represent a change in the distribution. The total is the same. On page 73 Noggin Cove gets a new service. Northern Bay on the railway, Old and New Bonaventures, Old Perlican on the railway, Peter's River and St. Vincent, Petty Harbour on the railway, Renews, South Side, on the railway,—all these are due to the opening of the new lines. It is the same with most of the changes on page 74 and 75. Rushoon and Baine Harbour, previously $40 now $30, was an error before. St. Ann's and St. Kyran's is a new service at $40. The St. Anthony votes are merely a new distribution, no change in the vote. St. Joseph's Cove and St. Alban's is a new vote. Salmon Cove and the railway is due to a branch line. Silver Hair and Fair Island is a new vote. Trepassey and the railway and Whiteway and the Railway, are both due to the branch lines.

The next changes will be found on page 76. The Bay of Islands service, for which a tentative vote of only $1600 was made last year, cost $6,300 to perform it with the steamer Port

Saunders, and we are providing this year a similar amount. In the same way with the service between Battle Harbour and Lewisporte, it cost $14,-500, and similar provision is made for the present year. On the same page it will be seen that the votes for the railway are slightly increased, there being an increase of a few hundred dollars. This is due to paying the Branch Railway Subsidies, as $69.50 per mile is required by the contract. The Collector and Inspector on the central staff of the telegraph branch in St. John's are re-arranged, but the total vote is the same. Provision is made for three operators now at $600 instead of one last year, this being rendered necessary by the increased volume of business, but, on the other hand, one operator at $400 has been dropped. Two typewriters have had to be employed instead of one formerly, this being rendered by the typing of the very lengthy war messages that are coming in at all hours of the day and night.

The next change is on page 78, $120 for an operator at Brookfield, but this was included in last year's additional estimates. On page 79 is an assistant for Gambo at $360, which is a repeating station and required this. The operator at Old Perlican is increased from $100 to $150, and the salary at Port aux Choix is increased from $120 to $480, this being now a wireless station and requiring a higher class of official. On page 82 a repairer is provided for Beaverton at $120 and a repairer at Grand Falls at $90. On page 83 there is an increase of $137 in Marconi royalties, due to the Marconi stations at Fogo, Bell Isle and Battle Harbour being kept open in the winter for the use of the sealers. There are no changes in the remaining estimates.

This explanation will, I think, be satisfactory to honourable members, and if there is any further information they desire, I shall be very glad to furnish it at our next sitting.

I plan to have this statement published to-morrow morning, and I now propose that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. 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 Monday next.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on Monday.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Jennings gave notice of question.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Stone gave notice of question.

Mr. Winsor gave notice of question.

Mr. Targett gave notice of question.

Mr. Coaker gave notice of question

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Lloyd gave notice of question.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. Lloyd gave notice of motion that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to Incorporate "The Union Electric Light and Power Company." and for other purposes.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a bill "To amend 4 George V. Cap. 19, entitled "An Act to regulate the prosecution of the Seal Fishery."

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until three of the clock on to-morrow afternoon.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker. Last evening there was a question referred to by Mr. Lloyd and also by Mr. Coaker in regard to certain alleged larcenies in the town of

St. John's. I wrote to the Department of Justice this morning and this is the reply that I have received. (Hon. member here read the reply). There was also a matter in relation to pit-props referred to by Mr. Coaker, and I have asked the Minister to meet Mr. Coaker in the morning and get particulars from him and then he will send an Inspector down to Notre Dame Bay right away.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the reports of the debates in the newspapers are getting very much behind. I think that I can say that this is not due to the reporters because every member has his speech on his desk next day, so that I do not think that it is their fault. It is only to-day the newspapers have completed the report of the speeches delivered last Thursday. If that is the rate at which they are going to continue we will wake up at the end of the session and find that we are a great way behind. I wish to draw your attention to that, so that some effort may be made to remedy the fault. The Reporters themselves have not done so badly but some of them might do better. I have some remarks here that are supposed to have been made by me yesterday and which I am sure I never made. (Hon. members here read the remarks). Now Sir, I am sure that those words never came from my lips.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker,I do not know whether the reporters take the remarks of hon. members on petitions seriously. My remarks upon a petition yesterday were reported but if they could not be reported any better than that it would give better satisfaction if they were not reported at all.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, MARCH 24, 1916.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker. I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Paradise Sound, Moncton, and vicinity asking for postal telegraph connection with these places. These settlements are quite a distance away from a telegraph office, and it is very inconvenient for the people as they cannot find out the whereabouts of trains and steamships. I hope this petition will get serious consideraton when it comes before the Government and that whatever is possible will be done.

MR. DEVERAUX—I beg to support the petition presented by my colleague Mr. Walsh. These settlements are places which abound with bait. Last year there was no bait anywhere else on that side of the Bay, there was a full supply at Moncton, Paradise Sound, and vicinity. As they had no telegraph office they could not announce the fact, with the result that the whole community suffered.

MR. ABBOTT—I ask leave, Mr. Speaker to present a petition from the inhabitants of Brooklyn and Lethbridge. The petitioners ask that the sum of $500 be granted to build a road from the railway station at Lethbridge to the main road, also from the Railway station to the salt water. I also beg leave to present petitions from the electors of Musgravetown and Canning's Cove, dealing with the same matter; also one from Jamestown of a similar nature. These petitions are largely signed, in fact they are signed by practically all the inhabitants of Brooklyn, Lethbridge, Canning's Cove, Jamestown and Musgravetown. I understand Sir, that the inhabitants of these places cannot get any freight from the railway station at Lethbridge unless they convey it over private in-

dividuals property. This has been going on ever since the station has been in operation. Now Sir, I understand that the party over whose land freight has hitherto been taken is dissatisfied. Therefore, the people are requesting the government to help them out. I heartily support the prayers of the various petitions and ask that the matter be given immediate attention. I now ask that these petitions be referred to the department to which they relate.

MR. WINSOR—I beg to support the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Abbott.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present petitions from Horwood and Dog Bays asking for the sum of $150 to make a road to Boyd's Cove in that vicinity. I have no doubt the request of the petitioners is reasonable and the road mentioned is greatly needed. I trust the government will find it convenient to grant the prayer of the petitioners and I ask that the petitions be received and referred to the department of Public Works.

MR. CLAPP—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of La-Scie asking for a telegraph office at that place. I ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department to which it refers.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS TABLED

The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs tabled the following Financial Statements:

Statement of Current Account of the Government of Newfoundland for the year 1914-1915.

Balance sheet of Treasury Accounts for the year ended 30th June 1915.

Public Debt to 30th June 1915.

Death Duties, Trust Account.

Departmental Trust Account, Marine Works.

Colonial Secretary's Departmental Trust Account, 1914-1915.

Trust Account Branch Railways, 1915.

Public Works Trust Fund 1914-1915, Roads, Bridges, etc., Repairs. Teachers Pension Fund for the year ending 30th June 1915.

SEALFISHERY REGULATION BILL

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. hon. the Prime Minister, the bill, "An Act to Regulate Further the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery." was introduced and read a first time and by consent of the House it was ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the bill, entitled, "An Act to Regulate Further the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a committee of the Whole to consider the bill entitled, "An Act to Regulate Further the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery."

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.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the bill entitled, "An Act to regulate further 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.

QUESTIONS.

MR. JENNINGS asked the honorable Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House the following information:—(a) How many

persons are employed at Botwood as Sub-Collectors or Tidewaiters; (b), what amount is paid each monthly as salary; (c), what is the amount allowed to each monthly for board and lodging; (d), what are the duties of each man between the close and opening of navigation in each year.

HON. M.N. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I beg to table required information.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to table a detailed statement showing for what services $120.00 was paid Mr. Hennebury, of Beaverton, during the year 1915.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In answer to the question asked by the hon. member I would say that the sum of $120.00 is the sum voted in the estimates to Mr. Hennebury as Cable Repairer for the northern part of the Island. He has been doing this work for a number of years and received the sum of two dollars a day to cover his expenses and the amount voted here is apparently the aggregate amount paid to him for each year. This amount is granted that he may be at all times available to undertake his work without any delay or question. It is the desire of the government that Mr. Hennebury should be recognised as the Cable Repairer for this part of the Island.

MR. COAKER—This is more important Mr. Speaker than might at first sight appear from the expressions of the Hon. Colonial Secretary. We would like to have this matter tabled because when we go into supply we may have something more to say in connection with the matter.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing all amounts, other than local, allocated from his department to Bonavista District during 1912 and 1913, and the names of persons to whom allocations were made.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing what grants, other than local, were issued by his department in 1913 for the District of Twillingate and Bay de Verde,giving the names of all parties to whom moneys were allocated, and the amounts of each allocation. and whether the returns for such allocations have been received by his department.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—I will table this on Monday.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. the Premier to lay on the table of the House the report of the Auditor General re the investigation held in connection with the alleged irregularities in the spending of moneys allocated to Victoria Village, Carbonear, as shown by Return Sheets dated May and July, 1913, and May 16th, 1914, also copies of all evidence taken in connection with same.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will table this during the course of the afternoon.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House the report of the Government Engineer, Mr. Hall, on the water supply at Change Islands and any recommendation concerning same made by him; also, if any money has been granted for the digging of wells, if so, what amount has been allocated and what is the intention of the Government re furnishing Change Islands with a better water supply.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I would like to remark that this matter comes under my Department, as it emanates from the Department of Public Health, and, as Hon. Members know, it concerns those difficulties which arose owing to certain cases of typhoid at Change Islands. An investigation was made in order that the Government should have this matter

reported upon and suggestions made as to the best way to remedy the state of affairs then existing. The report of the Government Engineer states that to remedy the condition of the wells in that district would necessitate an expenditure of some fourteen hundred dollars. The expenditure has as yet not been considered by the Government, but I will with pleasure table the report for the information of the hon. members and the House, and I will bring the matter before the Government and see what can be done, and in order that I may do this within a short time I would request that the honourable member would return the papers to me as soon as he finds it convenient to do so.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary whether it is the intention of the Government to erect telegraph wires from Gander Bay to Musgrave Harbor via Man Point, Fredericton, Carmanville and Ladle Cove this year.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.— This information is in course of preparation.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the cost to the Government of the outbreak of typhoid during last year, 1915, at Change Islands and Doting Cove, and any other places in Fogo District, which incurred any expense to the Government for typhoid cases, giving the names of the parties who received payment and the amount each received.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.— That also has reference to the Colonial Secretary's Department.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.— I shall have that information prepared for the hon. member.

MR. LLOYD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary when the Bay de Verde Branch Railway is to be opened.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— In reply to the hon. member I may say that this morning I got in touch with Mr. Reid in reference to the matter, and he informed me that the Company was anxious to have this line opened as soon as possible, but owing to the condition of the line they would have to wait a little longer, so that the ice which had accumulated on the track in large quantities could be removed. That, of course, would to a large extent depend upon the condition of the weather. He hoped if the present condition of the weather continued to have the line open before the 15th of April.

LABRADOR RAILWAY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend 3, George V., Cap. 14, entitled: "An Act respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

WAR MEASURES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend the War Measures Act. 1914," 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.

SALVATION ARMY INCORPORATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act to incorporate the Salvation Army," 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.

ARTICLES OF COMMERCE POSSESSION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act to enable the Governor in Council, during the existence of a state of war to take possession of articles of commerce unreasonably withheld" 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.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS 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, "An Act to amend the Law Respecting the Naturalization of Aliens."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

CONTROL OF TRADING BILL.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act respecting the Control of Trading in Certain Commodities."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I desire to move the second reading of that Bill. It is principally intended to cover the action of the Governor in Council in taking possession of the supplies of coal during the winter, and the regulation of the sale of the same and the distribution of the same; and also as regards the fulfilling of certain contracts in connection with the supply of coal. When we get into Committee I shall have some figures in relation to this whole question, and I shall defer any observations until that time.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the control of Trading in Certain Commodities" 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.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 27th, 1916.

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

PETITIONS.

MR DOWNEY—I beg to present a petition from Little Barachoix asking for the erection of a railway platform at that place. As hon. members are aware, Little Barachoix is a stopping-place for trains, and considerable inconvenience is experienced in the handling of freight and so forth owing to the absence of a platform. It is an agricultural settlement, and exports a considerable quantity of meat and other perishable products, which are liable to be damaged by storms, whilst there is no accommodation for them at this place. The petitioners set out that the people are willing to provide the materials requisite for that undertaking, and merely ask the Legislature to arrange with the Reid Newfoundland Company for the erection of a platform. I think that one about twenty feet in length would suffice for the needs of the petitioners, and for this purpose one or two thousand feet of material

would be sufficient. I beg leave to refer this matter tc the Department of the Colonial Secretary, and trust that it will receive the careful attention which it merits.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Point Leamington and Morton's Harbor for the same object as I referred to in connection with a petition here a few days ago. I have already spoken at some length about other matters of this kind. I beg that the same be referred to that Department to which it relates.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition from Harbour Grace in connection with the Labrador Steam Service. For the benefit of the House I will read this petition. (Hon. member reads petition.) This petition is signed by some sixty of seventy names of planters and others from Spaniard's Bay. I have much pleasure in giving this petition my heartiest support, and hope that the Government will find it convenient to consider this petition at their earliest opportunity and that arrangements will be made that will result in better conditions than they had last year. Some time in the spring of last year the Kyle was taken off that route and this withdrawal entailed considerable inconvenience among the planters, merchants, and others. I hope that this year the Government will take into consideration this matter in time to remedy the conditions of the Labrador Service as they exist at present. I have much pleasure in referring this petition to the Department to which it relates.

MR. PARSONS—I beg to support the petition. It is one of great importance, not alone to Harbor Grace, but to the whole of Conception Bay and to the Northern districts. I think it only right that this petition should come in so that the whole matter might be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker: I would like to say a word in support of the prayer of the petition presented by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries here today. I think the question of the improvement of the Labrador Mail Service is one that needs a great deal of consideration. Complaints have been coming in the past two years about the condition of the service down there. This year there were a number of shipwrecked crews down there, among whom was a crew from the place where I live, and when they arrived home I heard from their own lips an account of the conditions on the steamer, I think it was the Erik. They told me they were over a week on that steamer, and during that time they did not have a chance to boil the kettle; while their food consisted chiefly of hard biscuit, and anyone who knows our fishermen and how they get along will know what an inconvenience that is. They had the misfortune of losing their vessel and their summer's catch, and in addition had to put up with this discomfort in getting home. I think if possible this condition of things should be remedied.

MR. ABBOTT—I beg to present a petition from the electors of Newman's Cove and Birchy Cove, in the District of Bonavista, asking that telephone service be installed between Newman's Cove and Bonavista, and that poles be put to mark the way in bad weather in winter time. Also that a half-way house be built near Clark's Pond for the purpose of sheltering travelers caught in bad weather on the journey. (The hon. member then read the petition.) This petition, Mr. Speaker, is very largely signed. I think it must be signed by every elector belonging to the two Coves. I am well acquainted with this road

between Newman's Cove and Bonavista, and am in a position to give the petition my heartiest support.

I have also a petition from Summerville, asking that telephone service be granted to connect Southern Bay with Princeton and Summerville. This petition is very largely signed by the electors of Summerville. I would ask that these petitions be given immediate attention, and that the requests of the petitioners be acceded to. I now ask that these petitions be referred to the Department to which they relate.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Shearstown, in the District of Harbor Grace, in reference to the road around the main brook that runs through that place, and in reference to the mail service between Shearstown and Bay Roberts. At present they receive a mail only three times a week. I think myself that the Postal Department or the Government should look into this matter and see that they receive a mail every day. I do not think the increase in expenditure would amount to more than $20 or $30. They have a nice new post office there. There are between four and five hundred inhabitants in that place and there are a number of people doing business there. It would be just as well to have the mail courier come every day to Bay Roberts with the mail, as it is to have the mail lying in Bay Roberts and coming out three times a week.

They would also like to get the telephone extended to Shearstown. I know from experience that if you send a telegram to Shearstown it is put in the Post Office, and if that is the day the courier is coming it will be sent pretty nearly as quickly as if you expressed it; but if he is not coming to Bay Roberts, it will have to lie there till the day he comes. Now it is only necessary to put up about a mile of poles. The poles already there and owned by the Government lead pretty nearly into Shearstown, and about fifty poles more would give them a telephone service, which would be the means perhaps of saving life, and would also help out the people of Shearstown. I would ask the Government to give this matter their consideration.

I am sure that these people deserve it. They are an enterprising lot of men, and this is a place that has grown up rapidly. I quite remember when there were only a few people living there, and they were dependent solely on Bay Roberts. Today nearly every man there has a nice house and farm of his own, and they are all doing well. A lot of young men went away to Sydney and other places and made money and came home and spent it on putting up homes and going into business, and today they are doing well. I should like to see this matter attended to. I hope that the Postal Department will take this matter up, and after they have sent a report to the Government, I am sure the Government will accede to this request.

MR. PARSONS—I beg to support the prayer of this petition. I may say as regards the situation of the land there it is very low land, and they merely ask a small amount to dyke this land and bring it into grazing ground and prevent overflowing during the fall and summer.

With regard to the mail service, I beg to bear out what my colleague says. It is only a distance of fifteen or twenty miles walk for this service, as the mail is passing to and fro daily. I think it is only reasonable that these people should get this service daily, or at least oftener than three times a week. This is an agricultural community, and the people deserve great credit for their industry. It is one of

the prettiest spots in Conception Bay from a farming standpoint.

MR. CLIFT—I ask leave to present a petition from Richard May and other residents of Indian Burying Place, in the District of Twillingate, asking for the sum of $150 for repairs to a wharf. I have much pleasure in presenting the petition, and asking that it be given consideration.

I have also a petition from Peter Parsons and other residents of Long Island asking that motor boats be prevented from going out and securing trap berths to the detriment of those who have no motor boats. I would ask that the matter be referred to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for consideration. It is a petition of somewhat unusual character, and I have no doubt it will receive the attention at his hands that its importance merits.

MR. CLAPP— Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition which I have just received from the inhabitants of Groais Islands, District of St. Barbe, asking that that place be made a port of call for the s.s.Prospero. The petition sets forth as follows: (The hon. member then read the petition). I beg to point out to the House that fishermen prosecuting the fishery at Groais Island have to row some ten miles to the main land and back again in open boat in order to fetch their supplies and otherwise during the fishing season at great inconvenience and risk of life. I brought this matter before the House last week and cited the loss of the schooner "Blanche M. Rose" and the providential escape of the crew and passengers to the number of 26 persons. This happened last fall when the said schooner was returning from the Islands at the close of the fishing season. I have presented several petitions to the House on this matter. As for there being no depth of water for the Prospero, that was a mere excuse for the Captain not calling. The fishermen have a contrary opinion. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have done my duty in again drawing the attention of the House to this matter. I trust that the Hon. Colonial Secretary will see that the Groais Islands is made a port of call during the coming season The petition has my fullest support.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I rise to support the prayer of the petitioners of Groais Island. I know a little of the inconvenience which the fishermen of that place undergo during the fishing season, having been down there quite a lot during the past season, and I have really been wondering what the hon. member for St. Barbe has been doing during all the years that he has been representing that district.

MR. CLAPP—I have been presenting petitions.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I'd have raised Cain.

MR. CLAPP—And not only that, but I have called at the Department on several occasions, and have been told that the Captain of the steamer refused to go there. That is all I can do until we get the reins of power.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Why didn't you do something when you were in power? But, as I have already said, I have been at Groais Island during the past summer quite often, and I must say the people down there work under great difficulties and great hardships. They have no motor boats, or very few—though I believe they will have more this year—they have got to get together and man a boat and row to the land. The hon. member for St. Barbe said that the distance was ten miles, but very often they have to row farther than that, and then if a breeze comes up they have got to

remain at the main land, and in that way they lose quite a lot. Now, the Earl of Devon goes right down that coast, and if Bowrings think that there is not enough water there for the Prospero, there is certainly enough water for the Earl of Devon to go there at any time. I think that if a small light were put on the Point of Groais Islands, that Bowrings might be induced to let the Prospero call there on different trips up and down that Coast. It is right in her way, and would not call for very much delay for her to go in there. If a steamer call there I believe she would pick up quite a lot of business not only in the passenger traffic, but also in the way of freight, provisions, twines, salt, coal, and other things that the people there want, and would purchase if they had the convenience; that is all that they need. Now, I believe that the Government will take this matter up, and that this season there will be a boat calling at Groais Islands. I am sure I give the petition my hearty support. As I have already said, I often wondered when I was there last summer, seeing the inconvenience these people were put to,why my friend on the other side (Mr. Clapp) did not see that these people were looked after when he was in power, because they deserve it. Now, I am going to help him.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition which has just been presented by my hon. friend, Mr. Clapp. For the last two sessions similar petitions have been presented, and on each occasion I gave the petition my support. On the last occasion I drew the attention of the Colonial Secretary to the matter very strongly, and pointed out why the Prospero refused to go there. Bowring Bros. refused to allow the steamer to go there because Captain Kean said there was not water enough. There is enough water, but the Captain won't go there. There is no reason why the steamer should not go there at least one trip in the spring and in the fall. Certainly if the Prospero will not go there, then the Earl of Devon should be instructed to go; and if it is not possible to make arrangements with Messrs. Bowring to send the Prospero, then by all means send the Earl of Devon, though the people would prefer the Prospero.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, when this matter was brought to the attention of the House last week, I assured the hon. member that the matter would be taken up, and I have since written Messrs. Bowring Bros. in connection with it. I am entirely in sympathy with the hon. member in his efforts to get the steamer to call at Groais Island, because, as he stated here this afternoon, he has called at the Department on several occasions and emphasised the petitions which he presented to the House. I trust that our efforts this season will be more fruitful than they have been in the past. Last year we were a little late in taking the matter up, but this year that is not the case. I can quite see the possibility of objections being made; I think the Captain of the ship has some strong objections to making Groais Islands a port of call. However, the Government will be only too glad up take the matter up on behalf of the hon. member's constituents and I am sure it will be a pleasure on my part to help out. If it is not possible for the Prospero to call there I think the Earl of Devon may be available.

MR. CLAPP—Thank you.

QUESTIONS.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to lay on the table of the House answers to a question asked by Mr. Halfyard on Friday of the Minister of Public Works, relating to the outbreak of typhoid fever at Change Isl-

ands. That matter was entirely in my Department.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to lay on the table answer to question asked by Mr. Abbott on the order paper of Friday last.

MR. HALFYARD—I beg to draw the attention of the Colonial Secretary to question No. 13 on the order paper of March 24th, regarding telegraph wires as Musgrave Harbor.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Post Office is preparing that information. Mr. LeMessurier promised to let me have it this afternoon. I phoned him just before lunch, and he said, if possible he would let me have it before the House closed this afternoon.

UNION ELECTRIC CO. BILL.

Pursuant to motion and leave granted and on motion of Mr. Lloyd, the Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Union Electric Light and Power Company and for other Purposes" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on-to-morrow.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Law respecting the Naturalization of Aliens," was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order 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 Char.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with the Estimates, I want to congratulate the new Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Lloyd. I extend to him my hearty congratulations, and trust that he will fill the position which he now holds for many, many years to come. I am sure that Mr. Lloyd will uphold the dignity of that position. He is remarkable in this House for his fairness in debate. Since I have known him in this House that has been his reputation, and I know, Mr. Chairman, that in his criticisms in this House in the future he will uphold the reputation that he has earned in the past.

Now, when I introduced these Estimates on Friday last, I went into the details of every change, and as far as I know, made all the explanation that was necessary in relation to the several changes. I ask the Committee to consider the votes as we go along and pass them. Any information or explanation which the Committee may desire as we go along, I will do my best to furnish.

A number of the Estimates remain unchanged. Under the heading "Civil Government" there is only one change in the Pension Bill—nine names have been added to the list of Pensioners, making an increase of something like $1,100. Under the heading, "Administration of Justice" I may say we have not made any change, as the apparent change in the Estimates of to-day on page 13 is the vote that was passed last year in the additional Estimates, the salary of the two Bailiffs. This I explained on Friday last. Under the head of Legislation, there is no change; the vote is the same as last year. The vote for education is practically the same, an increase of $200 voted in the additional Estimates last year. Under the head of Public Charities; in the general hospital, as I explained on Friday, a rearrangement of salaries took place

under the recommendation of the newly-appointed Governors; and the total change shows an increase of $200. Under the head of "Lighthouses" there are several small changes, salaries and maintenance for new lighthouses being the principal. Under "Roads and Bridges" the vote stands the same as last year; no change. There is no change in the vote for "Customs"; it is the same as last year. When you look at the summary on the first page you will notice that the total increase this year is about $28,219. Added to that will be the amount of additional Estimates last year—$89,000—making a total of about $129,000. In looking through the Additional Estimates for last year you will find that a number of them have been dropped this year; and apart from the interest charge, the total increase this year will be about $28,000. This was explained on Friday. The interest increase on the two war loans was partly provided for last Session, and the balance is seen in the Estimates brought down to-day; showing our total interest increase as $94,727. If any other information is required, I will give it as we go along.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: In rising this afternoon, I want to acknowledge the hearty wishes from the Hon. Minister of Finance on the honour that has been conferred on me by my colleagues on this side of the House. I do not doubt for one moment the sincerity of the Hon. Minister in extending his congratulations to me; nor do I doubt the sincerity of the journals supporting the Government, in tendering me similar congratulations; but though I really appreciate his and their sincerity, I am more than struck by an observation they all make, in fact it is a commonplace remark of the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Government, namely the expression of hope that my term of office shall be lengthy. That will depend not on the wishes of the Hon. Minister of Finance, nor on the wishes of the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Government, nor on the wishes of the journals which support my Rt. Hon. friend; it will depend rather on their achievements—as they will appear to the country at large. But judging from the aid in this direction which my Rt. Hon. friend has given me and my colleagues in the past, and the aid which, during the next year or two, I have no doubt, my friends on the other side will give us, by the time the next election comes around, we will be transposed, by this aid of my Rt. Hon friend, from this to the other side of the House. And the Estimates this afternoon give a great deal of color to that observation. We are now dealing with appropriations; and it is our duty to subject them to a critical consideration; to offer support where support is necessary; and to make observatons that will be helpful. That function of the Opposition which we as an Opposition exercise is a very ancient function, and one that years ago, was exercised by the old House of Commons as a whole. The King's Ministers sent down financial measures, and the House as a whole entered upon critical deliberation over them. Then the period came when the Ministers of the King came down into the House themselves and introduced their appropriation bills and the duty of criticising these measures devolved on the Opposition; and now, today, that old function of the House of Commons has come to be exercised by this side of the House, and we are really doing the whole work of the House of Commons in controlling the expenditures of the Government. We on this side of the House, have in the past derived considerable aid from our friends on the Government benches; and we know that this experience will be repeated in the future; their

expenses are piling up, and we are sure that the trouble that is rolling in for our friends on the other side is going to roll us into power.

In looking through those Estimates, I find there are two large increases. One arises from the war expenditure which has been going on for the past 18 or 19 months. The burden that that has imposed is becoming fairly considerable; and by the time we meet next year that burden will very probably be much increased. That burden may be found by reference to page 4, which sets out the estimate for interest at $17,205 for the first year; $23,052 for second, and say $50,000 for current year—beginning July 1st next, on account of the second loan. In all probability we shall be extremely fortunate if we get through the war on even the second loan, that is to say, on the $2,000,000 borrowed by the Government. So far as I can learn, our volunteers cost us about $600 per man yearly, that is averaging officers and soldiers, and it is easy to see that even with only two thousand that entails an annual expenditure of $1,200,000. Now our forces are increasing, and we hope that before very long, before the Fall, that that force of two thousand will be in the neighbourhood of four thousand—and that expenditure of $1,200,000 will be practically in the vicinity of $2,000,000. Therefore, we shall be fortunate if this time next year our interest burden is less than $300,000. Now, Sir, I am not making these remarks with any desire of finding fault. If anybody on this side of the House has tried to be responsible for these expenditures, I have tried to be responsible for them—both inside and outside this Chamber. I think that in this House, in this country, no fault will be found with the Government for incurring this expenditure, and I believe the burden will be borne cheerfully and well, for the sake of the Empire, and for the sake of our own Island—for the safeguarding of our trade and the preservation of our very existence. But I mention the matter to show that we have in these estimates—and in those brought down in the years to come—to take into consideration a very large burden—and that burden has this further effect, namely, that of affecting other burdens. If our revenue amounts to four million dollars a year, the bigger the charge on account of these estimates the less there is to spend on other accounts. Now, that, Sir, is one of the main troubles that we have to face—the income that we can raise is, roughly, four million dollars, and this revenue is being handicapped from year to year by largely increasing annual obligations.

In referring to these matters we come to the burden of debt outside of the war, which is largely due to the policy of lack of economy in and the general extravagant administration of our friends opposite. And it is these burdens that present difficulties that the country will not bear cheerfully, and are not bearing cheerfully; these facts show that our friends opposite have done their best and are doing their best for us—their opponents. In dealing with these Estimates, the Hon. Minister of Finance has drawn attention to the increase in charges of interest.The increased estimate for the forthcoming year is $94,700.Roughly, the total increase in expenditure to be authorized, along with what has been authorized by statute, will be a little over $200,000 for the forthcoming year.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is not correct.

MR. LLOYD—I am glad the hon. member interrupted me. I will be glad to be corrected at this moment, if I am incorrect. I would like to point out to you how I arrived at my conclusion. I said $200,000.

Now may I explain how I arrived at my conclusion? If in error I will be glad to be corrcted. On page four, Sir, I find there is an increase of $94,726.68. That is the statement authorized by the Minister himself. That increase is due to the increase in interest account. Does my friend follow me?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes.

MR. LLOYD—Now, turning to page 3, I find that the total estimates for the forthcoming year are $4,079,000, and for last year $4,510,000. On further consideration I am satisfied that the Minister is correct in stating that according to the text of the Estimates the total increase is $120,000; $121,000 I think it is. But in reference to these amounts, I wish to point out that there is the usual allowance for contingencies of $10,000, which shows no increase whatsoever. Now in accordance with the Auditor General's statement, we see that he places expenditure on contingencies at $30,000, so that in the general run of the year the Minister was $20,000 out, which would make the increase $140,000. Now I want to point out another serious discrepancy. If anybody knows anything about changes in conditions, that person or those persons are the Minister of Finance and the Leader of the Government. Now, Sir, I find a big change is taking place in the prices of certain articles of commerce. Early in this year, I find the Opposition were called by the Government to consider with them the coal supply, and coal prices. Thus when last year we met here, coal was selling at $6.80. At the beginning of the year the price was suddenly changed to $10.80; and even today, the price averages $10.00 or $10.40. Now, my hon. friend has taken no notice whatsoever in connection with this matter. He is assuming the ruling prices of coal to be the same as they were four months ago. In other words, the Government expect to buy coal at precisely the same price as they paid last year. How it is proposed to deal with this matter I do not know. The tonnage question will not be relieved to the extent of making a big difference in prices until probably the end of the war. Now, Sir, if you turn to page 30 of the Estimates it will be observed that the allowance for coal and light in the General Hospital for 1915-16 was $13,000; and precisely the same allowance is made for the forthcoming year. No attention whatever has been paid to the increased price of coal. Now take the General Hospital alone. According to the Auditor General's statement, there are burned there four and one quarter tons a day. Now the increase in the price of coal from last year to this is $3.20 per ton. Last year the prices was $6.80. This year $10.00. An increase of $3.20 per ton on four and a quarter tons of coal per day amounts up to $13.20 per day. That means that in the General Hospital alone the Minister is out in his Estimates at least $5,000. You take the Poor Asylum, Government House, and even this very building. Take the post offices, light houses, public buildings throughout the whole country for which the Government provides coal, and you will find that my old estimate of $200,000 will not be far out. Now, Sir, the problem of keeping up the Government of the country is becoming more difficult year by year, because of the large increase in the permanent charges on the revenue. It is also a great difficulty for the Minister of Finance to find the money with which to keep up the public services of the Colony. You take up the road moneys for example. For many years these were obtained from surpluses in the revenue. Last year there were none, so there was no road money. The year before it was the same way. That year the Govern-

ment had to draw from the Government nest egg about $300,000 to make up the deficit. Last year they cleared off this balance and got a loan for the same purposes.

As there were no surpluses, there was consequently no road moneys; no amounts to distribute in the way of special grants in connection with public matters. I myself during the past year found myself obliged to ask the Government to consider a special grant for the district I have the honour to represent. I found, however, that the Government had no money to give. These were the circumstances of the case. An important settlement separated from the neighboring places by a stream had a long bridge passing across to it from the other side of the stream. The brdige broke, and for a time was impassable by either horse, cart or pedestrians. I found that there was no special moneys with which to repair it. The bridge was an absolute necessity, and it had to be repaired. Money had to be got from somewhere. Hundreds of cases like this are coming up from time to time. Several hundreds must in the course of a year. I can sympathise with the Government not being able to attend to matters like this with a short revenue. It becomes therefore incumbent upon the Government to make some attempt to deal with this matter. A few days ago, the hon. member to my right, Mr. Clift, the member for Twillingate, made some references to the Civil Service. The manner in which his suggestions were received was certainly political enough. The Hon. Minister of Finance and the Premier asked if he would name those Government officials whom he would discharge or decrease the wages of. That is certainly the politician's way of dealing with a suggestion, but not that of a statesman. The Civil Service should be looked into to see what changes it is possible to make.

That way is clear to my mind. There are men who thoroughly understand the Civil Service of this Colony, men whose business it is to understand it, not the political heads of departments who are often under the temptation to give jobs to men to whom they are under some obligation of a political nature. But you have the permanent heads under no political temptation whatever, who know from long experience the exact worth or worthlessness of each man in their particular department. You have the Auditor General who has held the important position in the Civil Service for the past sixteen or seventeen years. He knows what is going on in each department and he is the very man who could help you to get better work at less cost, if the matter were tackled in a statesmanlike way. What are you going to do and when are you going to attend to this matter? That should be your attitude and the spirit in which the matter should be treated.

There is another matter that might be tackled. That is the question of purchasing supplies. I will venture to say that no Government has ever tackled in a fair and proper manner the question of purchasing supplies on business-like and economic lines. This is a matter that every Government has made a subject of political patronage. As long as that goes on you can expect no economy in managing the Government of this Colony. Can not the Government of a country be run on the same business lines as other large business concerns and not made the basis of rewarding political support? Should Government money be spent in this way and supported by a Government member and passed by a political Board. But treat the matter as a business proposition and buy the necessary supplies regardless of political support.

Let the supplies be bought at the cheapest rates and assure this House that this matter is dealt with on an economic basis. Let there be men who can have full powers to investigate prices.. Let them know wha' the stores are, where and how they are distributed and where they go. Then, and only then, will we have any satisfaction in regard to this department. But, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to go into details in this matter to-day and no doubt in the future I shall have ample opportunities of discussing this matter but I will close my preliminary remarks by pointing out one other matter which concerns the Auditor General, and that is the expenditure of road moneys.

I wonder if there is any man bold enough to get up and say that we are getting value for our Road grants. There are hopes in that direction. I believe that with elective councils we shall get full value for the money spent on the Roads of this Colony, and that money would be spent in the public interests. Everyone in political life knows exactly how matters stand. I am prepared to say what I believe should be the policy with regard to these matters, what I believe would be the best policy for the Government to pursue. The interfering of members with Road moneys is a thing for which I have no sympathy; the member taking the money and distributing it exercises powers which I do not think he ought to be invested with. I am not speaking from information coming to me from unauthorized sources. This matter has been referred to specially by the Auditor General in his report relating to the illegal interference of members in the distribution of money, which is especially the case in times preceding elections.

I have made these remarks in, I hope, no unfair spirit. I may have expressed myself strongly and if I have it was because I think that the matters upon which I have this afternoon dwelt are worthy of consideration.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I would like to say just one or two words in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I think that the Government is to be congratulated upon the fact, that after listening to the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Lloyd, who is a keen critic, we have heard this afternoon how little the hon. member found to criticise He promptly recognized his error when I set him right with regard to the amount to which we thought our Estimates had increased. Just to make matters a little more plain to the Committee before I go on with my remarks, I will point out that last year we voted in the Additional Estimates $30,000 for a plebiscite vote; we also voted $11,000 for work that was done at Grand Bank and other places around the Island; this year our Estimates are less that amount. In the Estimates last year you will find provided $40,000 as interest on the War Loan, this year we must add to that sum $50,000 on the new loan received as interest from the 1st January, 1916. When you take the Estimates as a whole, the increase shows something like $28,000 or $30,000 apart from interest account. I think you will find after reading the Auditor General's report, in his reference to the Estimates of last year, that he states that the Estimates were as close to the requirements as it was possible to make them, and even if certain votes were not sufficiently large, we must remember that he went on to explain that our drop balance will more than cover the votes which this House did not make sufficiently large. You will find that, or words to that effect, in his report.

It is impossible to come in here with Estimates that will square exactly. I don't know of any Receiver General who brought Estimates before this House and came in the following year and found them correct to the dollar. I think if you will take the circumstances into consideration, you will find that the Estimates were figured as closely last year as it was possible to have them. The Leader of the Opposition charges that we made no provision for the increased price of coal in the several Government Institutions in the Estimates we brought down. I admit that. In my opinion it is impossible to estimate correctly the coal bill of next year, no one can tell what the price of coal will be in twelve or even six months; I think it is time enough to cross that bridge when we come to it. Special praise, in my opinion, is due the Premier for the interest taken by him in the matters which so suddenly confronted the Government of the Colony during the early part of this year. All will agree that he dealt with the matters in a masterly way, and grappled with the situation as it required to be dealt with. We all know what happened here in St. John's, we know the confusion that was created over the uncertainty of a coal supply, but the Government of the Colony immediately grappled with the situation, and invited gentlemen from the other side of the House to confer with them, which they readily consented to, and aided the Government. Not alone on the coal question, but on the salt and other questions which have arisen, the Government have acted with the same promptitude, and have been quite as successful in handling them. The matter of the Grand Falls industry became quite serious a little while ago, when the Imperial Government decided to commandeer two ships belonging to the A. N. D. Co., and the result would have been probably the closing down of that very important industry at Grand Falls, because those ships were the only ones to convey the paper and pulp to England, and if taken over by the Admiralty for war purposes, there was nothing for the Company to do, but to close the industry indefinitely. The Premier on this occasion made strong recommendations to the Imperial Government, placing before them the position in which Newfoundland would be placed by the closing of an industry that was so important to the Colony, and prevailed upon the Imperial authorities to assent to a proposal which he submitted to them. He explained to them the difficulties by which Newfoundland was beset, how difficult a matter it was to purchase ships, and how drastic the effect would be upon this Colony if the Imperial authorities insisted upon the steps they were taking. He also made representation to the Company with regard to the ships that were being used by the Company for handling the products from Grand Falls to the Old Country. These two ships were to come out here empty from time to time for the next few months, and he laid before them a plan, that as these ships were coming here empty, an arrangement could be made with the merchants of Newfoundland to charter them and send them to Cadiz for salt, and have that salt taken to Newfoundland to supply the shortage which should necessarily be created here within a few months. I think, Mr. Chairman, that very little fault can be found with the Government or with the Premier in those actions, and I know there are very few people ready to criticize the acts of the Government for the successful manner in which those difficulties have been dealt with.

MR. COAKER—Why are you discussing it?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOME.—Because there are quite a few people who know nothing about it, and you forget to tell them in your paper. Now, Sir, the situation is relieved, and no one knows better than the hon. gentleman, Mr. Coaker, that these two ships will bring to Newfound sufficient salt to fill the shortage which it was anticipated would be experienced in June and July.

Now, with reference to the criticism of the Estimates, it may not have been possible to figure the exact amount to the dollar that should have been placed in the Estimates. We are figuring on the future of Newfoundland, and on the future business of Newfoundland. These ships will arrive here in time, and the salt will be taken from the ships' side, or by certain firms in town, and carried throughout the Island to the fishermen to carry on the fishery for the coming year.

When you talk about the coal question as compared with the salt question, what does it show? The coal question, I grant, meant something to the city of St. John's, but see what the salt question meant to every individual in Newfoundland. The fisheries of Newfoundland mean eighty per cent of the earnings of the people, and unless we procured salt, we would be deprived of those earnings for at least twelve months. Now, to get back to Dr. Lloyd's statement that we have not figured on the coal question for the New Year. I admit that we have not. Why should we? What is going on at the present time? We may ask ourselves a number of questions in this regard. How many vessels may be in the local trade of the country within the next six or eight months? The coal question, when you look back on it, did not seem to be a very serious question after all. Two or three cargoes of coal supplied the shortage, and the anxiety seemed over. Now here is what may happen within the next twelve months. As the hon. gentleman on the other side knows, we are buying vessels day after day, both in Canada and United States, and even in Norway, and it may be within six or twelve months we will have a fleet of vessels that will be able to handle the output of fish from Newfoundland, as was the case thirty or forty years ago. Further, the question of freight may be remedied through other sources. Take the Nova Scotia fishermen who come here from time to time to fish around our shores —they have a much larger fleet of vessels than we have, and have less work for them, because the fish is sent to the West Indies in small lots, by steamer from Halifax and other parts of Nova Scotia. There was a surplus of fifty or sixty vessels in Lunenburg Harbour last winter without a charter; it was too late when the merchants of Water St. woke up to the fact that those vessels were at Lunenburg, and if arrangements had been made earlier in the day, those vessels could have been utilized for freighting our fish to Oporto and other markets.

Now, the coal question may be handled just as easily as the salt question was handled, and I take it if twenty or thirty vessels are purchased in Newfoundland within the next 12 months, and if there should be a shortage of fish, which I hope will not happen, what will keep these vessels employed? You will find people going around asking for coal or other charters, and they will probably be unable to procure them. There is no necessity for any one to get alarmed over the coal, salt or other questions that have been agitating us. The most of them have been straightened out, and we have still sufficient time

ahead of us to satisfactorily straighten the other matters.

The Leader of the Opposition refers to the supplies purchased by the Government, and said that the Government should have a Purchasing Agent.

MR. LLOYD—Did I say that?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Well, I think you meant that. What did you say?

MR. LLOYD—I said a Comptroller.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—What did you mean by a Comptroller?

MR. LLOYD—The Auditor General and Comptroller.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The Auditor General cannot become a Purchasing Agent. I do not think you can get a better system than we have at present, especially when we take the gentlemen who sit on the Board of Works. Practically all purchasing for the Government is done by the Board of Works. They ask for tenders through the principal papers, and any person is allowed to come in and tender. The hon. gentleman hinted that tenders were only allocated to political friends.

MR. LLOYD—Mainly.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—This is not correct. I can show the hon. member that this cannot happen, because if anyone puts in a tender for goods, and he is not satisfied with the action of the Board, there is no reason why he should not come up here in the House and ask for copies of those tenders, which should be in existence. I take it that the lowest tender is every time accepted by the Board, provided the party tendering can satisfactorily follow the conditions of the tender, and if the hon. member will put a question on the Order Paper to-day and ask for the tenders which went into the Board of Works, he will find that they were accepted on their merits, and not because of the political affiliations of the parties who tendered. Any tender rejected will be rejected for good and sufficient reasons. I will go further and say that the hon. gentleman knows this is correct.

I do not think there are any other serious objections made by the Leader of the Opposition. If there are any other explanations necessary, I shall give them as we go along.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Government cannot congratulate themselves over the defence put up by the Minister of Finance this afternoon in defence of the Estimates and the other matters he spoke of. If he had devoted his remarks to the estimates alone, I do not know but they might have passed unchallenged; but he gets up to make a speech in reply to the Leader of the Opposition in reference to the estimates, and gets off a half hour's speech regarding coal and tonnage and salt and the Grand Falls business, and all the rest of those matters that are not controversial at the present time and are not before the House. They are not before the House and were not brought up on this side of the House. The only reference to coal made by Dr. Lloyd was in connection with a question he asked. He pointed out that when you made up the Estimates last year the price of coal was $6.80, and now it is $10.40. He asked what you were going to do about the difference. Now that was a fair question, and one that he was quite justified in asking. But there was no need and no justification for all the talk you had about the coal question. If you want to talk on the matter, we are quite prepared to talk. I thought you were anxious to get through the session. I thought you wanted to get through in a month. But you will not,

if you go on, on these lines.

Then the Minister of Finance told us about all the wonderful things the Premier accomplished. He did great things. he almost worked miracles because we have coal to burn at St. John's to-day, because we can get salt for the fisheries, and because Grand Falls is not closed down. But what would the Premier be doing if he was not attending to these things? What is he there for? He would not expect Dr. Lloyd or anyone on this side to do these things. It was his duty, and if he did not do it he would have no right to the position. To my mind he was only too glad to attend to those matters once they were brought to his notice, but I wonder if he went very far out of his way to find out what was going on before they were brought to his attention. If he did, we are prepared to give him credit; but I do not thank him for merely doing his duty. I do not thank anyone for doing their duty; and I do not want to be thanked for doing mine. If, however, he had done more than that, and has done anything extra, he will find that he will get due credit on this side of the House. He did not tell us about the Grand Falls wharf. He did not tell us that the Government had spent $20,000 to build a pier for the Grand Falls Co. at Heart's Content. I wonder why he was silent about that? Is it true that the shipping pier which has been erected at Heart's Content was built by funds provided by the Government, or to be provided by the Government, or to be attached to the railway policy of the country? Is that true? The Premier might say whether it is or not.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No.

MR. COAKER—Absolutely untrue?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is partly true. I will tell the hon. member and the House exactly what has been done, so that there will not be any misunderstanding. Under the contract we had to build a wharf at Heart's Content. It was part of the railway extension policy to build a wharf at each deep-water terminus?

DR. LLOYD—Under what contract?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Under the Construction Contract.

DR. LLOYD—Where was that special provision?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—We have done it everywhere in the case of deep-water termini.

DR. LLOYD—When did you decide on that?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It was part of the survey, and not alone in the case of the branches but in the trunk line wherever we have touched a deep-water terminus we have put a wharf there. We have done that in every case where the railway has touched deep water. In the case of Heart's Content we went right down to the sea for that purpose. It was part of our policy to build a wharf there. Now, the A.N.D. Co. finding that they could not prosecute their work from Botwood for three or four months, approached the Government to know if we would be prepared to add a little to the wharf that we had already determined to put there Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, was asked to make an estimate of the difference between the cost of the wharf that we were going to put there and the wharf which the Company wanted. and we found that it was so small that we agreed to the Company's proposal. The Company, on the other hand, put up all their buildings, and decided, for the present, to make Heart's Content a winter terminus. That is all.

MR. COAKER—How much did it cost?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will let you know to-morrow.

MR. COAKER—$20,000?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No, the whole cost won't be $10,000 and the additional amount won't, I think, be more than $3,000 or $4,000 However, I will let you have the exact figures to-morrow.

MR. COAKER—I am very sorry to put the Premier to any trouble. The Minister of Finance did not, of course, anticipate that we were going to talk about these things, or he would have been a little more discreet this afternoon.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I was only replying to Dr. Lloyd's remarks about coal.

MR. COAKER—Don't get angry now, and perhaps we wont be very hard on you. But with regard to this terminus I am very glad to find that under the contract wharves are to be erected by the government at certain deep-water termini. I shall now ask the government to do their utmost to influence the Railway company to have a deep-water terminus built at Catalina. If there is any necessity whatever of having a deep-water terminus in the Bay it ought to be at Catalina. You have not gone ahead with the breakwater which was promised the people at Bonavista in 1913 and which was to have cost $150,000. The people were expecting that this breakwater would have been erected. Some money has already been spent upon it in connection with the securing of spars and sticks for its construction. This Heart's Content terminus can only serve the purposes of the A.N.D. Co. at the present time. It can never serve the purposes of the railway in connection with the Reid system,so far as the Bay service goes. Of course, it was only right that the government should do something to help the Company out, but you will probably wake up some day in the near future and find out that this wharf will be like the one that was erected at Lewisporte, and that it won't be used very long; it won't be suitable for the purpose for which it is intended, as far as the north side of the Bay is concerned. And now that we find the Premier so anxious to do his best to facilitate the business of the A.N.D. Co., I don't see why the A.N.D. Co. should not reciprocate and let the colony have the use of their steamer, when she is coming across without any cargo, They might certainly let her take a load of salt, or put into Sydney and take coal, and help us out in the emergency. That was no especial favor in view of what the Premier has done in building a wharf for the Co. at Heart's Content. Now the Minister says that supplies are all tendered for. That is quite true, but I am of the opinion that if you conducted the supplying of your Departments as we do our business that you would come out at the end of the year at least $150,000 better off. There are lots of supplies that are tendered for, but there are also lots not tendered for, and for that you have to pay fifty per cent. more than you would have to pay if you went along Water Street and purchased at the cheapest places I agree with Dr. Lloyd that you should have a controller to investigate the prices. Now, I should say that the duty of the Auditor is not to look into every item of expenditure, but to see that the item is correct and not to dispute what the price is. That is a matter for the Department. If the Department had a purchaser, similar to all the large companies—like the Reid Company, the A.N.D. Co. and other large concerns—and he was a man who did his duty, you would find that you would easily save $150,000 on supplies in the course of a year. That can never be done under the patronage system, unless something wonderful turns up Of course, a very strong government might do something; but no matter how much preaching is done,

when a Party gets in power it finds that its friends want this and that and the other thing, and they are not in a position to carry out any stringent reforms. I think, however, that the party that will take charge in 1917 —backed by the men on this side of the House—will be able to deal with that matter firmly; and who knows but that a few of you might be anxious to assist us in doing these things then!

Now, I am sorry to find that the Public Accounts for the year 1914-15 have not been brought up. The country expects us to look into these things, as well as pass your Estimates for the coming year. I have not yet seen the public accounts.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I am very sorry. That was an accident. They will be here to-morrow.

MR. COAKER—That should have been looked after. However, we won't get very far with the Estimates this afternoon. There is another matter—the Committee on Public Accounts. It is very strange that that Committee has not been appointed yet.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I asked the Speaker this afternoon to name the Committee.

MR. COAKER—You are a week late. It ought to have been done some days ago, if they are going to do any good.

Now, the Auditor General in his report on expenditure under section 33 of the Audit Act does not exactly congratulate the Government this year on the good things they have done, although his report is not nearly so severe as it was at the two previous sessions. I am sorry to note that he has again to condemn the Governor-in-Council for paying out salaries for new appointments and pensions that have not been authorized by the Legislature. I notice there is quite a list. The Government promised last year that they would do much better than they had done the year before. Well, they have done a little better,but there is still lots of room for improvement I notice there is a pension to William Hillier, a letter courier, of $94; John Gillis, Postmaster, $35; John McPherson, letter courier, $50; Elizabeth Trainor, Postmistress, $24; Bridget Duke, postmistress, $30; and Mrs. McDonnell, postmistress $40. Well, I wonder where you are going to end now, if you start out to pension post-masters and post-mistresses. There are about 1400 of them in the country, and they were never looked upon as being entitled to pensions before. You are going to have at least fifty applications every year now from persons who will be expecting pensions because you have given them to these six. In the Customs Department you have increased the staff without Legislative authority. There is Aubrey Crocker, Clerk to the Registrar, $600; James Wheeler, night-boatman $420; M. Brien, $390; John Cook, $420; R. Taylor, pensioned some years ago, $130; F. J. Cahill, Typist S. W. Coast Revenue Protection, $600; E. J. Dominey, Passport service, $1,090; Charles Barrett, Sub-Collector, Old Perlican, $120; F. Davis, Sub-Collector, Freshwater, $120.

I did not know that they were doing such an amount of Customs work at Freshwater and Old Perlican as to require a sub-collector at a salary of $120 a year. I suppose it is a case of someone looking for a job, and there is any amount of money coming into the Treasury, and you want to find a way of getting clear of it.

In the Public Works Department there is Eli Anderson, Keeper Channel Court House, $100; Jno. Grills, Storekeeper General Hospital, $600; Jno. LeGrow, Poor Asylum, $70; Andrew Ryan, late Attendant Lunatic Asylum, $400; Francis Fanning, late Attendant Lunatic Asylum, $300; Miss Southcott, late Matron General Hospital. I expect that you will

have lots of ladies looking for pensions now when it is seen that a Nurse at the hospital can get $620 a year. What will the people say about this pension? Then there is J. W. Mercer, for special services, $1,000. Is that going to be continued?.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I am informed by the Post Office officials that his report will be finished in about a week.

MR. COAKER—Does this work end then?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Yes.

MR. COAKER—In the Postal and Telegraphs Dept. there is E. Penston Stenographer, $200; J. W. Hayes, Clerk Parcel Post, $500; Wm. Gladney, Letter Carrier, $50; Joseph Curtis, Railway Postal Clerk, $400; Mrs. Andrews, Postmistress, $10; George Miller, Postmaster, $10; Wm. Newman, Postmaster $10; Denis Ryan, Postmaster, $50; Joseph Byrne, Postmaster, $10; Bride Sitman, Asst. Postmistress, $60; H. Willar, Telegraph Operator, St. John's, $120; T. J. Murphy, Telegraph Operator, St. John's, $120; Miss Johnson, Telegraph Operator, St. John's, $240; Miss Thorne, Telegraph Operator, St. John's, $250; J. Hefferman, Telegraph Operator, St. John's, $80; William Campbell, Collector, Telegraph Department, $60; 14 Messengers (at $120 each), $1,680; John Penwill, Messenger, Grand Bank, $24; S. Gaulton, Operator, Brookfield, $120; B. March, Operator, Old Perlican, $50; M. Walsh Operator, Port-au-Choix, $360; S. O'Quinn, Operator, Searston, $75; F. Stone, Messenger, Bell Island, $30; E. S. Hennebury, Cable Repairing, Beaverton, $120; H. Whitemarsh, Repairer, Grand Falls, $90. This matter I asked the Colonial Secretary about yesterday and about which I requested him to table some correspondence.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—It will be ready to-morrow.

MR. COAKER—I object to this increase of $120 being paid this operator or repairer. This official receives $600 a year and has received that salary for many years. He has a house found for him, has fire and light found for him,and a man found for him—to do work around the farm and to look after a fox farm. He also has a motor boat found for him to enable him to go wherever he wants to go. Besides he has some one living in the house who is getting $1 a day whenever he is away for looking after the work of the office in his absence. Last year we had an account showing he had been paid $50 a few years ago for a horse that he claimed he had lost in connection with government services the truth of which claim has, I presume, been investigated. I know this man Hennebury; I know the duties of his office; I know what work he has to do; and I know what a splendid home and salary has been provided for him by the government. He has many other ways of adding something additional to his permanent salary of $600 and taking everything into consideration his job is worth $1000. And this man who is getting all this, who is getting this, who is getting perquisities besides, this is the man that held up the Government Postal Telegraph Department, held up the Colonial Secretary, held up Supt. Stott, held up the business of Fogo district for fourteen days, last October, until he was given an increase of $120. If the Colonial Secretary or if Supt. Stott, or if Postmaster General Woods had done what was right, Hennebury would have been told to go about his business or obey orders. If you are going to have an official in any department who is going to boss you around—Well it is time to cry "halt" and to ask that man to get out, and to find some other man who is willing to do whatever services are required without dictating special terms. The telegraph ser-

vice between Beaverton and Change Islands was suspended last Fall, and Hennebury refused to attend to this work until the Government gave him $120; and he held that work up for fourteen days during the busiest part of the season. When he did go to attend to the duties of his office he found that the cable was unharmed, and that the trouble lay in the telegraph office at Change Islands,where it was found that lightning had affected a ground wire; and for fourteen days the whole business of that station and Fogo Island was interrupted, because the girl in charge of that office did not know how to test that wire and this man Hennebury refused to go and investigate the trouble until his demands were met. Is it any wonder that the people of the North have not any use for the Government? Do you know that this man is not only a repairer and an operator but he is a political agitator as well and very much opposed to the F.P.U.; he travels all over the north; and probably his services are very acceptable to the government and this is his reward for serving the party. But I am surprised that the Premier did not take some action—my confidence in the Premier led me to think that he would not be a party to any official holding up the public services for an increase of $120. There was one thing that was referred to by Dr. Lloyd and that has not been commented on by the Hon. Minister of Finance, and that was in reference to the war expenditure. Dr. Lloyd said he had been a party to this war expenditure and that he was ready to shoulder his share of the responsibility. I can say for my part that I am willing to shoulder my portion of the responsibility for these expenses that you have to incur and that have to be properly met in the interests of the country and the Empire; but I am afraid that when the time for investigation comes you will find that a large amount of this war vote which is going on now has been spent in a manner that will not give us satisfaction. Take the question of the "Petrol" and "Fogota" and their performance of patrol duties around our coasts last year. Why did you let these steamers go? Why did you charter these steamers at all? What use would the Petrol or the Fogota be in protecting the colony if either of them met a submarine?

HON. MR. CASHIN—There was an Admiral in charge.

MR. COAKER—I am very much afraid that the Admiral would have made for the shore quickly if he had come in touch with a submarine. This year you are going to have the same expenditure. That being so, drop these steamers and get half a dozen small boats—fast motor boats- to do the patrol work. If there is a submarine to be seen on the ocean they will find her and also manage to get clear of her and get to land and give warning of the danger; but if a submarine gets sight of the H.M.S. Petrel and Fogota then good-bye steamers. With regard to the war expenditure: I may say that I do not intend to find fault with the government for expending two or three million dollars in the defence of the Empire. If the necessity has arisen—and we all know it has—and Newfoundland has been called upon to do something for the maintenance of the Empire of which we love to be a part, I do not know there is any man in Newfoundland who is going to hesitate about giving you his support in expending money for this purpose. The other day when the Address in Reply was before the House I said very little in regard to the war because I thought I would have another opportunity when the vote for this purpose was being moved. I have to say that I am very much grieved over the response that has been made by some

of the Northern Districts in connection with the enrolment of volunteers. I do not think that any young man need feel ashamed of becoming a naval reservist or a volunteer for the army under the circumstances that are now facing this Colony and the Empire generally. In my estimation there is nothing too good, no reward too great, for the young man that leaves his home, comes here and enlists, and offers his life for the service of the Empire. I hope that when these men return—and I feel sure a good many of them will so return—with arms and legs off and physically unable to work, that the Colony will see that every one of these gallant men has enough to live on and sufficient to support themselves during the remaining period of their misery. It is easy enough for a man to shirk his responsibility in a time like this and allow "the other fellow" to do his own and the slacker's work as well; it is easy enough for a man to shout "The King and Country are calling for men" —and then to himself say, "but I will remain at home and take it easy." But the young man that will leave his home—perhaps in some of the outports—and comes up here and enlists and goes to France or Gallipoli or some other portion of the war-zone to which he is drafted, and risks his life for the furtherance of our cause, why that man is the noblest creature that God ever made. He comes forward and willingly offers his very life—he does not rest satisfied with protesting his loyalty to the flag, he goes forward bravely to face death in order to protect his home and friends and maintain the liberty and freedom of the Colony. It is not a question of performing his obligations to his country by merely risking his money or worldly possessions. No! It is not merely that—but he comes forward and states his willingness to make, if necessary, the supreme sacrifice of all, that of his own life. Such a man is one of whom any country might be proud. In connection with this subject I may state that I am a firm believer in the principle of conscription at such times as those we are now passing through. In the past few months I have taken my stand on public platforms and expressed my feelings on the subject of enlistment; and have done my best to help the various recruiting campaigns and urged all eligible young men to come forward and voluntarily enlist for the defence of the Empire. I am an admirer of the volunteer system and believe in it while it continues to be effective; but I say that should the day ever come when every young man is required to do his very best to safeguard our Empire to uphold its flag, and to further the cause which it has espoused, and the volunteer system should fail, then every available man should compulsorily be called upon, and it should not be left to any man to refuse to go, and remain idly home and allow a few splendid, brave young men to go forth and fight for all of them. It ought to be the duty of every young man of a certain age, who is physically fit, to come forward and respond. Why should a certain number of men come forward voluntarily and go forth prepared to meet hardships and privations, to live the life of the trenches or to ceaselessly watch on one of the ships that helps to guard our Empire, to chance death itself, whilst others stay behind and live on the fat of the land, enjoying what our soldiers and sailors are preserving for us, and laughing at them for their pains? If ever conscription becomes necessary, and it is found we ought to do things which we are not doing, then, I, for one, will have no hesitation in supporting a Conscription Act in this House. So far as the war itself is concerned,

we have to win supposing it takes every young man in the Empire under thirty-five. We have to win. There is no such thing as allowing Germany to win. We value our liberty, we love our constitution, our rights, and our freedom and the other benefits we enjoy in the shadow of the British flag; and we will never see these privileges crushed—we are not going to give in to those men who threaten our national existence. We know the Germans will fight furiously and doggedly; we know they are born fighting-men; but still we are going to win. If we realize that the Germans have made up their minds to crush Britain and to make us a third-rate power, and to set herself up as the Ruler of the World we ought to be prepared to send men and to vote the last cent so that these plans of Germany should be frustrated. We are telling these Germans that we are going to conquer them, that we are going to crush their power, beat them to the ground and render them harmless for the future; that we are going to relegate them to a third-rate place amongst the world-powers; and the Germans appreciate what our threats and designs mean; and you may be sure they are going to fight on to the very last ditch before they will be willing to forego their dream of world-conquest. Are not these men going to fight the fight and do you not think that while they have a man living they will go on fighting? They are built of the same stuff as we are; they have the determination to win; and that spirit is going to make the war all the longer. We should therefore leave no stone unturned to see that Britain is victorious in this struggle; and all I hope is that the Hon. Minister of Finance—or whoever has charge of our expenditures—will do everything in his power to see that good value is given for the money that we spend for this purpose. Now the hon. member for Burin in his address on Opening day stated that everything was blooming like roses; that everything was prosperous and that prices were splendid and work abundant. He said "every branch of industry and trade have prospered,employment has been abundant and our general position is one which might well be envied."

The reply to all that is this: You have a revenue of four million dollars; a revenue for this wonderful year; a year in which we are told the country is prosperous and doing well. One would imagine from his description that the country was one flowing with milk and honey, and he considered it wonderful that you were getting a revenue of four million dollars, but I tell you that this is not so, the country is not prosperous. When that time comes the revenue will be six million. The tariff which you have at present with everything taxed up to the highest point should give a revenue of six million in normal times. When the revenue is produced you can make up your mind that the country is prosperous, but that is not the condition of affairs now. You are getting on very well it is true; you have recovered from the bad condition of 1914. It is wonderful to see how well the country has got on but you should not make it out better than it is, but when the day comes when times are normal again you can make up your mind that with the present tariff the revenue will be six million dollars, that will be the day for Newfoundland!

During the year you have had elections held all over the country for the return of elective Road Boards. I am sorry that all the settlements are not represented by these boards. There has been some hesitation on the part of some of the men on these boards because they thought by having elections the control of money would pass out of their hands. In

some settlements where there are no elective boards that is the reason and the men in charge of the old boards did not call meetings because they were afraid that they would not have control of the money under the new scheme, and the people themselves did not know how to carry it out. I am pleased to find that there has been such a response. In Bonavista Bay there are not half a dozen settlements that have not elective boards. In Twillingate there are very few places that have not elective boards, and I feel sure that when the next Board election comes around there will be no complaints from any part of the country in this regard. During the last few years members on the Government side of the House thought that we were wrong in our opinion as to the demand for this system, but the result has shown that they were wrong and that we were right, and I hope that the Department of Public Works will do all in their power to see that everything runs harmoniously and that the Road Boards are given every assistance they require. I feel that the present Minister of Public Works will do his best in this regard. I have had no occasion to complain of Mr. Woodford since I came to the House, and I feel sure that the same harmony will continue under the new system.

You will remember, Sir, that I offered to give the Prime Minister a list showing where he could reduce the officials of the public services. I said that I would give the Prime Minister a list if he would promise to carry out my recommendations but he would not make that promise, but I can tell the Minister of Fiance and Customs and the Prime Minister that in Green Bay there are ten or fifteen officials that we could get on very well without. In fact they are nothing but a nuisance to the community. They are only breeders of strife, division and trouble. I suppose the same is true in other districts but I know that we have several places in Twillingate where you might save many dollars. I pointed out last year that at Exploits there is a sub-collector of Customs whom you are paying four or five hundred dollars when you might get forty or fifty men in the place to do for $50. In Moreton's Hr. you are paying $400, and I am sure Mr. Jennings will bear me out when I say that you can get a man at $50, to do the work a great deal better. Then at Lewisporte you have an official that is costing you $900. You could get that work done just as well for $200. The official there is a good man, energetic and attentive. You will remember that a letter was read from him the other day in which he gave particulars about the pit prop business. He does his work alright, but the work at Lewisporte could be done for $200, and that man could be given a position in some place where he would be necessary. At Botwood you are paying a man $500, to do the Magistrate work. Now there is no need of a Magistrate there. You have Mr. Fitzgerald who does the work at Grand Falls, and who calls at Bishops Falls, and if he can do the work in these two places and spend three days a week in St. John's he could easily go to Botwood and Lewisporte and do the work there, and he would do the work much better than the man you have there now. Then again at Botwood some shipping is done. You send down a couple of tide-waiters from outside the district and give them $400 salary and $30 and $25 a month board money. Do you expect that men in similar positions in other parts of the country are going to put up with paying their own board when they know brother men are found by the Government. You don't give board money to men

in other parts of the country. What did you send those men there for? Is there anything square or proper in a Government Department that takes men from other parts of the country to send to Botwood when a hundred men could be found in the district suitable for the position? I would give you a list of officials not wanted, that would save you $50,000. Of course that list is not going to be accepted by the Government. You cannot go on much longer like this. By so doing you are piling up the majority in favour of Mr. Clift, Mr. Jennings and myself.

There are some statements of expenditure in connection with 1914–1915 that I want. There is quite a list of them. I asked the Minister of Finance and Customs for a somewhat similar list last year, but I did not get it. I am going to ask this evening for some detailed statements of certain expenditures and if the Minister will make a point of giving me that information he will have very little trouble in connection with the Estmates. We do not intend to keep them here dodging from day to day; we do not want the session to be too long and if you give us the information we ask for in connection with the expenditure of last year we will facilitate business in every way possible.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: It was not my intention to make any remarks on the Estimates this afternoon, but since Mr. Coaker has drawn attention to the condition of affairs that existed at Change Islands last year, I feel there is nothing for me to do but back up the statements that he has made. Those who were living at Change Islands last year know what it was to be suddenly cut off from outside communication by telegraph, but I do not think that it shows much credit to the Department that such a condition should have existed so long. It seems that there is a line-repairer named Hennebury. If the statements made in connection with him are correct then the matter is discreditable to Mr. Hennebury and discreditable to the Government. I do not think that people here in St. John's fully realize what it is to be completely cut off from communication at that time of year when men want to get in communication with St. John's to know the price of fish; to find out the rates of freight and the whereabouts of schooners. It is probably the most important time of the year to merchants and fishermen. When I called the attention of the Colonial Secretary to the condition of affairs, he told me that there was a wireless station at Fogo, and messages could be sent from there. That was only adding insult to injury, because for the lack of these repairs Change Islands, Seldom Come By, Joe Batt's Arm, Tilting and other places were all cut off completely, and I do not think that there was a proper appreciation of the circumstances on the part of the Colonial Secretary, or by the Superintendent of Telegraphs. On November 8th, the interruption commenced, and on November 22nd repairs were effected,immediately on the arrival of Mr. Hennebury at Change Islands. I do not suppose that anything like that will occur again in connection with the interruption of communication by telegraph while the Hon. Mr. Bennett holds the position which he now holds.

That brings me to another point. There are many important places in Fogo district that are cut off absolutely from the outside world by lack of communication by telegraph. In the Fall of 1913 it was decided by the Government that a telegraph wire be erected from Gambo to Musgrave Harbour via Carmanville and Ladle Cove.

Wires were sent down just preceding the election, and the people of the district were led to believe that with-

in two or three months they would have the poles erected and the Postal Telegraph Offices open. In the meantime the election took place and a man not favourable to the Government was elected. Result, nothing done. The wires are down there still, and the Government is paying a man $20 a year for storage of a few bundles of wire in Fogo. The same applies to Ladle Cove. I do not know what exactly they are paying for storage at Ladle Cove, but I suppose it is about $20. Of course it was only an election idea. Last year I asked the Government what they intended to do, and now I ask the same question, and according to the Colonial Secretary, it is a matter for the Postmaster General to decide.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I am going to table the reply to that question this afternoon.

MR. HALFYARD—Well I hope the reply will be in the affirmative. Now what was it the Colonial Secretary himself said about telegraphic communication in 1913? He said, "It is a well known fact that in this country a large number of people are isolated for a long period from the rest of the world. One can hardly understand nowadays a man educated, industrious, ambitious, living in a part of the world where he is cut off for six months of the year, but there are places where up to the present date such conditions have existed, and not insignificant places, but large important centres of Districts. These places have now been linked up by the telegraph wire and the cable, and instead of being shut off during the whole winter when navigation was impossible they can not alone get in communication with St. John's but with any part of the world. That surely is a boon that will be remembered by these people. The wonder is to me that they have been so long neglected and not resented their abandonment. Sir Edward Morris during his periodical trips around the country to find out for himself the exact state of affairs has been responsible for a great many of these remedial measures, and has thereby conferred a boon and a blessing upon these people that will I am sure be appreciated by them."

More is the pity that the Prime Minister does not go down to Fogo District and visit Carmanville, Ladle Cove and other places. When he was down there last time as a result of his visit we got a wharf at Fogo which cost ten or twelve thousand dollars. We may not all be of the opinion that the wharf is of great benefit, but we will give him credit for his good intentions. I wish he would make another visit. I would only be too pleased to go down with him, and although I have not been down there since the election,I would not be afraid of the result, because if possible the union spirit is stronger today than it was in 1913. Fogo as a district does not get a share of patronage or conveniences that it should get. Last year I called the attention of the Minister of Finance and Customs to how the civil servants in Fogo were being paid, and I made a comparison with other districts, and it was found that Fogo was not getting its share in any particular, and he admitted that there should be a re-adjustment of salaries to civil servants, but nothing has been done. I say the same thing this year, and I suppose it will go on until you go out of power, and until someone comes in who has pluck and energy to re-adjust matters. You are very anxious when it comes to a vote that affects some districts that the rights and privileges should not be interfered with. I remember in this connection a remark of the Prime Minister when the question arose as to the price of the Alconda's coal. He was very particular that the Government should not be called upon to

bear any of the expense out of the general revenue. I offered to suggest that it would not be a bad idea if the Government had to pay a little so that the buyers of the coal would get the benefit, but the Prime Minister turned upon me with righteous indignation and said: "What do you suppose? Do you want the people of the outports to be paying for the coal of the people in St. John's? That was all right, but the people of the outports might have come into St. John's and got the coal, but still it was only right that the general revenue of the Colony should not be called upon to bear any burden or expense in which one particular district is the only beneficiary, but you should carry that principle throughout. If that rule were applied to every particular it would be all right. It would not be fair to call upon the general revenue to pay for a cargo of coal consumed by the people of St. John's, but you are not so particular in other respects to see that all districts get their just and proportionate rights and share of government patronage according to population and their returns to the revenue of the country. Fogo has been neglected and is being neglected. I have no hope of your doing anything in Fogo while you are in power. I have told the people so, and they see that you are almost as bad now financially as you were at the time of the Bank crash. I cannot get a cent except the ordinary grants. The people are clamouring for money but I have told them it is no use to ask me for money because their request will meet with no response. If other people can get it, we can't. You do not consider the demands of the district of Fogo. I did not intend to say anything about this until later on, but as the condition that exists in Fogo district in regard to telegraphic communication and their getting of their share of general revenue and general improvements came up, I thought I ought to say a few words.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reply to the hon. member for Fogo, and the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker, in relation to the question of the cable repairer, Mr. Hennebury. I promised to table to-morrow the correspondence in reference to this matter, and from this I think it will appear that while Mr. Hennebury is in the Estimates as receiving $120, yet it will be seen that he is not receiving more than he received in former years. Early last summer Mr. Hennebury was in St. John's and he called in to see me, he said that he did not desire to have anything further to do with the repairing of cables. He would prefer that the Government would appoint some other person to look after the work. He was not satisfied to be taking the allowance of $2.00 a day for expenses and to have it continually appearing that he was getting more out of the Government that he was entitled to. I asked him to let the matter stand until I brought it before the Government. The matter was allowed to lapse for the time being, eventually the difficulty in Change Islands cable occurred. Mr. Hennebury had not been informed as to whether his wishes had been acceded to and therefore when the trouble occurred in Change Islands, Mr. Stott communicated with Hennebury, and Hennebury declined to undertake the work. There was considerable correspondence in connection with the matter, and as a matter of fact the cable had been out of repairs three or four days before it was reported. Then the Government after enquiring into the facts found that they had been paying annually to Mr. Hennebury approximately $120. In view of the fact and of the difficulty of getting another person with his experience and com-

petence for this work, they decided to employ him regularly at a fixed amount. It was therefore decided to make an allowance of $120 per annum to Mr. Hennebury in lieu of his services as cable repairer. With regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for Twilingate, I hope he does not insinuate or mean to insinuate that I did this with other than proper motives. I want to assure the hon. member and this House that I had no retainer from Mr. Hennebury to do anything improper. I would not support this grant were I not entirely actuated by the interest of the service. An equivalent amount had been paid in former years. We had to get somebody to attend to this important work, and we got Hennebury for a reasonable amount. As to the other statement that other men were engaged as assistants. I know of no assistant.

MR. COAKER—You have a repairer. How about him?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—A telegraph line repairer is there such as is everywhere else in the country where the telegraph lines are located. In view of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the expenditure is consolidated and made part of the Estimates, no additional obligation is incurred. From past records before me I find that he has been paid at times even larger amounts than $120. With this extra payment Mr. Hennebury becomes obliged to do repair work in this portion of the country. Now that that is explained, I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I have anything further to state. I would assure the hon. members, however, that I was accentuated by the highest motives in making this alteration.

MR. COAKER—Will the Colonial Secretary say that this man was not receiving $600 from the Government, and that that salary included work of this kind? Was this not a part of his regular work? Could not have the Government made him do that work? If not, you are going to have every man in the service saying that he won't do special work unless he gets paid extra. What sort of a service will you have after a time at that rate. I know the whole business for I served my time in it. I know that if I was told to do a thing and refused to do it, I could not hold the job. If you had discipline in the Department you would not have happenings such as that. No official in the Department should dare to do such a thing, and had you proper discipline no employee would disobey or refuse to carry out an order. What are they getting their salaries for? Is it to dictate to the Colonial Secretary or head of the Department?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—He was a paid operator, not a cable repairer.

MR. COAKER—That is not a satisfactory excuse. If you are going to continue like this and allow every one who chooses to hold you up like this, what sort of a department do you expect to finish with? Just wait and see what the Commissioner has to say about the department in his report. You came here last year and said that there was some trouble. You ignored some things. You let that man come here to the city and visit your office, and allow him to waste your time in talking about a matter that concerned the discipline of the service. You ought to kick him out of the office. You let a man like that play with your department and hold up all the lines for fourteen days, and then you come here and recommend that he get an increase $120 and thus reward him. You have had the whole Fogo service interrupted fourteen days just because a wire was grounded. That is no way to run the public service.

What is his object in getting this $120. He knows well enough that he

is a public nuisance, an eye sore. He knows that he is disliked by thousands in the Northern Districts. They would sign a petition ten thousand strong to get him removed. He wants the $120 in order to add $80 a year to his pension. That is what he is after. You go on doing this and you will have no end of trouble. You will have scores in the department going to Mr. Bennett or to Mr. Woods or Mr. Stott telling them that they will not do their work unless they get forty, fifty, or sixty dollars increase.

Now I hope the Premier will look into this matter. I feel sure this would not have happened were he in the position of Mr. Bennett, and had to deal with it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman. Whether I go alone or in company, when necessity requires it I will go to Fogo. If on my last visit I did not get the hearing I desired, it was because my friend on the other side had sent circulars all over the district about my intended visit, telling the voters what to do, warning them against hearing me and I must say now that they carried out instructions to the letter. It was quite evident that they had been instructed, and while from a party standpoint this might be defendable, nevertheless I am sorry that there is any constituency,or any settlement or body of citizens who are willing to be so treated. I do not think it is right to advise any man not to hear the other side. It is a good motto "Audi alteram," hear the other side, for there are always two sides to a question. I think were the other side in this case made clear to the people, Mr. Halfyard would have never been returned to this House.

MR. COAKER.—They heard Fitzgerald.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I do not think they did hear Mr. Fitzgerald. Had they I do not think the member opposite would have been sent here. I will say no more about that however; but will make one or two references in connection with one or two points which have been raised. In the first place like the Minister of Finance I congratulate the hon. member for Trinity, Dr. Lloyd the new leader of the Opposition on his elevation to that office. Some men have greatness thrust upon them; others acquire greatness; others are born great. My friend I think comes under the first and second of these. He has both acquired greatness and has had greatness thrust upon him. He has acquired his position here by industry and by the good work he has done in this House, from 1904 to 1908 on the Government side ,and on the Opposition side during the past four years. I know a little of his work because I was a member of the late Government from 1904 to 1908, and I know something of his work here during the past four years; and I think that all on this side of the House will join with me in congratulating him on his appointment. I have always admired the Doctor in this House not alone for industry but for what might be called the ginger which he puts into the debates from time to time. Fearless, he is never afraid to say what he thinks is right, and he always has given me the impression of being sincere. Always ready to show up the defects but never desirous of making opposition stronger than the case warrants is his reputation, and for these reasons I am glad to find him promoted and I may wish him on behalf of this the Government side of the House many years to enjoy the emoluments as leader of the Opposition. Many years, for what nobler position can there be than that of leader of the Opposition. Some men only think of when they are to get to this side of the House.

That is not the object of the Opposition. The Opposition should leave that entirely out of consideration. Their duty is to study every measure that comes before this House to try to help to make it the best possible and not to be continually thinking day in and day out and dreaming night in and night out of when they are to get on the Government side. Whatever can be the temptation? What can be the inducement? I notice that even the learned Doctor himself here in his first speech as leader of the Opposition talks of the time when they will "be rolling over to this side of the House." What could be more amusing than to imagine the members of the other side of the House rolling over to this side. Now I have no objection to any-of my hon. friends coming over here to this side, but if they are to come over would it not be better for them to come over in a more dignified manner than that? Then again, it is not very edifying for any opposition to claim that its chief merit to the control of the Government is the shortcomings of the present administration. No member of the Opposition should claim to succeed to the Government of the country merely by reason of the shortcomings of the members on this side of the House. They should establish their claim and show to the country some constructive policy. Show to the country that there is something in themselves, that they intend to do something, to construct and build up, that their talents are not altogether destructive. I would advise my friends to take this advice into their serious consideration and remember that the outside public wants something more than criticism, because very often the public can see as far through the criticisms of the other side of the House as the hon. members who make that criticism. Be that as it may, I am glad to see my friend in the position he is in this evening, and I have no doubt he will never do anything that will cause his friends and followers to regret having made the appointment. Now as regards the various matters that have been referred to, there are one or two points to which I would like to refer. There has been a general reference to the need of retrenchment. It has been pointed out this evening by the Leader of the Opposition, that there has been no genuine attempt to curtail public expenditure as evidenced by the estimates. That principle has been laid down by him and other speakers. But in the same breath there are complaints that certain services have not been increased, and if half the requests made were acceded to, the estimates would be doubled. Mr. Halfyard referred to the fact that down in Fogo civil servants are not paid in proportion to other districts of the country. I gather from his statements that down there they do not have their per capita share as compared with other districts. That may be so. I am not prepared without having the opportunity of examining the various public services down there to give any opinion. I will state this, however, that these services are exactly the same as we found them when we came in here seven years ago. No salary has been reduced one single cent; if anything, they have been increased. I am willing to admit that there are services all over the country inadequately paid, but a matter such as that to which the hon. gentleman refers needs special enquiry and a thorough examination, but at the present moment the funds of the country do not warrant any increases in the public service. Nearly every case referred to here this afternoon arose since we last met here, and is due to the fact that certain pensions

had to be granted to persons who were unable to continue their work any longer, and certain new appointments had to be made, which appointments were demanded by the various services in which these additions have been made. Only when you are in charge of these departments do you discover that certain things have to be done between sessions. The Government is merely the Committee of this House, a Committee of both sides of this House. Any appointments we made are merely the carrying into effect of what we believe to be the wish and desire of the House as a whole. Now, the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker, was astray this afternoon when he thought that he had discovered a departure in relation to the pensions of small offices in the outports, such as postmasters. Now, that is a matter that has been going on for years. Is not the small postmaster in this Colony who earns thirty or forty dollars, entitled to a small pension exactly the same as the highest officials in the country? The principle is the same. This is a principle which no one in this Legislature will gainsay, especially as those with larger salaries are more likely to have put by something for a rainy day. The principle of these pensions is that everyone, on becoming incapacitated, should receive a sum to ensure him against want in his old age. I will go further. I will take the Committee into my confidence and say that we determined at every meeting of the Council since we met here a year ago to keep expenditures down and make no new appointment, and grant no new pensions, or increases whatever, except where it was absolutely necessary, or there was some extraordinary reason that it should be done. I say this in all sincerity, and I am sure that you will all understand and appreciate, that no other policy could be followed in view of the financial position of the Colony. It would be nothing short of a crime to increase expenditures except where absolutely necessary, and in saying this I am prepared to take up every single expenditure on its merit and discuss every appointment and increase made this year. I am prepared to defend every individual case. There was a shortage of seven hundrd and fifty thousand dollars on the 30th of June last, not due altogether to the lack of purchasing power on the part of the people, but on account of the fact that the goods were not imported. Old goods were sold which had in some cases been lying on the shelves of the shops for years. Many went abroad but could not buy. I hear there was considerable mistaken economy. I do not mean the economy of the public service, but I refer to persons who refused to employ, and where expenditures were curtailed in such a fashion that many men had to go to bed hungry on account of the shortage in labour. In that way the purchasing power was decreased over the whole country and particularly so here in St. John's. Then we found ourselves with a deficit of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Now, on the 30th of June next we will not alone be able to make up this deficit, but we will have a surplus. In the course of a few days the Finance Minister will be able to give the figures. Matters look much brighter to-day than they did a year ago. This year we have an increase of one hundred and twenty thousand dollars, ninety thousand dollars of which is interest on the war loan. I think hon. members will concur in my statement that the Government has been sincere in its attempt to curtail as far as possible the expenditures of the Colony.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. 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 motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "To Amend the Act respecting the Bank Fishery."

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to amend Chapter 115 of the Consolidated Statutes, Second Series, entitled, "Of Passenger Accomodation on Steamers and Sealing Vessels."

Mr. Speaker appointed the following standing Committee on Public Accounts: Hon. M. P. Cashin, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Devereaux, Mr. M. J. Kennedy, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. LeFeuvre, Mr. Clift.

Mr. Coaker 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, Tuesday, at three ot the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 28th, 1916.

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 the inhabitants of Harry's Harbour, in the District of Twillingate, asking for a sum of money to repair the public wharf at that place. The petitioners ask for the sum of $200. I have very much pleasure in presenting the petition to the House, and would ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. JENNINGS.—Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition.

MR. JENNINGS—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Port Anson, in the District of Twillingate, asking for a small sum of money for the repair of a public road at that place. I would ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Indian Bight, Little Bay, asking for the sum of $100 to continue the forest road. The road is much needed for the requirements of the community, and I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition. I would ask that it be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present petitions from Catalina, Trinity East, Port Retxon and Trinity West, praying for an Act of Incorporation, to allow certain members of that neighbourhood to be incorporated for the purpose of lighting certain towns and settlements from Trinity West to Bonavista, and also to have the use of certain water powers for lighting and other purposes. I ask that this petition be received and referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

On motion it was ordered that these petitions be received and referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

BANK FISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill, "An Act to amend the Act respecting the Bank Fishery" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

PASSENGER ACCOMMODATION BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill, "An Act to amend Chapter 115 of the Consolidated Statutes (Second Series) entitled "Of Passenger Acomodation on Steamers and Sailing Vessels," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House answer to question recently asked by Mr. Abbott.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the names of the parties with amounts due the Postal Telegraph Department for the years 1914 and 1915; also a detailed statement with full particulars of the expenditure of $2,505.00 for telegraphic construction for the years 1914 and 1915; also a statement of the amounts paid on account of telegraph supplies for the years 1913, 1914, 1915.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say that I gave instructions to have this statement prepared. It will not be ready for two or three days, when I shall table it.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon Minister of Agriculture and Mines for a detailed statement of all moneys paid on account of the Prevention of Forest Fires for the years 1944 and 1915.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, I may tell the hon. member that these statements went to His Excellency the Governor. On their return I shall table them.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all expenditures for the Propagation of Lobsters from January 1st, 114, to date; also, a statement of all moneys spent by the Game and Inland Fisheries Board from January 1st, 1914, to date; also, a statement of all moneys spent on account of Cold Storage for the years 1914 and 1915; also, a detailed statement giving the particulars of the expenditure of $41.-820 for the construction of Light Houses for the years 1914 and 1915; also, the amount spent for the enforcement of the Bait Act, with detailed particulars of same, for the years 1914 and 1915; also, the amount spent for Motor Ferries, with detailed particulars of same, for the years 1914 and 1915; also, the amount spent for Light House Supplies, with detailed particulars of same, from July 1st, 1914, to December 31st, 1915; also, a detailed statement of all expenditures for Marine Works from July 1st, 1914 to date.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to inform the hon. member that this statement will be tabled to-morrow. I may say that the matter of ferries is not in my Department at all, but the Department of Public Works.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Public Works for a detailed statement of the expenditure of $14,092 for Improvements to the General Hospital for the years 1914 and 1915; also, a detailed statement of the expenditure of $350 for repairs to Colinet Bridge, 1914-15; also, a statement giving full particulars of moneys paid for repairing and furnishing (1) General Hospital for 1914 and 1915; (2) The Poor Asylum for 1914 and 1915; (3) The Government House for 1914 and 1915; (4) The Fever Hospital for 1914 and 1915; also, for Medical attendance on paupers for 1914 and 1915; also, a statement of all expenditures, with detailed particulars on account of smallpox for the years 1914 and 1915; also the amount for supplies to the Lunatic

Asylum with detailed statement, for the years 1914 and 1915.

HON. MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—This statement is in course of preparation.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs for a detailed statement, giving full particulars, of all expenditures of the S.S. Fiona for the years 1914 and 1915; also, a statement, giving full particulars of all moneys paid Preventive Officers, Tidewaiters and Boatmen for the years 1914 and 1915; also, a detailed statement, giving full particulars, of all moneys paid on Contingencies Account for the years 1914 and 1915; also, all amounts paid for Office Rents, with full particulars, for the years 1914 and 1915; also, the amount of Refunds to the Treasury, with detailed particulars, for the years 1914 and 1915; also, the amount paid Mr. W.J. Walsh, M.H.A., for services for the years 1914 and 1915; the amount paid as Bounty for Shipbuilding, with detailed statement,from July 1st, 1914, to date; also, a detailed statement, giving full particulars, of the following payments—Colonial Secretary—$10,988 for Railway Awards and Fees. Minister Public Works—$12,000 expended on the General Hospital; $7,000 expended on the Lunatic Asylum; $11,000 expended for Light Houses, from unappropriated loans; also, a detailed statement of all War Expenditure from August 4th, 1914, to date; also, a detailed statement of the following expenditures on Public Buildings by Minister of Public Works for the years 1914 and 1915—Spaniard's Bay, $1,356; Bay Roberts, $2,574; Harbor Grace, $585; Channel, $1,592; also, by Colonial Secretary, a statement of all amounts, with particulars, paid as Contingencies for the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly for the years 1914 and 1915

HON. MINISTER of FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I beg to table the answer to part of that question. The balance will appear in the Public Accounts, which will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement showing what amount was paid the Newfoundland Produce Co. for the whalers Hump and Cabot which were engaged by the Government to do service on the Labrador.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES.—This statement will be tabled to-morrow.

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.

(Under head Pension.—Miss Southcott $620.)

MR. CLIFT—How does that happen to be $620?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I might say in answer to the hon. member that Miss Southcott's pension is based on the salary which she was receiving, namely $600, and her emoluments—that is, the privileges which she had at the hospital, such as her diet, etc., I think the whole amount was estimated at $930, and she was pensioned at two-thirds of that amount.

MR. COAKER—How can the government justify pensioning this woman at $620. Here you have a magnificent woman, splendidly trained, first class in every respect, You take her from the hospital, and permit her to go out and do the same work outside as she was doing at the hospital, and give her a pension of $620; and we have not had any explanation as to why the change is being made, or as to whether anything improper has been done by her to justify her removal. It seems to me that unless you give some

explanation as to why you are making the change, you have no right to come in here and ask for $620 a year pension.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In answer to the hon. member I may say that this was done on the recommendation of the Board of Governors. It is well known to the House and to the General public that matters in connection with the General Hospital have not been working as smoothly as might be desired for some time. Conditions arose down there which made it absolutely essential that some alteration be made. Miss Southcott, it is quite true, is not yet past her labour and is still well able to earn her salary, and, no doubt, under other circumstances, would still be in the employ of the Government, but the Board of Governors, in the interests of the institution, considered that some change should be made,and they felt that it was necessary to dispense with the services of Miss Southcott. But after her many years of faithful service, and the good work which it is well known that she has put into that institution, it would not be the right thing to put her on the street without any consideration or compensation. On the recommendation of the Board of Governors, who had gone thoroughly into the matter, the Government reluctantly decided that Miss Southcott should be pensioned on the usual scale. That is the explanation. The change was unfortunate but unavoidable.

MR. COAKER—That really means that no charge has been brought against this woman; that she did her work faithfully; but for some peculiar reason the Board of Governors asked for her dismissal and the Government agreed?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That is so

MR. COAKER—There is another vote—A. W. Earle, sub-collector at Clarenville. Will the Minister of Finance explain why this pension was given?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The reason why that pension was given was because the man was past his labour. He asked for a pension last year. He was not able to do the work, and we could not turn him out without giving him a pension. We gave him the usual two-thirds. He applied for the pension.

MR. HALFYARD—There is a pension here for Esau Gillingham, the Lighthouse Keeper at Penguin Island. I would like to know why he has been pensioned. As far as I can understand, he is well able to do the work, and was desirous of being retained in the position. Perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can explain to us why he is removing this man and giving him a pension; and also give us information as to who is to take his place, if that has been decided upon.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I have no doubt that the hon. member for Fogo is well acquainted with the circumstances of the case now before the House; but I might tell him that for the last three years Mr. Gillingham has been asking for a pension. Last year he wanted to know the reason why he did not get it. He wrote me a few days ago saying that if the Government did not feel like giving him a pension he was prepared to do the work while the war was on. As a matter of fact, Mr. Gillingham has been seeking a pension for the last ten years, as far as I can understand from the Lighthouse Department, and would have been only too pleased to have got a pension at any time during that period, but the Government did not see their way clear to pension him, although I asked for one for him when I first came to the Department. Mr. Gillingham is a very

old man. I think in one letter to me he referred to the fact that he was fighting in the Civil War in the United States. Well, if that is so, it is time he got a pension; he deserves it. As to who will be appointed in his place, that is not for me to say. Perhaps the hon. member himself may have a word to say in connection with that.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing the matter of pensions I would like to bring to the notice of the Committee that there is at the present time in the possession of the Old Age Pension Accountant (Mr. S. Woods), some hundreds of applications for the Old Age Pensions. I understand that the majority of these applicants ranges from the age of 75 to 85 years of age, and a large number of them are unprovided for and in very poor circumstances, but not one of their cases can be placed on the Old Age Pension List unless one of the 1200 who are now getting the pension dies. When one of the pensioners passes off the stage of action, one of the applicants takes his place, provided he is vouched for by a magistrate, a clergyman, a school teacher or some other prominent citizen belonging to the locality in which he resides. Now I feel that the Government ought to take this matter into serious consideration. Undoubtedly most of these men began to work at perhaps 9 or 10 years of age, and worked till 75 in order to support themselves and their families and pay the necessary taxation essential to carrying on the country's business, and I may say to support some non-producers. These old gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, worked for over sixty years to keep the Colony moving, and when they are worn out they make application for the paltry sum of ninety odd cents a week as a pension, and they are given a cold shoulder by the Government of their country. The Government, Sir, has said of these applicants, by its actions if not by its words, as was said of Mother Keyes,

"Where they are and how they fare,
We don't know nor we don't care."

So I would say, Sir, that while we are voting the amounts for pensions to civil servants at two-thirds of their salaries, we would carefully consider the many applications of the Old Age Pension, and that a sum of money be voted in this year's estimates sufficient to put all at 75 years of age on the list.

MR. COAKER—I have much pleasure in supporting what the honourable member for Bonavista has said, and I think it would be well to ask the government to grant another $20,000. Why not take the $23,000, you would have to spend on the tuberculosis campaign and add it to the Old Age Pension vote and divide it amongst the old men of the country. You have started well; and now you ought to continue the good work. There are more than 400 men in this country over seventy-five years of age not receiving the pension of $50. Include in your pension lists all these men who are looking to you for provision for their old age. You cannot spend the money in a better way. You have just come in and asked for a pension of $620 for a lady, an estimable lady, Miss Southcott, late Nursing Superintendent at the General Hospital; and the pension is given. If you can do things like that you ought to be able to go further and grant pensions to these old men, men over 75, who are seeking it to-day. You ought to be able to find the money; if you want to put five cents on something later on to compensate for this expenditure I will have no hesitation in supporting it. Give us $20,000 to help these old men who have been looking to you for the past three or four years to do something for them. Why not take up the whole 1600 of

them and be done with it. I know the Premier has a warm place in his heart for these old people, these 400 aged men who are entitled to be put on the pension list; will he not do something for them? If you cannot do anything better take the $20,000 that you would have given to Dr. Rendell and let it go towards Old Age Pensions.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Chairman. I agree with the remarks of Mr. Coaker re this old age pension question. I have had several applications from broken-down fishermen, over 75 years of age, asking for the old age pension. I think it is only fair that these men should be taken in hand, and if it is possible that this $20,000 be spent by the Government in this way, it should be done These men have worked hard for the country, have served their country well,and it is only fair that now, in their old age, they should be looked after. I agree with what the honourable member for Twillingate has said. At present I may say that I am waiting to get two or three old men in, but it is impossible to get them on the list just at present as it is all filled up.

MR LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. I think the proposition just put forward is perfectly reasonable and should be entertained by the honourable Minister of Finance. There is no question that there are to-day many proper applications for old age pensions which cannot receive support because sufficient funds are not available. Spend this money, which, as I understand from Mr. Coaker, is available for this purpose; the proposition is reasonable; and I have much pleasure in supporting it.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman. I have much pleasure in supporting the suggestions made by the Honourable member for Bonavista and supported by Mr. Coaker, Mr. Clapp and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I have never been able to understand why the Governments that have handled the affairs of the country have made discrimination between civil servants and the industrial worker. True it is that the civil servants perform services for the country; but so also does the fisherman, the carpenter, and every other working man in the country; and it is these men who receive no consideration from the Go ernment of the country he has served, when he comes to old age. There is r› pension awaiting him. But there are many civil servants who when they arrive at the age of 65 or 70 receive comfortable pensions,while men who have done their hardest work in the interests of the country are discriminated against—not intentionally perhaps—but discrimination is there. I think the government should show some heart towards these men, who as has been pointed out, are in destitute circumstances to-day.

I know of several cases in Port de Grave where fishermen have spent 40 or 50 years earning their livelihood and are now dependent on their friends, and in poor circumstances. I do not think it would mean a total increased expenditure of $50 per head to give these old men a pension, because what you are now doing in the way of relief through the Relieving Officer to such would be saved if pensions were paid. I hope the Government will take the suggestion and give to all men who have reached the age of 70 or 75 a suitable pension.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I do not think the gentlemen on the other side are in earnest when they advocate that we should take the vote of $25,000 for Tuberculosis away and add it to the Old Age Pension vote. Why should we drop that vote that has done so much good throughout the Island? Dr. Rendell and his staff of nurses are doing considerable work quietly in and around St. John's, and also in some outside

Districts. There is not a member of this House who can deny that a certain percentage in his District are afflicted with this dread disease, and I cannot conceive of a more charitable work than to alleviate the sufferings of the poor and afflicted. We have arrived at a stage now in many places that when it is known that a person is stricken with consumption, neighbours are not at all anxious to visit or tend upon them not even their immediate friends, and considerable relief is given from this vote, and instead of reducing it, if the Government could afford it, I think they should increase it. I think this suggestion has been made without consideration by the hon. gentlemen on the other side. I am quite prepared, and would agree to vote $20,000 as an addition to the Old Page Pension, providing we could afford it, and I trust the day is not far distant when we will be in a position to do so, but I think our first duty is to pay our bills.

MR. COAKER—I have no desire to make any opposition to this vote. All I want to make sure of is that it is properly spent. If there is any reason why this vote of $25,000 should be continued for tuberculosis, I certainly shall not object; but the matter as explained to this House last year was unsatisfactory. Last year there was $8,000 spent, which in my opinion was not justifiable. The Doctor himself gets, I understand, four or five thousand dollars. Why don't you cut that out. He wouldn't die. I understand he is a man very well to do. That $5,000 would pay one hundred old age pensions of $50 per year.

I have certainly no objection to the Government voting this money to help these people, only we want to be assured that they are being helped. What we want is returns. If you cannot get these satisfactorily the vote ought to be dropped and one for old age pensions substituted in its place. All I want is a vote of $20,000 to provide the remaining 400 for the aged fishermen over 75 who have served their country well, and are now not in a position to do more.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to have anything to say when these estimates were being voted, but now that this matter is up I feel that I must say something. What I state here I do not know whether it will or will not make my party popular. I never consider that aspect of it at all. I first endeavour to satisfy myself that of which I intend to speak is a proper one, and I try to express my opinion without fear or favour; and so I say here that the present system of giving pensions is a rotten one. I do not blame the present Government entirely, for the system probably existed during many past administrations, if not ever since we got Responsible Government. Take it from the standpoint of the poor man. Here by this system the man who gets a good salary and has an opportunity to lay up some money is the man who gets the largest pension; while at the same time he is the man who should need the least. This system of pension at two-thirds of the salary is a rotten one. It is altogether unfair, and there is nothing I think which gives more dissatisfaction to the general public than does this system. The real wealth of any country is its production and the producers, whether fisherman, farmer, or miner, are the real mainstay, the backbone of the country, and he has to foot the bill every time; yet he is the worst looked after man in the whole country.

The time will come when some Government will have to take this matter up and put the granting of pensions on a fair basis, and if I happened to be one of a party which would take up this question, I should have no hesitation whatever in supporting it.

Taking on an average, every third fish caught out of the water by our fishermen goes into the revenue. A portion of our worn-out fishermen at the age of 75, gets a small pension of $50; small as it is this is a God send to many a poor man, and very acceptable when we cannot afford a larger amount, and it is creditable to the Government for having originated the scheme, but there are yet a large number of deserving cases who are still excluded, but I trust the time will speedily arrive when a fair arrangement will be made and the grant increased so as to include every fishermen of 75 years in the whole Island.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word or two in connection with this matter. I agree with my friend Mr. Coaker, in his suggestion that something should be done for the poor aged men of this country. I am not in favour of dropping that tuberculosis vote,because we are a small country and cannot afford to lose any of our population. The plague of tuberculosis is one which it is very difficult to deal with. We cannot afford to let it continue without making some effort to stop it. Go from district to district, g o from house to house, and you will find one out of every four or five suffering from the disease of tuberculosis. In my opinion, Sir, this is worse than smallpox, because a person who has smallpox has some chance of getting well; but, Sir, when one has tuberculosis one has no hope. I know several cases in my own district. Before I was sent here to this house, many and many a day and night have I spent with a family suffering from this disease, and nothing being done to relieve and assist them. There are families in my district today which I consider ought to be receiving benefit from this work, but who are not receiving any. As a result of my influence the Doctor went over on several occasions, and I may say to his credit, did much to help the people. His work has certainly had the effect of doing much good over there. I know the condition of the poor fisherman, as he is called, and I don't think the title is warranted. I think the House ought not to be referring to the fishermen in such terms as the poor fisherman. I think, Sir, it is a degrading title, and we should refer to them as fishermen of this country. If there is a man whom I admire it is the fisherman. I do not call him poor. Some are a good bit better off than I am. These are the bone and sinew of the country. They are to us what the British Navy is to Great Britain. If we did not have them we would be like Great Britain without her ships patrolling the Atlantic Ocean, the Indian Ocean, the North Sea and the Mediterranean Sea. They are, as I have said, the bone and sinew of the country, and I think this Government and every other Government should do all in their power to assist the fisherman when unable to do his work at the ages of 70 or 75. He is then not able to go to the fishery, and I think a Government ought to do its best to provide the means for him to live comfortably the remaining years of his life. I believe if the Government saw their way clear they would really do their best to grant another twenty thousand dollars to pay four hundred fishermen pensions of the small amount of $50 per year. They alone of the whole country have not been looked after, and we find some today who are 75 years old and have never learned to do anything but catch codfish. Yet Sir, we find them to-day, a great many of them fighting for the Empire. Forgetful of home of parents and of self, many of them have gone to fight for

us, and to sustain the traditions of the British Empire.

I say to this Government of which I am a member, that if the Finance Minister can but see his way clear, if we have any surplus, I shall be very pleased to support any effort made in that behalf. We, all of us, Mr. Chairman, are growing old, but which of us is more deserving than the fishermen who form the backbone of the Colony. As has been so well stated by my friend on the other side of the House, Mr. Coaker, the system as it now stands is one inaugurated from the Home Country. But let us, as a Government continue as well as we can this policy, so that when we go out of power it may stand as a monument raised up in our remembrance. Politics make strange bedfellows, and a member can never count with certainty upon the support of those who promise him their support. It is up to the Government, I take it, Mr. Chairman, to see this matter through, and to see that the old fishermen who sent their lives building up this country so that we, all of us, might live in it, shall not want when perhaps harder times come with old age. With fifty dollars added to his own earnings, and the income which perhaps his little farm yields, and the occasional help of a son or daughter in the United States, he is in assured comfort when old age overtakes him. I would give my heartiest support to these pensions, Mr. Chairman, as I think they supply a very great need in our midst.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS— This is a matter, Mr. Chairman, which occupies the interest and attention of every man in this Assembly, and my own personal feelings and experience prompt me to state that every credit is due to the Prime Minister who initiated this system of Old Age Pensions, for I well remember that when this very question was under debate some years ago, the majority considered that the scheme was both impossible and impracticable by reason of the limited financial abilities of the country. Indeed these men rather urged that reductions in public expenditure should be practised. There is ample room, I admit, for expenditure as regards roads and bridges, and every demand should be met, I take it, Mr. Chairman, as well as circumstances may permit. I should be very sorry indeed to see in any way the tuberculosis grant decreased, rather would I like to see it increased, for in my opinion, it is not large enough. For, as we are all well aware, there are large numbers of families in this Island unfortunately suffering from that disease, and it is only by means of a grant such as this that those in charge can reach these people and lend them a helping hand. The welfare of this Colony depends upon the economic powers of our fishermen, whose trade forms practically the only source of wealth that we have.

I have, Mr. Chairman, given special attention to the speeches delivered here this afternon from my friends, Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Lloyd and others. A few days ago they spoke at some length in reference to the great and pressing necessity of everything being done by the Government to encourage the fishermen of this country to help out the fish industry. Every word they said was true, and most serious consideration ought to be given to the remarks of those hon. gentlemen. More ought to be done in this direction than has been done in the past. There is one particular point to which the hon. leader of the Opposition referred at some length, and that, Mr. Chairman, is the pressing question of cold storage or bait depots. This is a matter which should receive the full consideration of the Government, for you

cannot expect the fishermen of this country to carry on the trade of this Colony unprovided with the necessary bait to enable them to catch the fish. The only practicable way out of this difficulty is to provide bait depots. As Mr. Coaker stated here a few days ago, as long as the arctic current washes our shores, will this Island possess her great codfishery. But what are you doing to increase the value of this fishery, the gold mine of the Colony,in your legislation? If the Government can see their way clear to vote twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars to Old Age Pensions, I say by all means let them. I have no doubt that when the Finance Minister comes to square his accounts that he will find some means of satisfying the demands in this connection, and add some twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars to the list of Old Age Pensions. I have no doubt that the Prime Minister will do all that he can to facilitate matters. I myself viewed as an impossibility a few years ago his attempt to allow fifty dollar pensions. I now wish to state that the Opposition should get every credit for bringing the matter up for debate at this present moment. The Premier is anxious to concur with their demands and ideas as far as is possible, but, of course, it must be taken into consideration that every day demands are made upon him, as the Opposition will know well, if ever they sit on this side of the House of Assembly.

Before closing my remarks, I would like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Lloyd, and as has already been said, I hope that he will enjoy that position for many years. I also extend my best wishes to him and hope that he will adorn that position—no, not for many years, because I hope that in time he will come to occupy some important and lucrative position. We all admire the English characteristics for which he is so well known. He is honest, brave and fearless. I heard not many months ago that he was likely to retire from political life. That is a thing which I should be very sorry to see. I always enjoy hearing his musical voice, and his melodious foreign accent. He is, Mr. Speaker, entitled to all the praise that can be given him, and I can only hope that he will enjoy the responsibilities of his office.

MR. TARGETT—I have very much pleasure in endorsing the remarks from both sides of the House regarding these old age pensions. It has been suggested that this is a popular subject, but I am not concerned whether my remarks are popular or not. As long as I am doing my duty I am not concerned whether I am popular or not. My mind is to do my duty to the best of my ability, and leave the rest outside. I may say that for a number of years I have thought about the pensions that civil servants have been getting, and I have often wondered why civil servants have been getting pensions while the poor worn-out fishermen of the country have not been getting anything. Now, as far as it goes, I have a great respect for the civil servants. I believe they should get pensions, but I do not believe they should be getting the enormous ones they have been receiving. To my mind these pensions have the effect of making men extravagant in going through life. For instance, it seems likely that a man receiving a large salary will be a little extravagant and say to himself: "I will be getting a pension in a few years' time, and I will not try to save up anything for a rainy day," and for that reason it seems to me that this pension is likely to make a man more extravagant than if he had no pension in sight. Now with regard to the aged people in the different districts, there are quite a number of them in need. The Minister of Marine and Fisher-

ies thought it was not right to call them poor. I do not think it right to call all the fishermen poor, because some of them are very rich, but a large number of the worn-out fishermen are not very rich. I can think of several today, men that began at the fishery at the age of nine or ten, and who have worked and risked their lives time and again to support their wives and families and help the country up; and as has often been remarked, the fishermen are the backbone of the country, and if it were not for the fishermen of this country there would not be very much to be got out of this country. I fear there would not be very many lawyers or doctors or other professional men in this country but for the fishermen, because there would be nobody to keep the country going. That is my mind towards it, and I believe the worn-out fishermen should be looked after better than has been done in the past. I give the Government credit for what they have done as regards the old age pension, but I do not believe they have given them enough. I believe the Government could easily have given a few more fifty dollar bills—a few more pensions. There is lots of money that can be spent in ways that do not do half as much good. In fact there has been quite a good many fifty dollars spent in this country that to my mind was wasted; and I think the Government should try to make some improvement. Now, I noticed when the Minister of Public Works was speaking, he said he was surprised where the Premier found all the money, but I am not surprised, especially when I see all the money that is spent in this country that could be put to better use. Now if the Government of the day were in earnest about this matter, I believe there is a way they could give a few more aged men pensions. There is always room for improvement. A man that is doing business for a number of years can see ways to make improvements, and it is the same way to my mind with Governments, and Governments have been running in this country for a number of years, and I am surprised there has not been any improvement made before with regard to the aged people of the country, and I am sure it will not be much trouble for the Government to see their way clear to make improvements in this way. There are lots of places in which there could be retrenchment made, and a few dollars given to the aged people of the country, and I have no doubt that if the Government will look into this matter and try and help out these men they will find a way of doing it. These men are warriors. A man that starts out at the age of ten, and time and again runs the risk of his life to support his family, and his country, so to speak, to my mind, that man is a warrior. From time to time quite a number of men have lost their lives in the codfishery and the sealfishery: and the men that are running the risk of their lives from year to year to keep up the country as well as support their families are warriors; and I think the Government should do their best to make improvements, and I trust that the Government will.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to make one or two remarks on this subject. From the few members that have spoken on this side of the House and on the other side, it is apparent that there is a great deal of sympathy for the suggestion that has been brought before the House by the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Abbott. Someone has offered the suggestion that this is a popular subject. Well, in a question like this that affects the aged people of this country, I think it small to suggest such a thing when the subject is brought to the attention of the House. It is a most serious subject. It is a vital subject, and

I may say that the lack of funds to support our aged people and give them the few necessities of life when they are going down the hill and nearing the border line, often has the effect of hurrying them off owing to the lack of comforts they would receive if they had this money for their use. I do not suppose the suggestions offered this afternoon will be put into effect till a few weeks or months before the General Election. I would not like to make any unkind remarks, but that has been the experience of Governments and it is particularly so in reference to this Government. You have always made glowing pre-election promises, and it will be a great thing for you to say in a manifesto a few months before the election of 1917, that you propose to increase the old age pensions, and that all the old people in the country will be getting a pension if you are returned to power. Politics has a demoralizing effect on any people when promises like that are made, and has a very bad effect upon the people of this country. It may be used to a certain extent when the comforts of the people are not endangered or not lessened, but when a matter like this is brought before the House political attitude and political spirit should be forgotten and means should be provided so that the number of applicants who are now seeking these few dollars may have their request granted. I suppose there are fifteen or twenty applicants in the hands of the Registrar of Old Age Pensions from the men of Fogo District, and we cannot do anything for them and must wait for someone to die to give a pension. It has been called a pension but it is more like a pauper dole; because the condition of the applicant has to be considered, and if by hard work and self-denial he has saved a few dollars for his old days, that has to be enquired into. If he is the owner of a house or the owner of any property, that will disqualify him. If he has a son who is working early and late to make both ends meet, and he happens to be successful at the fishery, he has to help nis aged parents out. That is all right, but all these things go to prove that it is only a pension in name and not in reality. It has been brought to the attention of the Government that in cases where there were two old people—husband and wife—both getting a little help from the Relieving Officer—a paltry donation—if the old gentleman was fortunate enough to get the fifty dollar pension the amount he was receiving from the Relieving Officer was cut off, and his wife would no longer receive any allowance. I think that has been proved. Instances can be cited where that has taken place.

Now we give you all the credit for making an attempt to do something; but I believe if you were going to the polls next fall you would put this in your estimates. You can find money for lots of things. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has offered a suggestion, but I do not know if he means to curtail any other grants. Perhaps he will cut off the grant for dredging. I don't know if he will agree to that or not.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES— Grand Bank would not.

MR. HALFYARD.—Well all right, what about cutting the grant for agriculture? I suppose the Commissioner would not be satisfied with that. Whatever grant you touch you will find someone objecting and saying it cannot be done without. Now I would propose, and I believe the Commissioners will support the suggestion, that this year we do without the grant for agriculture. Where you have twenty thousand dollars cut off fifteen thousand and allocate it to old age pensions. Then you will be doing

something and we will praise you for your attempt to help the poor men who are worn out in making this country what it is .

There is no need to dwell on the hardships of the fishermen. We are dependent upon them for the revenues of this country. We all know that, and they know it themselves. The hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Jennings, has said that every third fish that is caught by the fishermen goes towards paying the revenue of this country. That is only one third. I think we may say that they are taxed to a higher extent than that. We are depending upon the fishermen to carry on the business of this country, and when we say that, we are not speaking for the purpose of gaining popularity. The view that we take of it is that it is outside the realm of popularity. We are speaking upon a matter which affects the whole of this country. We have debated it time and again for years. It has been a pet subject when looking for votes, and incidentally it may appear popular for the Opposition to bring it up; but I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that we are dealing with it as a matter of duty and it is in that light that we express our opinion upon it. I think that the vote for Agriculture should be cut out and an extra $20,000 voted for old age pensions.

MR. CLAPP.—Mr. Chairman, when I spoke upon this subject in support of the position taken by the hon. member for Twillingate, I had no desire to seek popularity so far as my district is concerned. In fact, I think the Government will admit that I am too popular in that district already. I only had in view the old broken down fishermen. I have seen many of them in the district of St. Barbe and really your heart goes out to them.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—What about your pocket?

MR. CLAPP.—I attend to that too, but I don't let my right hand know what my left hand does in that connection. But many of these old men are very poorly off and as the hon. member has said it is not through any fault of theirs. In many cases it has been brought about by poor fisheries or trying to raise large families; and now that some of the members of those families are fighting in the interests of the Empire, it is only fair we ought provide a further twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars towards granting pensions to these men. I don't want to delay the House; I merely rose for the purpose of disabusing the minds of hon. members that I had any object in backing up the remarks of the hon. member for Twillingate in advocating a further grant—if the Government can see their way, to put aside as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries put it, $20,000 or $25,000, in order to relieve the needs of the old men who have reached the age of 70 or 75, let it be done.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, this is too important a matter not to deal with it seriously. It is one of the most important matters that could come before the House. I think the debate which has taken place is very creditable to every person concerned, but we are apt to make a mistake in taking too seriously any little remark that may be made from time to time by members on either side of the House. So far as the Finance Minister's statement that those on the other side of the House were raising this question for the purpose of making themselves a little popular is concerned, well, that is after all a very common expression to hear from either side of the House. I am sure that no one is going to find fault with the member for Fogo because he stated in the course of his remarks that if this were election

year a vote would be placed in the Estimates. Not that there is any truth in the observation but it is along the line of criticism one looks for and must expect from a member in opposition, but I am quite certain the hon. member did not mean it, he is laughing now himself. He knows that that is not so; he knows that it would not be in keeping with the fitness of things, or of Parliamentary etiquette to make any such charge seriously unless he was prepared to prove it. We placed that vote in the Estimates after much consideration; and I may say now, for the information of the House that this is one of the matters that occupied the serious attention of the Government when we were discussing the Estimates; every item was fully gone into and was carefully considered by the Government, not once or twice, but ten times, when these estimates were before us. There were some votes we might have cut down and some we could have increased Now there are 1200 old fishermen in the country today getting pensions of $50 each, who six or seven years ago had no pension. No one claims that that is the amount we would allocate to them if we had plenty of money, but we have to cut our garment according to our cloth, and we have done our best up to the present in providing $60,000, that is to say, $50-pensions for 1200 old men. Now there may be cases, there may be pressing cases, that must be dealt with between now and the time we meet again; and I am quite satisfied that nothing would give the Finance Minister greater pleasure than his being able to put in the Estimates a larger amount for this purpose. and hearing what has been said here this afternoon, I think the Finance Minister will be very pleased to consider this matter and see if it is possible to grant an additional amount for this vote; and I can assure the House that the Government will give the matter every consideration. I understand that there are somewhere in the neighbourhood of 400 men seeking old age pensions That number would represent all those who have applied for the last four or five years. When these pensions are granted, they generally come on the representation of some clergyman, or some reputable citizen who knows the applicant and the representative of the District is considered because of his local knowledge of the place. But no objectionable enquiry into the circumstances of the party applying; and no undue scrutiny of or enquiry into the surroundings of the applicant are made—I mean nothing of an obnoxious nature; but it is necessary before the pension is granted that the Government or the department in charge of it should be satisfied that it is a deserving case. I think it will be well to keep in view that there is quite a distinction between Old Age Pensioners and pensioners under the civil service. There is no comparison between the two at all; there never was any connection between the two; and we are only creating confusion, cheating ourselves, and misleading the public when we attempt to institute a comparison between them. What is the position of a pensioner under the civil government? You pension, under our Act, every person who holds an office, trifling or important, in this country when he arrives at a period when he can no longer perform his duties. Now why do you do that? You do it because it is done by private people or concerns as a rule whenever they are able to do it. No man with an old servant who has served him faithfully for years will turn him out on the street and let him die because he is aged and worn out; and so we find, for instance, under the

British Government, under the Parliaments of the Dominions or of the Colonies, and indeed in most countries, that members of the civil service are always pensioned or retired on an allowance when they arrive at the time when they cannot perform their duties But besides the personal aspect, there is the more important reason a state reason, and it is this: It encourages these people and makes them work better; it holds out an inducement to them to perform more faithful service; it ensures greater honesty because when a man knows that he is going to be looked after when he becomes old, well, then he is more likely to give good service to the State than if he had not this assurance, and you render him more independent, more careful, and more particular about the faithful performance of his duties. Why there are men in the civil service in this country to-day who could make their salaries ten times over, if they wanted to be dishonest and provide in this manner for their old age. It would be hard to find a more honest and deserving class; by means of pensions you protect these civil servants, you remove the temptation from their paths, and you get better service for the State by letting them know, by making them feel and believe that when the day arrives when they, after faithfully observing the obligations of their offices, can no longer work, that you will give them a substantial and (having regard to the country and its powers of meeting obligations) a reasonable retiring allowance This has been the history of the Colony, as Mr. Jennings has said, ever since Responsible Government was granted to it, and even as far back as 1833, when the prerogative of Representative Government was first conferred upon our land, civil servants, their active life work over, were retired on allowances well-merited. Consider our Pension Bill to-day; if you look at it —at the Bill now before you, the one we annually pass—you, will find, I think, that about 70 pensions are included in it; not many considering the thousands of civil servants in the country; and the total amount voted under it for this specific purpose is about $23,000 or about $300 for each person. In this Colony we have never gone beyond that amount and we never had more officials pensioned than are now protected by that measure, viz.: about seventy pensioners; and I say that is one of the best votes we could have because it is meritorious in every way, it is necessary, it is justly essential, and more than that it sets a good example that the whole country may well follow with advantage—the providing for faithful servants; and, as I said before, it is an incentive to these civil employees to well and faithfully administer the trust that has been placed in their hands, and thereby you confer still another benefit—you remove from their paths all possible temptation to devote their energies in any other channel save the State. By voting a pension you make him independent and he knows that when the day comes when work is possible for him no longer that you will pension him and he will be cared for if his service merits this consideration. That is the reason why we grant pensions; and it is not fair to ourselves, not fair to the old age pensioners, not fair to civil servants generally, to institute comparison between this form of pensioning and the other—more commonly known as "Old Age Pensions."

My friend, the hon. member for Brigus, referred to what he terms "discrimination" in the allotment of pensions. Let me say positively that there is no discrimination at all. We came into power seven years ago and

found that no provision had been made for assisting old aged fishermen; and we gave them old age pensions. But we did not give them a pension of fifty dollars in recognition of years of service passed in the performance of public duties as civil servants; we gave them pensions because their years of participation in avocations that have done so much and are doing so much for the common weal entitled them, in our opinion, to this tribute to their worth; we gave them some assistance, but we would very much have liked to have been able to give them more. And in bringing down such a measure as this, we were merely following a precedent that had been established in Australia, New Zealand, England, Germany and many other countries—the institution of Old Age Pensions. Some of these countries have been able to grant nearly double what we have been and are doing; but these countries are richer than we are, and can afford to give more in pensions. Take Newfoundland to-day. We have to carefully consider the class of man who is paying the pension, the tax payer. Remember the average earnings in this country per family do not amount to $400. The earnings of our laboring classes, artisans, and fishermen (the latter representing a comparatively small proportion of the population of St. John's in contradistinction to the outports, where fishermen predominate) taken as a whole, will not average more than $400 per family; whereas if you go, for instance, to Nova Scotia our next door neighbour, you will probably find that the average earnings there total more than $1,000 per family per year. In Ontario this average is larger again, perhaps double, and I should say that it is nearly four times that in New Zealand. Consequently, these people being richer than we are, can allocate much more towards social measures, such as Old Age Pensions, because they can get more revenue from taxation. For example: last year in New Zealand the revenue was about $60,000,000. Now their population is just four times ours—they have a population of one million, we have a population of a quarter of a million—and if their revenue were computed on the basis of population it ought to be four times as much as ours. But we collected last year four million dollars, whilst they collected sixty million dollars. Accordingly, therefore, they can easily afford to give four times the amount we give towards these pensions, and, in fact, allocate nearly the same proportion to every other public service, because the earning power of their people is far greater than ours. The same is true of Nova Scotia and the other Canadian provinces. Hence, we have to cut our cloth according to our measure. It would be a very nice thing to give everyone a pension when that person came to a certain age; it would be excellent for every old man to have a pension coming to him as of right, as is done in some other countries, and as it was advocated here; but in our circumstances that would be simply taking the money out of one pocket and putting it into another, because we cannot give pensions to everybody in the country without extracting the amount from someone else. The correct policy is to do what we can along wise lines —lines such as we have followed. Take the case of the ordinary outport fisherman. As I said before, here in St. John's we have merchants and professional men, labouring classes and artisans, but very few fishermen, whereas the population in the outports is composed mostly of fishermen. Now nearly every outport fisherman has his own home; very few are tenants,—you could count those that are tenants on your fingers; he has his stage and plot of land, his furniture, and other belongings. He rears a

family, and during the rearing of his children all goes well as a rule. He helps pay to the revenue of the Colony, and in fact, as has been stated, he is truly called the mainstay of the country—the bone and sinew of the land. When the old man's family is reared, the girls as a rule get married and the boys act similarly. Generally one of the children remains home—either a boy stays with the old people and gets married and brings in his wife, and a new generation springs up, or the opposite happens—all the boys leave, and one of the daughters remains behind marries, and husband and wife live with the wife's parents. As a rule, therefore, only small assistance from the State is necessary, because it happens rarely that the old man is left entirely dependent on himself; it generally happens that he has a son or a son-in-law to help, and that is why a $50 pension is allotted to him and makes him in a large measure altogether inde pendent. We do not consider that this amount is the measure of what he deserves or of what we would give him if we had means. It is simply an honorarium, so that in his declining years he would not feel the pinch of poverty. There are three or four hundred cases of deserving fishermen over the country, and if we had another $20,000 I do not know of any vote on which we would sooner expend it, because after all it is a necessity—not a luxury. Many of our services are luxuries that we could exist without; but this, as it was stated, is an essential; and for that reason I am quite satisfied that everyone in this House is as one on the question of helping this measure along as much as possible. I should like to assure the House that if it is possible to do anything more this year in relation to this matter,it will be done—but remember we are not yet out of the wood. I hope we may have a surplus this year—I believe we will have a surplus but it will be small, and there are other obligations and other liabilities facing us that have also to be met. Yet I think I can assure the House that any special case of the nature referred to that arises between now and the time when we shall again meet will be considered, and, if possible, the wishes expressed here this evening will be carried out.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I would just like to say a word or two in reply to the Rt. Hon. the Premier. He has made two statements with which I cannot altogether agree; and as the points raised by them are, both from the viewpoint of this side of the House, and in the opinion of the Fishermen's Union, very important, I wish to make a few observations thereon. The Premier in his address, justified in every possible way the pensioning of civil servants,and drew distinction between pensioning civil servants and paying an amount to old age fishermen. With regard to civil service pensions: a great many of the men thus pensioned do not deserve them, and have not earned them, and should not get them. A man may today enter the civil service at the age of sixty-five; he is generally worn-out before he was placed in the position; he remains there for four or five years, and at the end of that time he is pensioned at two-thirds his salary. Because such a man had a certain amount of political pull he is placed in the civil service; and it is not fair to class him with a man who entered the service far earlier in life, just because he has reached the age when pensions are allotted. Such a man should not receive a pension of two-thirds his salary and be thus placed on the same level with the man who entered the service at the age of 25 and remained there till he was 75. We have always contended that that principle is wrong, and we have sug-

gested that the Government should institute some scheme for the creation of a fund in connection with civil service pensions. The establishment of such a fund would mean that every man would contribute so much of his salary to the fund from which his pension would be drawn, and when the time arrived for the apportioning of his pension—when he had come to a certain age—he would be entitled to a specified retiring allowance, but only in proportion to the amount which he had paid into the fund. Take the case of clergymen, for instance. We never hear of any application from these men for old age pensions; they are public men; they do far better work than many men in the civil service; their labours are in a great many instances arduous and unceasing; and yet when they come to old age, and their days of self-support are over, we never see of them petitioning for old age pensions.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—They hope for a reward in another world, and look forward to that alone.

MR. COAKER—We all hope for a reward in another world. There are clergymen in this country to-day, some of them eighty years of age, who are drawing comfortable pensions; why? The pensions do not come from the Government; they come from the fund towards which these clergymen have been contributing since they entered the Ministry. Such a fund as this should be established in the civil service; the scheme presents no difficulties, and it might be carried out very easily. But before being entered upon it should be given great consideration, for it would necessarily have to be properly elaborated. It seems to me to be the fairest plan to adopt; let every man put a certain proportion of his income into the fund, and when he arrives at a certain age let him receive a pension in proportion to what he has paid in. In any case, the State, as of right, should look after its servants, and State aid should be added to such contributions of the officials, and I believe the plan thus outlined would be effective. I also wish to speak about the method of allotting pensions. Allow me to quote a case in point: A certain sub-collector at Fogo was, some time ago, pensioned. He was very well able to work, and there was no necessity for retiring him; but the Government wanted to get him out of the way to put a party-supporter in his place, and so they gave him a pension of $400 and retired him. But what did this man do? Why he started out teaching school. He, an old age pensioner, went up to a small settlement and opened a school. He had saved during his time as sub-collector a sum of four or five thousand dollars, and was in very comfortable circumstances.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—What case was that?

MR. COAKER—It was one that occurred some years ago; it did not happen in your administration; you were not bad enough to do that.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I thought so.

MR. COAKER—This old man died and left an estate worth four or five thousand dollars. I know of another case that took place in the Department of Public Works. I know you pensioned a man there when there was no reason for so doing.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—He had applied for a pension three years previously.

MR. COAKER—I do not know whether he applied for it or not; he should not have got it; he was a strong, healthy man, able to get over Water Street as fast as I can to-day; he was quite capable of doing his work,—but another man wanted his job—someone else got it—and he was pensioned. I do not agree with these things. You should never have given

that man a pension whether he asked for it or not as long as his health was good.

The Rt. Hon. the Premier said that civil servants could make lots of money if they were not told they were going to be looked after in their old age; he said that if some of them chose to be dishonest they could make their salaries in an hour—that they could sell out the State. I do not agree with him. Take the case of Customs officials: It is not so easy for customs officers to be dishonest; everything has to be correct; there is a splendid system of auditing accounts; and a man has to be a pretty clever man if he is going to defraud the Customs, because he can and will be found out. Anyway, most of them are too honest to do it. A man came to me when I was sub-collector, and said: "I hear you, as Customs Officer, get 20 per cent. of all duties collected on goods entering this port. Now you give me 10 per cent. and I will get all the goods possible brought in here." I said: "There is the door—go."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—But they are not all Coakers; we all could not be subjected to such temptation and come through unscathed.

MR. COAKER—You never spoke a truer word. There is a discrimination even now between the aged fishermen, as regards this pension. You see a man named John Brown living in one place, and right next door to him is another man named John Jones. Both of them are 75 years of age; both of them have raised families paid their merchants 100 cents in the dollar, and now they have no means of support. You make arrangements to give one man fifty dollars a year and the other man next door gets nothing. He has done the same thing for the Colony; he has raised his family; he has worked just as hard, and he has just as much right to get that $50 as the other. Fifty dollars a year is a splendid help to these old men. It is a great assistance to them in every way. Now are you going to allow that state of affairs to continue? If you can,get $20,000 more anywhere at all. All these men are entitled to a pension. They are entitled to it as a right, and not as a favour. Under the present system it is given to them as a favour. I say give it to them as a right, it belongs to them, and if the right exists it ought to be given to every aged fisherman. He has assisted the Colony in every way; he has reached the age of 75, and you say that you will give it to Jack but not to Tom. You have no right to leave one of them to receive pauper relief. I know one of these old men spoke to me before the election. He said to me: "Is my name on the list?" and I said: "No, it is not." Then he said: "Why isn't it?" So I asked him if he got relief and he said: "Yes, I get $3 a quarter," so I said to him, "Your name is not on the list because you are a pauper." So he looked at me and said: "Me a pauper? I have been going to the Labrador for fifty years. I have brought home thirty-three loads of codfish, and because in my old age I have come to that condition where I need assistance because my merchant has seized my vessel, and I have no way of earning a living when I am 83 years old, I get $12 from the country, and you will not give me a vote." I think that is a most awful thing. That old man was 83 years old; he had fallen into misfortune. His merchant had seized his property and had thrown him on the world. He got $12 a year out of the revenue, and he had no vote, while that man at Fogo who was getting a $400 pension, and had put away $6,000 had the vote, and was called a gentleman. John Warren was getting$12 and had no vote, while Mr. Lucas could walk in and vote as

often as he liked. Such is the system that we oppose. It is unfair. It must be altered.

The vote was adopted.

MR. LLOYD—How are these votes being passed now?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Where there are no changes in last year's votes they are passed by totals. If you want them read down in details we will do so.

MR. LLOYD—When a matter of that importance is being changed you should at least have the courtesy to ask us about it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—You were asked. Mr. Clift spoke about it this afternoon, and I explained it to him. You, I think, were absent.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman: The Minister asked me if there would be any objection taking the votes in globo. I said that I had no objection if they were the same votes as last year. If there was any new votes they ought to be explained. I did not see any object in going through all the details of last year's votes. That is the reason why I agreed, but it is quite competent for any member to ask to have the votes read in detail.

MR. COAKER—I object to the taking of the votes in this way. If you took the votes all in that way, you would get through the Estimates in half an hour. It is not because there are no changes, therefore there ought to be no discussion. You may have spent the money last year, but that does not say that you spent it right.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—We are not trying to shirk that in any way. I made that statement this afternoon. We are quite prepared to read the Estimates over twice if you want them.

MR. COAKER—Oh, I expect you would be glad to get through them in half an hour. There are two or three things that we want to talk about, for instance, the Fisheries Department. You cannot expect us to pass that vote without the Fisheries Report. You cannot expect us to pass that vote in five minutes.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I would suggest that every vote be read, and if there is any vote that it is desirable to hold over, we can allow it to stand.

MR. COAKER—As I said, we have no Fisheries Report, and you cannot pass that vote without the Fisheries Report, and also the report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Postal Telegraph has not been tabled. You cannot expect us to pass that vote while that report is still in the slings.

EDUCATION VOTE.

MR. COAKER.—What is that pension of Mr. J. D. Munn?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is an arrangement under which Mr. Munn retired some 10 or 12 years ago. It will appear in the pension list next year. It is not in the Education Act now before the House.

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 asked leave to sit again.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

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 regulate further the Prosecution of the Sealfishery," without amendment.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that in reply to

their message of the 23rd of March, instant, on the subject of the Bill, "An Act to regulate further the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery," that they had appointed the Hons. Messrs. Bishop, Harvey, Winter, Gibbs, Goodridge, Templeman and Murphy, a Select Committee of the House of Assembly, in relation to the said Bill.

Mr Speaker informed the House that His Excellency the Governor would receive the Address in Reply on Thursday afternoon at three of the clock instead of Wednesday as previously announced.

EDUCATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the law relating to Education."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can add anything more to the explanation that I gave the other day, in introducing this bill, when I moved the second reading. I then pointed out that it is really a codification and consolidation of the whole Education Law of the Colony. In the past the Act was structurally imperfect and any information in relation to any particular subject had to be sought all over the Act. Anyone who looked at the bill now presented will find that every subject has been appropriately grouped under its own head, wherever there are any amendments of any importance as we go along I shall call the attention of the House to them. The greater number of them are merely declarations of what has been the general practice for many years. I think that you will find that the bill will be of great advantage not alone to the Superintendents but also to the teachers whose duties are more particularly defined and to school boards whose powers are set forth for the first time and of everyone interested in this education question. The only regret that I have is that we are not in a position to-day to make any recommendation for an increase in the grant. There is no doubt that the various departments of education, especially in the vote for Board Schools and for sparsely populated districts, require an increase. There is still room for more schools and better results than now exist, but I hope that there is a good time coming when the Finance Minister will come in here and recommend to the Legislature a substantial increase in the Education Vote. It is really one of the few votes that goes directly back to the tax-payer; a great many votes that you are passing to-day in the Estimates, a great deal of the four million dollars are given back to the tax-payer, only in indirect advantages. He pays the interest on the public debt and he gets the indirect advantage of the public services represented by the public debt, but the Education vote gives a direct result to the Tax-payer. In other words he gets a direct advantage in the free education of his children from the money which he pays in. I do not know any other vote in the Estimates that more correctly illustrates that principle and it is a pleasure to know that of the $360,000 voted, most of it goes directly back to the voter. I beg to move the first section.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, it is rather a coincidence when the very day this bill was introduced that we should see in the public press a statement of the intention of the enemy, that the Germans were getting ready for the industrial fight to take place after the war is over for the control

of the world trade. The instrument the Germans are forging is the education instrument. I regret with the Prime Minister that what we are now considering is merely a consolidation of the Education Statutes. The consolidation is very important. It tends to make clear what the law is. We want in Newfoundland to forge an education instrument to make Newfoundland the Scotland of the New World. Education in Scotland has given prominence to Scotchmen throughout the world. Unfortunately education in this country is handicapped by scarcity of money. I know the good work clergymen, school-masters, boards of education, are doing, and I think it will be found that their main difficulty is finance. This naturally impedes the work. I am not looking into this matter from a party standpoint. An educational policy ought to be a national one, and a non party one.

In the first place teachers should be trained for their profession. I cannot understand why teachers should not have expert training. We must train a man for his business. Here, with conditions as they are, there is little opportunity for them to be trained. I venture to make that statement in the presence of those who have to do with teachers. I venture to say that they will be the first to back me up. I had some connection with the teaching profession myself. I can tell what happened then. They came to St. John's from the outports and went to Feild College. There they sat in classes with boys as a rule very much younger than themselves. They then took an examination and went out to teach what they had never been trained to teach. They had little knowledge of child life. they had studied little of the methods of teaching. How did they know what the conduct of a school should be? I say this because I have the highest regard for their employment. School-teaching is their business and they ought to have the fullest opportunity to learn how to do it. Some attempts have been made but they have not gone far enough.

I am glad to see a section empowering Boards of Examiners of different denominations to come together if they so desire for the purpose of establishing a suitable training place for teachers. I am glad the importance of this has been realized, and hope this section will be availed of. The first point, however, I wanted to call attention to was the training of teachers. The Council of Higher Education has done, and is doing excellent work. But I think it is time to look for more than a mere examination system.

I am hoping for something better; We are wasting our educational money on a little bit of Latin, a little bit of French or Algebra; we want a more compact and useful curriculum. The prime necessity, however, is the proper staffing of our schools. Except in St. John's, throughout the Island little attempt has been made or can be made properly to staff any of the schools; as a result you have in some cases 100 children put under the supervision of one teacher, who has of course, no chance of bestowing any individual attention upon each child. Until you have properly staffed the schools throughout this country you cannot begin sound education.

In a large school you have one, or perhaps two, Teachers maintaining what they call discipline. When I was a young teacher I well remember that a teacher was classed by his ability as a disciplinarian. I will tell you how discipline works out under such circumstances. The children are kept quiet. They must not disturb the teacher as he goes the round of his classes in the school room. Now, I can

tell you, speaking as an experienced school master, and a student of education that the major portion of the children are being dwarfed in the process. Far better would they be out of school in the woods, on the sea, anywhere where they may be exercising their faculties. They may not perhaps learn to do sums correctly, but they are mentally active and their imagination is at play. There they are free to question, to ask those endless question that every normal child delights in. The child wants to know. He is eager to know. He is greedy for the explanations of the delights of of his surroundings. He is educating himself, and the teachers and the parents whc in any way repress him, in doing this are doing him a grave injury.

Take the case of the unfortunate teacher who has some hundreds of pupils entrusted to his care. Is he not incapable of grappling with the situation so complex and exacting as is this one? To make any progress at all he must silence them all and attend to as many as he can. His school is not divided into class rooms. He knows that it is not properly equipped. He has neither the time nor energy nor means to take advantage of the way a child naturally educates himself. We all know the child and what a wonderful prattler he is. How he wants to make up stories. How he has his visions. How wonderfully inventive he is. For an inventor is every child. These natural activities can be taken little advantage of under the circumstances I am describing. Surely you will see how uneconomical is the present system of staffing schools. Then there is the difficulty of the sparsely populated settlements. Let me relate to you a little incident I came across on a political campaign. I usually visit the schools when on political campaigns, with a schoolmaster's interest rather than as a politician. It was a small settlement. I will mention no names, and I asked several people I met if they had a teacher. I asked if the folks here read and write? They answered, "There is no one here who can read or write, but we have got a girl who can read somewhat." I went into an important settlement nearby. On the street going up to the school, I came across some youngsters, boys and girls, about eleven years of age. The time was half-past eleven in the morning. I stopped these little folks, and asked, "Why are you not at school?" I cannot tell you how surprised they were at the stupidity of the question. They at school! The reply showed their hurt feelings. Why, Sir, we have left school. I asked how old they were, and they answered 11, and they were indignant at the idea that young women of eleven, or a young man of twelve, should be expected to be at school. These points I think suffice to show the urgency and need of being up and doing. I have every admiration for what Sir Edward Morris has endeavoured to accomplish in the way of education. But he has not done enough, nor a quarter enuough. I may tell you, Sir, that before I got into this House the first time, I was fully determined that education was one of the subjects that I would press forward whenever I got the chance, and those who know can attest my labours before I got a seat in this Assembly. I will do all I can to advocate increases of funds for education. The Prime Minister well knows that in those days in the summer of 1904, he and I had several conferences as to what might be done in this connection on the next session. At the time the Synod had assembled. Sir Robert Bond was in England. The result of our common endeavours was the forward step in granting educa-

tional money. I will tell you the little bit of advice I was once given by an old politician. He said to me that if I desired to go into politics I should keep clear of education above all things. I replied that I did not care how dangerous the task, I could not follow that advice. Let me give you a little experience. I went into a little settlement in Trinity Bay. The people were strongly hostile to me. When we went there we engaged a school room, in which to hold our meeting. They declined to enter that school room and hear our talk. Seeing how matters stood, I thought that it was useless to hold a meeting, but suggested that instead we may have a little chat. I sat on the table. I began by asking them if their school room was good enough and they answered "No." A further question elicited the fact that for the past six months they had had no teacher. "Do you want one?" I asked. They answered in the affirmative. "Why do you not, then?" said I, "get busy. We chatted on and at last held a political meeting and talked education for an hour, and when the time for my departure came they loaded their guns and gave me a royal send-off. That was a venture in a new direction, and it touched a responsive cord in their hearts. I give you this instance to show you that the time is come when the people are taking an interest in these matters. They are waking up. I have traced these points very briefly, but I would wish to impress them upon the attention of this House. First of all, schools need more money and a great deal more money. The first and foremost purpose of that money is to train teachers to know how to do their life work. Then we want some authority to tell us what is the best curriculum to develop the resources of Newfoundland. The best asset of Newfoundland is the child; but having that asset you want to give him brain power and knowledge of the kind that will be of advantage to him—not merely some book knowledge. I enjoy a book as much as anyone. That is for the leisure hour. What we want is a good course. It is very difficult to find. You will want able men to tackle the problem; men who know child life and child development, who know what it is possible for a school to do and for a school teacher to do. It is not an easy matter. These kind of problems will have to be tackled if Newfoundland is to make the best use of her resources.

Now, it has often been remarked that a Newfoundlander does pretty well when he goes abroad. That is correct, and it is because a Newfoundlander has a natural education. The school education is not worth the snap of my fingers as compared with the natural education. The child is out in the boat, and on the sea, and in the woods. He becomes vigorous and learns his way about. He helps his father to build the boat, and build the house and row the boat and sail the boat. That is the education that gives handiness to Newfoundlanders. I am not disparaging school education; but I am pointing out that school education, valuable as it is, must go on the lines of the good work in Newfoundland to-day. We must make our school work run on parallel lines with this natural education. We have good material if we make proper use of it. With a good educational policy in Newfoundland, we can make Newfoundland within the next twenty years the New Scotland of North America.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, with reference to sub-section (b) there are two points I would like to draw attention to and make suggestion. First, I would suggest that the word "man"

be stricken out, so that ladies can take a place on the Board.

The other point is that many on this side of the House think it would be desirable to alter that clause there, so that a member who retires should not be eligible for re-election within a period of one year. There is a tendency at the present time for Boards to continue the same constitution year in and year out without any new material coming in at all.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Of course as I pointed out to-day, the object of that is to meet the difficulty of finding suitable men to take their place. In many cases it is almost impossible to get a man to fill the place of the man going out, and it is desirable to avoid that by still having him eligible for re-appointment if necessary. However, I will take a note of that.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, the objection to many of the Boards is this, that the Parson forms the Board. He sends on the list of appointments and the Government puts them in the Gazette. These are not always the best men in the community—not always the best men in the interest of education. They generally consist of business men, and business men are not always the best men to have on the Board. I have had an experience myself in connection with Herring Neck, where we had a business man on the Board, and in spite of the law he did not retire. The Parson retained him year after year and the authorities upheld him. Herring Neck is without a Superior School because business men stayed on the Board and backed up the Parson, and the children had to do with an inferior education when they might have had a good one. Now, one man retiring will not make a great deal of difference to a Board of four or five members. If he has been a good man the same system will be carried on by the remaining members of the Board. It is a good thing to have a man retiring every year. From the experience I have had it is my opinion that the people should be allowed to elect their own Boards. Each denomination ought to meet at some time—say at Easter when they have their Church meeting —and the people of that denomination ought to have the right to elect their own Boards every second year. The Board should not simply consist of whoever the Parson wants, because there are scores of Parsons in Newfoundland that know very little about the requirements of education in this country. I have had the experience and I have fought them for years, and I say to-day that the educational condition of the people of Herring Neck is a disgrace to the Clergymen that have worked there. They have had plenty of money to keep a good school open, but instead of keeping one good school in a centre and given the children the benefit, they have scattered the money in lots, and the result is that very little benefit has come from it at all. I suppose there is no place in Green Bay where the children are so far behind.

I am not in favour of that section. Let the law remain as it was. There is no good purpose to be served by this. If there is a good man on the Board, the good work will continue after he goes off. I am not going to suggest in connection with this Bill any alteration in any of the parts, but this thing is one of the planks in the Fishermen's Union Bonavista platform and if we come back in control of the Government, school boards will be elected by the people, and they will be able to select their own man.

Dr. Lloyd also made an amendment in connection with the word "layman" so that ladies could be members of these Boards. There are plenty of

ladies in the various communities that would make good material for members of these boards. They are accustomed to looking after children, and many of them are, perhaps, school teachers who have married and settled down in these places.

Now the Fishermen's Protective Union does not hold the idea that the whole public should select the whole Board. Take the Church of England, for instance; once a year they assemble for their Easter vestry meeting; the Methodists have another time to meet and do the general work of their Church. At these meetings a Board for two years should be elected by the people assembled, and all the trouble would be over. You will find that if you let the people elect the Board, they will always elect those who will do the best work in the interests of education.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will consider those suggestions, Mr. Chairman, and I would now move the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again 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 again.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 29, 1916.

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

The Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the following documents:—

Report of the Municipal Board for the year 1915.

Expenditure St. John's Municipal Council 1915.

Estimated Revenue Municipal Board for 1916.

Interim Report of Public Schools under Church of England Boards for the year ending June 30th 1915.

PETITIONS.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to present to the House today a petition from the inhabitants of Little Bay Islands, asking for the sum of $100 to make a road to the new school which they have erected. The petitioners point out that they built this school at a cost of $4,000. The ordinary road grant is small, and it is all needed on the local and main line roads in that locality, and there is no money to spare from that source, and so they ask for a special grant for this purpose. I have no doubt that this grant is badly needed. and trust that the wishes of the petitioners will be met. I ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker. I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants on the north side of Joe Batt's Arm, in the Electoral district of Fogo asking for $100 for the purpose of building a road. The petitioners set forth as follows: (petition read) It has been largely signed by the people who reside in that locality and I trust that its prayer will be sympathetically considered by the Department to which it relates.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker. I beg to present a petition from the residents of Sergeant's Cove, Fogo. Their request is that a sum of money be allocated to build a breakwater at that place. The petition is as follows: (reads petition). If the prayer of that petition were acceded to and the breakwater built, it would be of

great assistance to these people. As it will be noticed, this petition has been largely signed by residents of Fogo and adjacent places. I beg to ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the consideration that its great importance demands.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to present a petition from Trout River, Bonne Bay. The petitioners are asking for the extension of telegraphy there. Trout River is a flourishing settlement and is still growing. There is great difficulty in getting there, with certain winds by boat and the fishermen would deem it a graceful act on the part of the government to establish a telegraph office there, and it would prove of material assistance to the people. I do not know whether the Premier when visiting that district called at Trout River, but I presume he did, and he would thus be conversant with the customs that prevail there It would cost the government a very small sum; but it would enhance them in the estimation of these people, and their action would be appreciated by the people of that part of the district of St. Barbe. I beg to ask that the petition be referred to the department of the Colonial Secretary.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary laid on the table of the House copies of correspondence relative to Mr. Hennebury, telegraph operator at Beaverton in answer to question of Mr. Coaker.

The Minister of Public Works laid on the table of the House a statement asked for by Mr. Coaker.

Mr. Winsor gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Stone gave notice of question.

Mr Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

INFLAMMABLE OILS BILL.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to amend and consolidate the Law in relation to Inflammable Oils"

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	$215,593.33
Pensions	23,302.99
Administration of Justice.	150,337.34
Legislation	33,780.00
Education	5,300.00

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.

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 OF FINANCE.—Mr. Chairman. I promised yesterday to have with me to-day copies of the accounts for the members of the House. I regret that as they were in the hands of the binder I could not get them for to-day. I will bring them with me to-morrow whether bound or not.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. Before we take up the Estimates I would like to make a few enquiries with regard to the education estimates. I have in my hands a statement tabled by the Colonial Secretary for Departmental Trust Accounts. I would like to enquire in the first place where these credits come from. By what authority they come there; and then why a number of educational items that come from year to year are not in the

estimates but put in this contingency account. For instance half the items are educational grants which occur from year to year. I am quite satisfied to let this matter be attended to to-morrow.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I will have this information for the Hon. member to-morrow.

On vote for Musgrave Hr. Relieving Officer, $20.

MR. HALFYARD—Officer at Musgrave Hr. $40?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—No. $20

MR. HALFYARD—I am so sorry. I was delighted to think that this man was getting an increase. Now I find to my regret that it was all a delusion. I am truly disappointed to find that this vote is the same as last year. There is a man at Musgrave Hr. who has to take in the whole section of Fogo district from Cape Freels all the straight shore including part of Gander Bay. He gets $20. Not enough to pay him for answering letters. I called this fact to the attention of the House when in Committee last year. Fogo district gets altogether $60 divided between two relieving officers. $60 for two officers who have the whole district. The officer at Fogo gets $40 and the man at Musgrave Hr. $20. The gentleman who held that office has since passed away. Seeing you have appointed a new man I think you ought to do better in the way of a salary for him. We find that the officer at Carbonear, a compact little district gets $300. He is in touch with the whole of his district at half an hour's notice. Is this condition to continue for ever? Do you never intend to try and treat civil servants fairly? Give them a square deal. How can you expect honest competent work to be done at that rate. It is just because of the character of our people. They have such high ideals that temptation has no effect on them to do wrong. I trust that the Minister of Finance when he brings in his supplementary supply will see that the salary of the relieving officer at Musgrave Harbor is raised because it is a most important appointment and entails great work and care. Now for the benefit of the Committee I will give the salaries relieving officers receive throughout the whole island with the exception of St. John's district. I will do this so as to impress upon the Minister and the government the great wrong which is being done to certain districts.

Fogo district has a population of 8257. Officers get $60; Port de Grave district has a population of 6,986, 4 officers get $240.

This is a district where all sections of it can be easily reached in a short time. Still it has more officers than Fogo District. Harbour Main district population 9,471, has three returning officers getting a total salary of $120; about one third of what Carbonear is getting. Hr. Grace with a population of 11,925 has three returning officers getting a total of $550. Carbonear 5,114 population has one man getting $300. Bay de Verde has a population of 10,213, has nine officers getting altogether $200. Trinity with a population of 21,788 has 10 officers, getting $344; Bonavista with a population of 22,894 has eight officers getting a total of $410. We are going up north now and cannot expect to get much. Twillingate has three officers getting $185 between them. St. Barbe has a population of 10,481, and eight officers getting $230. St. George's has a population of 11,861 with two officers and they get $100. This district is like Fogo, they are both in the same class. Burgeo and La Poile with a population of 7,793 has five officers getting $245. Fortune with a population of 9,989 has four officers getting $120. Burin with a population 11,616 has 7 officers getting

$220. Placentia and St. Mary's, population 16,099 has 6 officers getting $270 or $30 less than Carbonear. This with a population three times as large and ten times the work. In Ferryland which has a population of 5793 people, there are three relieving officers and one hundred and twenty dollars is the total salaries. Now the total salaries paid to outport officers is $3697.00.

Fogo district according to its population should receive one hundred and sixty dollars and it only gets sixty dollars. Now the whole House will bear me witness that this matter needs readjustment in that particular When you come to other votes you will find that the civil servants in Fogo district do not get their rights re salaries in one particular. But you come in here year after year and ask us to pass these estimates and you will not take the time, or the care to set these matters right. We are content to continue along in the same old rut and honest and efficient civil servants have to suffer.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman. While I agree with my honourable friend, Mr. Halfyard in the sentiments he has just expressed and share to some extent in the opinions that he has uttered, yet I feel that I must take exception to him in his statement with regard to Port de Grave, if he thinks that there is room for re-adjustment in these matters there I think the peo-people of that district are satisfied with what the Government has been pleased to allow them down there and do not need any more for that purpose. The people down there have been fortunate with regard to their fisheries of late years, perhaps more so than in any other portion of the Island. They have been very successful. Every person is I think in happy circumstances, and there has been no need as far as I am aware for money going down there for this purpose and therefore little demand if any is made on the relieving officer. Port de Grave however, has not been so fortunate as everyone knows. The people down there have been more unfortunate than any other people in Conception Bay, who depend on the Labrador fisheries. This fishery has been very uncertain for the last few years. And it is very hard for these people to go down there and spend their summer months only to find that they have nothing to show for their hard labor. Such an uncertain occupation compels a number of them to seek some relief from the relieving officer, but I would also say this for that district that these people are willing to work for what they get from the relieving officer. They do not ask it for nothing. And it is on account of this that I wish to take exception to the remarks of the hon. gentleman that has just sat down when he referred to Port de Grave and said that re-adjustment ought to be made without reference to the state of the people, and the greater demands they have to make on the relieving officer necessitating far more work for him than the relieving officer in Fogo has. I sincerely hope that if any alterations are going to be made on the lines laid down by the hon. member or on any other lines that hon. members will con sider above all the circumstances of the people.

MR. HALFYARD—My hon. friend, Mr. Grimes, has I think caught hold of the wrong side of the question altogether. I was speaking only of the salaries which are received by the officials themselves and did not refer to the funds which go to the districts for relief. You have, at any rate down at Fogo two officals supposed to attend to the applications for rerelief. Last year when you asked for the returns in the different districts, I think it was shown that Fogo was getting its per capita share of the grant. However, I am not speaking

of this now. My hon. friend misunderstood me evidently because I was not talking about the actual grant. I was merely referring to the salaries which the relieving officers receive for distributing of the grant.

MR. LLOYD.—There is a matter here which I think the Premier might explain. Why does the Commissioner at Carbonear get $300. I think that there must be some reason, some story attached, because on the face of it, it seems abnormal, to say the least, Perhaps the Prime Minister will explain.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER I think that it will be found on enquiry that the salary which the Commissioner at Carbonear receives is simply the growth of years and would arise, I think, out of the difficulty in obtaining suitable persons for that work. In other cases which have been referred to here this evening the pay of the Poor Commissioners appears to be very small but that is explained. I think the hon. gentleman will see, by the fact that the official in question holds some other office. I am speaking under correction, but I think it will be found that two relieving officers at St. George's are Magistrate MacDonald and Magistrate March which gentlemen receive in this capacity the sum of fifty dollars each. These gentlemen are peculiarly well fitted for this position as they can see and are familiar with the merits of each case that arises. For this extra position they are content to receive the small pay of fifty dollars. If they were removed to-morrow I do not think that you could fill their places at such a small sum. In some cases it has not been thought desirable to give it to persons other than magistrates in which case of course a larger salary has to be given to make it worth while for a man to accept the responsibility of the office. Then again the Hon. member Mr. Halfyard referred to the salaries of various officials, and then we come to the case of Mr. Fitzgerald. Now, Mr. Fitzgerald, as you know is Relieving Officer. He is a most estimable man. He receives a very small salary, but he is also Post-Master and Fishery Warden, (for which he receives a salary) so that he would not make much more than he is entitled to. Also if I remember correctly he is Poor Commissioner. All these emoluments make but a living wage, some $350 to $400. In addition to this he is of course able to attend to his own domestic affairs. I am unable to say exactly the merits of that case, but I can assure the hon. member that I will look into it. It seems to me that it must have been increased within the last few years. These cases are very difficult to deal with, and to explain the reason for the small salaries voted one would have to go back to the time of the appointment. You will find some salaries as low as $16 or $10. No doubt these cases can be explained. I quite agree with the hon. member, Mr. Grimes, in his remarks in relation to the diferences of Districts, but there are some districts which fortunately do not require any assistance whatever They neither look for relief,nor do they need it. In some places the vote is as low as thirty cents, per head, and in other places it is as high as $1.50. When I say this I am speaking of the past few years. This is not the fault of the people, but arises as was pointed out by the Hon. member for Port de Grave, from circumstances over which the people have no control whatever. A bad fishery on the Labrador and they come back having worked harder than if they had actually secured a catch. You cannot let them starve. If there is one thing the people do not want it is pauper relief, they want only enough to pay their way. It has never been looked at,

this question of pauper relief from a district standpoint at all.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to make a few remarks in reply to what the Prime Minister has just said on this subject. The reason he gave for the officer at Carbonear getting $300 is contrary to all logical deduction. I admit that Carbonear is a compact district and may have demands for casual poor relief, but I am not talking about what relief the people should get. I mentioned nothing about the grant. In Fogo District you have two officials getting $60, you have four in Port de Grave, and I cannot account for this discrepancy, when the grant for permanent poor, which is given on the per capita basis, is greater in Fogo district than in Port de Grave. I would like to draw the attention of the whole House, and particularly the Finance Minister, to this question. These men are appointed not to give out any extra grants, but are given the appointment to distribute the per capita grant. Fogo gets its per capita grant like Port de Grave or St. John's West, and there should not be such a discrepancy between the salaries of these men. It seems that questions are now brought up to sidetrack the question before the chair. It is unworthy of those who preach fairness in debate. The question here is the salaries paid to these men, not the amount of poor relief that they are distributing. Another thing said by the Premier was that these men were paid for doing other work. If they are doing other work, should they not be paid for it? Should not the man at Fogo get paid for doing the Post Office work? It is not because he is doing the post office work and getting paid for it that he should do the poor relief work for nothing. Why not give the man at Carbonear other work and save part of the salary paid him as Relieving Officer, if that is the policy you wish to follow? But, Sir, go down to the bottom of these salaries and you will find almost all of them are allocated or distributed on account of politics. Before an election a man promises to support a candidate on the promise of a raise in salary if that party is elected, and if he is elected he gets the salary. There is not a man in the House but knows that politics of the baser sort is at the bottom of this thing; and instead of determining to do any better you go on and let the unfair condition re salaries remain.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: Just one word. Since my friend, Mr. Lloyd the Leader of the Opposition, asked about that vote I made enquiries, and I find the history is this. In 1898 when the retrenchment scheme was inaugurated by the administration of that day, under Sir James Winter and Mr. Morine and other members of that Government, a gentleman by the name of Mackey, as a great many members of the House will remember, was Clerk of the Peace at Carbonear. He was dismissed by them, and they appointed him Poor Commissioner. It was back as far as that. He has died since, and another person has been appointed in his place. That is the history, and I am sure that no member on the other side of the House will take any exception to any action in which Mr. Morine took such a prominent part.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I must challenge that, and promptly take exception to it, because it was clearly a political job at that time, and it has been perpetrated apparently by every Government since, and even by my Rt. Hon. friend the Prime Minister.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: If my hon. friend from Fogo has been misunderstood by me, I think he has also misunderstood me when he referred to the difference between the am-

ount that was allocated in Fogo District for salaries and that in Port de Grave. He said there was need for re-adjustment, and he gave some very interesting figures as to the number in the locality under the jurisdiction of the Relieving Officer at Fogo as compared with Port de Grave. Now, he says a re-adjustment is necessary in order to make things more equal, because they do the same amount of work. Now I question that statement, that the Relieving Officer at Fogo has to do the same amount of work as the Relieving Officer at Port de Grave or Harbour Grace. It is not the amount of money that is going into the district that is to be considered, it is the amount of work done by the official in charge, and when I defended my district and the men who are Relieving Officers there, I did so because I know from what I have heard of the conditions in Fogo that there is very little work for the Relieving Officer to do, and there is therefore no need of paying him as large a salary as is paid to the Officer in Port de Grave, who devotes so much more time to the work.

MR. HALFYARD—I think it is very unkind of my friend, Mr. Grimes, to say that the Relieving Officer at Fogo should not get as much as the Relieving Officer at Port de Grave.

MR. GRIMES—He does not have to do as much work.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Before that vote passes I would like to point out that there is a little inaccuracy there which I would like to draw to the Minister's attention. Some two years ago the management of the Halifax School for the Blind and also the Deaf and Dumb, represented to the Government that it was no longer possible to continue the care of those children at the rate of $200 a year, and if the Government could not see their way to increase the grant they would have to discontinue receiving pupils from this Colony. It was after the outbreak of the war, and the Government could not see their way to ask for additional supply in this respect, so therefore they were reluctantly compelled to cut down the number of pupils to meet the amount of the grant, so that instead of having twenty pupils at the Institution for the Blind we have now only sixteen. We formerly had the right to send twenty pupils at two hundred dollars each, allocating $4,000 for that purpose. We are now only permitted to send sixteen at two hundred and fifty dollars each. The same thing applies to the Institution for the Deaf and Dumb. I make this explanation because there might be some misunderstanding in the future. I know there are a great many applicants wishing to get into that Institution, and they may think the number there is not up to the number provided for in the Estimates; therefore I would like this explanation to be recorded, so that those outside the House will not misunderstand the position.

While on this subject, Mr. Chairman, I wish to take the opportunity to state to the House that while I was in Halifax a short time ago, I had an opportunity of visiting the School for the Blind. I was invited by Sir Frederick Fraser, the Superintendent, to go there, and I gladly availed of the opportunity, as I am sure that we in Newfoundland are greatly interested in the work that that Institution is doing. Through the instrumentality of Mr. Weir, who is known to most members of the House and to the public generally in Newfoundland, I, in company with several others from this city and other parts of the Island, spent a whole morning there, and under the guidance of Sir Frederick Fraser saw the entire working of the whole Institution. I would really like for every member of this House to have a similar oppor-

tunity, because it is well nigh impossible to tell of the work being done there. To say the least of it, it is truly marvellous.

It is wonderful what has been achieved in the way of educating those who are afflicted by loss of sight—who have been absolutely sightless from birth; they are being taught all kinds of trades, to read and write, to play musical instruments; they are educated as teachers, and other professions, and they are brought to as high a standard as if they had all their faculties. I went through the Institution; went into their factories and saw them make furniture, brooms, clothes, and all other kinds of necessaries for the Institution. I also went through their school rooms and saw the system by which they are taught to read and write. I was also treated to a concert that they gave in their large and commodious concert hall and to say that I was surprised would not be expressing what I felt. I was absolutely astounded at the proficiency to which these pupils had been brought in a musical way. I had the pleasure there amongst others, of listening to a young girl from Clarenville, who certainly showed a good deal of natural talent, and her accomplishment was of such a character that I felt proud to know that she was a Newfoundlander. She could play the piano, the violin, and several other musical instruments, and she sang most beautifully. I don't know that I have ever heard even an opera singer surpass her in range of voice and in musical sweetness. I suggested to Sir Frederick Frazer that if he were ever contemplating a visit to this country that he should bring this lady down as an illustration of what could be accomplished by him and those associated with him in his work; and I assured him and the pupils, that as a Newfoundlander, and as a public man in Newfoundland, I would never let an opportunity pass of expressing a word of admiration for that Institution; and I only hope that the time is not far distant when the financial condition of this country will warrant a still larger grant being made in this connection, as I feel sure that there are many blind children in this country who are deserving of the privileges which can be secured at that Institution. It is certainly one of the greatest Institutions that I have ever had the privilege of visiting, and I hope that the time is not far distant when every child in Newfoundland that is afflicted with blindness will have an opportunity of availing of the privileges which can be secured there.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: As we have heard so much from the Colonial Secretary in praise of the School for the Blind at Halifax, I trust he will use his influence to have the grant for that Institution increased. During the last Convention of the F. P. U., Mr. Weir gave an address, in which he pointed out that there were 45 blind persons under the age of 21 in Newfoundland who had no education whatever. Now, why should we educate 20 children, and leave 45 for whom we do nothing at all. If you leave those 45 year after year without anything being done to educate them, what is to become of them? Why should we favor 20 and do nothing for the other 45? Now, we promise that if the Government will take this matter up, the F. P. U. will be prepared to make a donation for this object; but of course we would not be prepared to make any move unless the Government shows more interest than they have in the past, and encouraged us to do something. If you would increase that grant by $1,000, that would mean that five more children could be educated.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

It costs $250 a year for each person.

MR. COAKER—Well, it would mean four, and that would make a vast difference. Everything possible should be done to help along those persons and enable them to help themselves. If you don't educate them, you will have to care for them as paupers for the next forty or fifty years. They are going to live, perhaps, some of them, seventy or eighty years, and it will mean quite a sum of money to provide for them as paupers. If it is possible to turn them into producers, as Hon. Mr. Bennett pointed out can be done, it would be a splendid thing any way you look at it. Now, I would suggest that this grant be increased. Come down and ask for another couple of thousand dollars, and we will be prepared to back you up. Then, if you cannot find the money, and you are behind that much at the end of the year, it will merely mean that you will have to ask the Bank for it. It will only mean another couple of thousand on to the $750,000 that you were short last year, and that you will have to find some time; it will be money well spent, and we will have no hesitation in supporting it. If you will do that, the F. P. U. will probably make provision for four more, and that will be twelve that will be provided for.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman: Might I ask the Colonial Secretary—I am sure we are very much indebted to him for the interest which he has taken in this work and for the information which he has given us with regard to the Institution at Halifax—how are the candidates who are sent to that institution selected? Are they taken just as they apply, or is there any enquiry made as to whether the parents of these children are able to support them or not? The reason I ask the question is that I heard a little while ago that there was a child attending one of these institutions—I really don't know which at the present moment—whose parents are well able to pay the amount that the Colony is now paying for it. I would like to know as to whether any enquiry is made as to the ability of the parents of an intended pupil to pay the necessary fees, or are they taken without any such enquiry?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: I might say in reply to the hon. member that a strict enquiry is made into all the circumstances of the parents and the friends of the child. There is a regular list of questions. The applicants are taken in their turn. When I say that the Poor Commissioner, Mr. O'Dwyer, is the official that looks after the enquiries, one can readily understand that the thing is properly done. He is not the sort of man to recommend any application that is not a deserving one. I may say that I don't know of any case where a child has been sent whose parents could provide the necessary fees for its education. The procedure is that enquiry is made from the magistrate, clergyman, or other prominent person in the locality in which the child resides, and if it is found that a child's parents or friends are unable to pay the necessary fees, then the Government sends the child away and pays the fees.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman: I thank the Hon. Colonial Secretary for his information, and I may say that I am quite satisfied that if Mr. O'Dwyer makes the enquiries, then it is alright.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I would like to add my voice to that of the Colonial Secretary and my friend, the hon. member for Twillingate, behind me, in urging the reconsideration of this grant, or that at all events, when Supplementary Supply is brought down we shall see an additional vote for this purpose. It is a pity to think that we have in New-

foundland 29 young persons who are blind, and who are without the facilities which this school, or some similar institution, can give them. The value of this institution in making it possible for blind persons to take a part in life has already been demonstrated to us by the Colonial Secretary. The story which he has told of what he saw and heard is a marvellous one. It must be within the recollection of many members that they also have seen and heard Mr. Weir, the travelling secretary of that institution. He is a credit to himself and to Newfoundland, but that credit to my mind is due very, very largely to the institution with which he is connected. I knew Mr. Weir many years ago when he was a pupil teacher at Bishop Feild College, and afterwards when he was receiving a very small salary as a teacher. Mr. Weir with his sight, and with the education which he had received up to that time, was not one-third the man he is today without his sight, and that is due to the Halifax Institution for the Blind. He has acknowledged to me himself that he felt he was a stronger man blind than he was with his sight. We have also another instance of a Newfoundland boy, a very poor Newfoundland boy, taken from Bonavista Bay, who to-day is the second teacher in that Institution. If he had his sight he would probably be earning little of what he is earning today. I heard Mr. Weir remark that if he had not lost his sight he would probably be earning one-quarter of what he is earning today. I think that it is the duty of the Government to give these 29 others to whom reference has been made a chance of becoming earning members and powerful members of the community, rather than a drag, as they will be if they do not get this opportunity—a drag on the country, and a burden to themselves.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I don't think there can be any objection to the proposal of my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, to have this matter considered, so that when Supplementary Supply comes down, if possible, a small additional vote may be taken to cover the cases referred to by him and by the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker. I am not aware that any application has been made which has been refused. The policy of the Government has been—and I speak now with an acquaintance with two administrations—that in every case where a child has applied, through its parents or guardian, even though the vote has been exceeded, to arrange for the child to go, and then to come in and ask for a small increase. As a matter of fact, within the last few years we have doubled the vote for this purpose. A few years ago the vote was something like $1200 for each of these institutions; today we are voting $7,000. I don't know that we could do better than spend the money in that way.

MR. COAKER—When was the vote $1200?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In '98 we voted $2400 for both institutions. Only about seven years ago the vote was only $4,000; now we are voting $7,000, but I would vote $40,000 if we could afford it. No question could be more important than the education of a blind child, and it differs from most matters in that it requires to be dealt with promptly. Now, I don't know that any of the 29 cases that have been referred to here have ever come before the Government. Certainly, no application has been refused, but I don't doubt for a moment that the report given by Mr. Weir is correct, and that there are that number of children all over the Island who might avail of this institution. But I would like to make it clear here that I cannot recollect any

one application having been made and refused, even though the vote was exhausted. That has been our policy and we have followed it consistently.

MR. CLIFT—I would like to ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary if he gets any reports from the hospitals at Battle Harbour, Indian Harbour and Pilley's Island. I see there is an amount of $1,000 voted for Battle Harbour hospital; $500 for Indian Harbour; $1500 for St. Anthony, and $1,000 for Pilley's Island. Does he get any reports from these institutions, as to the number of cases treated there, and other particulars?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, every year. I shall look them up and lay them on the table.

MR. JENNINGS—At this juncture I would like to ask a question or two with regard to the General Hospital. Have any new rules been introduced there regarding visitation of the general public to that institution; and also, are there any new rules regarding members of the House of Assembly who may have occasion to visit the Hospital? I have been there several times since coming to the city to visit a near relation of mine, who had to undergo a serious operation. Both before and after the operation was performed I was anxious to know how he was getting along, and visited the Hospital to find out. My last visit was yesterday morning; I went purposely at that time to find out how he was progressing so that I could write his friends by the outgoing mail. My visit finished, I was just about to leave when I was approached by an official, whose name I do not know, who asked me if I had any permit to visit the Hospital at that time. I was rather surprised at the question, because I was given to understand that the members of the House of Assembly can visit these institutions at any time they wish. I replied: "No, Sir, I have no special permit other than the privilege conferred by the position I hold." "Well," he said, "it is against the rules of the hospital for anyone to come here visiting except on visiting days without a permit." I said I did not understand that, and thought I had the privilege of coming at any time. Certainly, I felt to some extent mortified, because I would be the last person in the world to go anywhere if not within my rights. However, nothing I could say seemed to convince this official, and he still insisted on my procuring a permit from Dr. Keegan before visiting the Hospital again.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: I certainly sympathize with the hon. member over the treatment accorded him at the General Hospital. The official he refers to could not have known that Mr. Jennings was the hon. member for Twillingate, otherwise he was derelict in his duty. Instead of in any way hampering the hon. member or turning him out, or keeping him from going into the Institution, he ought to have been glad to have seen him there. Any member of the House has a right to go into any of our institutions at any time he wishes; and this is a very proper rule, because the members of this House are the representatives of the people, and the people keep up these institutions, and if their representatives have not the right to go there, who has the right? If the hon. member desires to lay any complaint or will give me the name of the official, I shall see that the complaint is thoroughly investigated, and the official reprimanded. As regards the rules for visiting, I think the Board of Governors has made some alteration in the rules. It will be readily appreciated that that hospital with its 200 patients will have quite a large number of visitors—friends of the patients —and such a large number of people

going through the wards would necessarily interfere with the work there. Therefore some regulation must be adopted for the admission of visitors, and that has been dealt with by the Board of Governors. I do not know what arrangements may have been made, but I feel sure that what has been done has been done in the public interest. I regret that Mr. Jennings received such scant courtesy there, and I can assure him it will not occur again.

MR. JENNINGS—I would like to say that I have no desire to lodge any complaint; but certainly it was mortifying to me—and it would have been to anyone else—to be placed in that position, and even after I had rather modestly informed the official of my position, he still persisted in his assertion that I should have got a permit.

MR. COAKER—I think the Hon. Colonial Secretary should instruct the head doctor to issue permits to all the members of this House. Personally I have never found any difficulty in getting in there; I go there at any hour from nine o'clock in the morning to six o'clock in the evening, and no one objects to allowing me in.

MR. JENNINGS—Probably the official in question felt in the same position as the old man whom I met in a railway carriage one day. He and I got into conversation, and he asked me who I was, and I very modestly told him. He was smoking a pipe, and he took it out of his mouth, looked me over, and said, "Well, you do not look very much like it." Probably the hospital official doubted my word.

MR. LLOYD—May I ask if a Superintendent of Nurses has been appointed yet? If so, who is it?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes; Miss Taylor.

MR. COAKER—May I ask if the Government contemplates doing anything with regard to the Poor Asylum?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The plans for a new Poor Asylum have been drawn up and were carefully gone into fully a year before the war. Tenders were called for; but the war intervened; and naturally the Government had to stay their hands until the war would be over.

MR. COAKER—Have you not a loan for $180,000 for that purpose?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That would not be sufficient—the lowest tender was half a million dollars. However, last year extensive repairs were made to the Poor Asylum and things are fairly good there. Repairs were also made to the Lunatic Asylum.

MR. LLOYD—Is there any report about the work done by the Public Analyst, Mr. Davies?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—No, but I will have one made for you if you wish.

MR. COAKER—Is there anything in the nature of a report in regard to what has bene done in inspection of food Last year you will remember we passed an "Inspection of Food Act." I think we ought to have the report on that work before we pass this vote.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, I can get that for you, too. Mr. Davis is also Food Analyst.

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair.

Mr. 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 motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

EDUCATION 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, "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Education."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: Last evening when we were discussing this bill it was suggested that sub-section (c) of section 5 might be amended by making it eligible for a lady to be a member of the Board, and also an amendment was suggested in relation to the reappointment of retiring members. I undertook to see the educational authorities today and to discuss the matter with them. What I propose now is that I take notes of any suggestions that are made as we go along, and that I will deal with them all at the same time; in the meantime those sections could stand.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM GOVERNOR.

At five 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.

GOVERNOR ASSENTS TO SEALING BILL.

And being 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 assent to the Bill entitled: "An Act to Regulate Further the Prosecution of the Sealfishery."

EDUCATION BILL.

Committee of the Whole on Education Bill, (resumed).

MR. LLOYD—Is there any fund at present to carry out the purpose expressed here in regard to night classes and technical education?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: There is no provision made in the present Estimates. The Bill before us was intended to cover all these points that may come up from time to time. There are many matters in this bill for which no provisions are made at present, for instance, there is a provision for Medical Inspection, but there is no vote to cover it. It is hoped however, that next year we will be able to pass a vote to cover that provision.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I have no objection to this bill in that way. Our educational system is such that we have no system to help those who have left school to obtain an education after the ordinary day's work is over. I knew a great many young men in my young days who had to make their way in life by their attendance in night schools. I have derived much advantage from them. I fortunately lived in a district where continuation classes and colleges offered great facilities. In Manchester, the Victoria University and the Manchester Technical Institution offered us young men extraordinary chances of getting on if we wanted to get on. When I came to Newfoundland, what I thought was the most deplorable feature in our educational system was that there was no opportunity for a young fellow who had left school, to better himself educationally. I am very glad to see that enabling classes are included in this Bill. I shall be more pleased when we get the money to carry it out.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: Will the Premier tell me whether there is any report made by the Commission appointed in 1913 to investigate this matter. Of course, 1913 was just previous to an election. I think there was something in the manifes-

toes or Speech from the Throne about the Night Schools.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is quite right, and the policy of the present Government was to take up this whole matter, and not alone meet the case referred to by the learned Leader of the Opposition, but to go a little further, and if possible to establish technical schools, having special regard to the requirements of the fishermen; in other words, to arrange for something a little in the nature of an elementary knowledge of navigation. Of course, it would not be a complete course but they would be taught an elementary knowledge of charts and many other matters that would be of use in their business. That was our idea, but as you know, in the first year after the one referred to, there was a shortage in the revenue, and then the next year the War followed.

MR. COAKER—Is there any report on the question?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No, there is no report. There was no Commission appointed. When these continuation schools are established they should meet the case suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. Those who have left school would be offered an opportunity to develop wnat they have already been taught, but it is also hoped that in large centres like Grand Bank, Bonavista, Catalina and in other places, a great opportunity will be given by the teaching of technical knowledge. That would require special teachers who understand something about navigation and other technical subjects. Perhaps some matter in relation to the fisheries, biology and other matters might be taught; then in other places it might be arranged that the teachers of the schools could carry on the night classes. The provision here is to meet a case like that, and I should expect that the first large increase in the revenue will probably result in a vote being passed for this purpose.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I do not wish to be misunderstood on this matter, and I just wish to correct what may be a misinterpretation of my remarks. This section deals with night schools and continuation classes. When I made reference to the matter I was not excluding technical training or any training of that kind; as a matter of fact that was exactly what I was referring to. I spoke of the knowledge of technology. In the days which I spoke of, when I was attending these schools, it was a technical school. In one week there would be six hundred different classes at night; six hundred technical classes held in addition to the day work. Since then there have been great developments in the Technical School. It is now one of the biggest institutions of its kind in England, and rivals Charlottenburg, Germany. I fully appreciate the importance of technical education. I know something about it. I have seen a great deal of it, both at Owen's College and in Manchester, and it was that feature, the absence of which I thought such a handicap to the boys who had left our collegss and schools that they had no chance of advancing themselves. Much of their time is given up to reading books or going to the rinks, because there is nothing else for them to do, and I should very much like to see something suitable established not only in St. John's but also in the outports, and especially on the lines of fishery schools, such as they have now in Norway, and to a certain extent in Great Britain. But what we want is money. Neither the Government nor the Superintendents, nor the teachers can do anything until the grants are largely increased, but this department of technical work and night school is practically un-

touched in Newfoundland, because in so far as it has been introduced we have only touched upon the fringe.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I think the Prime Minister stole this platform in 1913 from the F. P. U., because this was a plank of the platform laid down at the Bonavista Convention in 1912. Our idea was a very simple one, and something on these lines. We intended to have a large school at Bonavista, and have all the teachers in the place to assist in teaching. There would be a bonus of $40 or $50 to each of the men for their services, which would be from the 1st of December until about the end of April. The young men who wanted to take part might commence in the early fall and continue through the winter. That is a very simple plan, and it would not cost more than about $10,000. We might have night schools all over the Island of that kind. We did not intend to teach anything technical, but of course, that would come in time. At present this question of night schools is a most talked of scheme, but from the present indication we won't get anything from you until 1950.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman. I just want to make a few remarks upon the subject matter now before the Chair. This Bill to amend and consolidate the Education Act is a very good thing in itself, but it is only a bill to consolidate the Law. It is a very good thing that those engaged in teaching and the Chairmen of the School Boards should have this Bill showing exactly the Law in regard to education in a concise and summary form but that is where the matter rests as far as the improvement of education goes. We are all agreed upon that point that this bill will neither advance nor retard education in this country. After the excellent and illuminating address given by the leader of the Opposition yesterday afternoon on this subject, anything I might say upon the matter would be very flat. We cannot blind ourselves to the fact that wherever you go to-day you hear a buzz, not very distant at all times, but you hear the buzz of people talking about education. The outstanding feature of this discussion is the distinct advance that has taken place upon the ideas which existed some years ago. No one to-day would say that education is a bad thing. The representative of the once large and important body who held such ideas if there is such a representative existing in a semi-fossil state, keeps his thoughts to himself. There is a voice going up on all sides demanding more extensive education for every one. Education they say is the panacea of all human demands and unless a country is to go to the dogs people must have education. The Clergy of all denominations are raising their voices and demanding more education because they say that the lack of education is causing the people to leave the churches and chapels and drift into rank infidelity. Big manufacturers and capitalists are demanding education because they say that the working man with education is a better workman than the man without it. The leader of the opposition, in his very able speech yesterday suggested that the next great war will be a commercial war. Big guns are not going to take part. Great armies are not going to take part, but the men and women will all take part in the great industrial battle and if we are to keep up our own we will have to educate our people. If England is to take her proper place in this great commercial war, her people must be educated for that position. But what can we do to advance education? I have had some experience in teaching in public schools in different places in the outports. I was twenty years at the work, and I may say these were

the best years of my life. I wish I could enjoy now the vim that I put into the work when privileged to teach both at Greenspond and Catalina. I was fairly successful; that is of course viewed by the results of the Council of Higher Education Examinations; but what an amount of worry and energy it entailed to get those results. Imagine having to teach the ordinary subjects as well as the extra subjects for the higher grades of the Council of Higher Education Examinations. As Dr. Lloyd pointed out here yesterday we have to have discipline but it may cost dearly. The younger boys and girls of the junior classes were to keep quiet while the senior classes were being instructed, (I mean instructed not educated), into what they should do in the night for recitation the next day. I was fortunate to get one hundred per cent of my candidates through the examinations successfully on two or three occasions. One year we got the Outport Intermediate Scholarship and during the long time I was teaching we captured the first, second or third places in nearly every ordinary subject in the curriculum. This however was not real success. Sufficient time cannot be given to all the pupils to get the best work from them. To a younger teacher just through school there is a bit of glamor about the competition with all the other schools of the country. He or she is determined to do his or her best to get passes with the result that in a large school the Junior class must suffer. My opinion of the Council of Higher Education is that its best work is done. I give great credit to those who were in the work and who are in the work now, the clergymen, the teachers and the Chairmen of Boards and all others who have done and are doing their best to advance the cause of education; but I think it is my duty to give it my opinion that the Council of Higher Education has had its day. Taking it from a financial standpoint we cannot afford it. I think some of the money needlessly spent. Take for instance the sending of the papers of the primary examination to England to be corrected. Cannot we get a board of examiners in Newfoundland to set these papers and correct them; and still know that it is done honestly? It does not look good and I think both the Primary and Preliminary grades might as well be corrected here as not. The present system ought in my opinion be discontinued. This act looks very well to an outsider, and Dr. Lloyd, the leader of the Opposition, described the situation very nicely yesterday. You will notice on page 52 that the primer class has to spend 40 per cent of the time in school at one thing, 12 per cent on another thing, 12 per cent on something else and so on. Now that is all right, but you must have a teacher for that class and only that class. You cannot work that schedule and at the same time take standards one, two and three, and in some cases up to standard seven. That is how the curriculum works out. It is an utter impossibility and it is not worth the paper and ink used in printing it unless used in a school sufficiently staffed. You look at all the different subjects necessary for these examinations, and you will realize the impossibility for one teacher to do justice to all the pupils. It is an utter impossibility to teach them as set out in the curriculum. Ninety five per cent of the schools in Newfoundland to-day have only one or two teachers. If we do not make any more advance during the next fifty years than we have made during the past fifty, we are going to find ourselves in the millenium before we will be able to use this curriculum to advantage. We cannot staff the schools sufficiently because we have no money. Our country is too poor to educate our people properly;

while our present system and of using our revenue is continued. We should have more money to train teachers. More money to train teachers and staff schools. Teachers ought to be well trained for the most important work that can engage the attention of man or woman. I was in my time permitted to sit at the feet of Mr. Holloway, and while he was a most excellent teacher, what had I learned when I left college in the line of teaching children? Simply nothing. And in my case and I venture to say in the case of the majority of young teachers, the chief object is to get results and to do so, the senior pupils must be given attention, and as a result the junior classes are more or less neglected not through any fault of the teacher, but both teacher and pupil are victims of the system. Now I can assure you that until our system is placed on better foundations and an honest attempt made to rectify errors and weaknesses we cannot have the results that we desire until we can have our teachers properly trained, as has been set forth by Doctor Lloyd so ably. We must aim at technical education. This is the question that is occupying the minds of present day statesmen in all parts of the world. A great many people demand free and compulsory education, and in this respect we are away behind the civilised world In Austria education is compulsory and free. In Hungary, Belgium and Chile it is free but not compulsory. In Peru it is free and non compulsory. In Portugal it is free and not compulsory. Also in Roumania. In Sweden education is highly developed and an illiterate Swede is rarely found. In Norway it is compulsory and free. In America some states are compulsory and free while fifteen others are free but not compulsory. Brazil has free education but not compulsory—that is to say that it is nominally free although eight-four per cent of the people are illiterate. Germany has free and compulsory education. Whatever we may think of Germany we must admire her system of education for it is the best system in the world. In France it is free and compulsory. Still here in Newfoundland we are not considering compulsory education. We need the money to equip and staff schools, we have already, so we say. But that is in my opinion a vain excuse. Every encouragement should be given both parents and children so that all children of schoolable age should be sent to school. I believe there are some parents, a few, who do not give education the consideration which it merits and are willing to let the advantages which it offers to their children pass by. Mr. Chairman I don't think that there is anything that we can do to improve this bill. As it stands I fear that it is not worth the paper it is written on, re advancing education in this country. The only time that the curriculum will be properly appreciated is when the schools have been properly equipped and staffed. The teachers must be better trained so that they may be made capable to deal with the tasks that lie before them, and educate the children over whom he or she has control that they may be better fitted to engage in life's battle.

Mr. Chairman, there is another matter I would like to draw attention to. Under one section it is provided that "not less than nine-tenths of the allocation to the Board from the grants of the Legislature for general educational purposes and for Superior or High Schools shall be expended in salaries to teachers."

Now, I note in the Report of the Church of England Schools, the Superintendent draws attention to the following:

"From this Table it will be seen that the following Boards of Education fail-

ed to comply with that section of the Education Act that requires that nine-tenths of the regular grants shall be spent on teachers' salaries:-- Bay de Verde, Belleoram, Carbonear, Champneys, Channel, Exploits, Forteau, Gander Bay, Harbour Breton, Kelligrews, Newtown, Norman's Cove, Petty Harbour, Pool's Island, Port Rexton, St. Anthony, St. John's, Smith's Sound, Spaniard's Bay, Upper Island Cove. In some cases the causes have been unavoidable, but in others there appears to be no satisfactory excuse."

I do not know whose business it is to see that the teachers are recompensed according to the Act. One thing that the teachers complain of in several of the districts is that they have to work for such small salaries, perhaps not enough to pay their board. Perhaps it may be that some of the people of the place are interested enough in the matter to take the teacher for less than they would take another boarder. At the same time the Chairman of the School Board may be doing some little clerical work, and will take from the Board funds an amount for secretarial work—in some places ten or twenty or thirty or forty dollars. Perhaps it may be right, but it seems to me to be very small of them when the teachers have to put up with such small salaries. That, however, is beside the question. The main point is that if the teachers are not getting nine-tenths of the grant, they can be given any amount. They can be given only one-half. If the law is broken at all you do not know to what extent it may be caried.

MR. LLOYD—Can the Prime Minister give me any information as to how far these sections 16, 17 and 18 have been availed of?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—These sections are sections 104, 105 and 106 of the old Act. Up to the present they have not been availed of to any extent. They have been practically a failure. They are remodelled now by all of the Inspectors in the hope that they may be able to be availed of. I shall look into this matter before it comes up again and will be able to explain it more fully.

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 motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

CONTROL OF TRADING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill, "An Act respecting the Control of Trading in Certain Commodities."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I have already explained to the House the effect of this Bill. It is merely for the purpose of indemnification in connection with anything done this year in relation to the coal and salt supply.

MR. LLOYD—The Bill has not been distributed.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It was distributed over a week ago.

MR. LLOYD—I have not seen this Bill before. The point I would like to clear up is this: This Bill is evidently meant to cover the actions of the past. The position that I would like to put is this: suppose you take any such action in the future, during the course of the war, where will be your means of indemnity?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is correct that this Bill only covers actions of the past. We think that the

Act we passed the other day deals with the other point.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion, this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

STATUTES CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Revise and Consolidate the General Public Statute Laws of the Colony, and for the publication of same."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker I beg to move the second reading of that Bill.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, before that motion passes I wish to make a few observations. And first I wish to say, Sir, that if I understand the Bill aright, I cannot concur in the principle proposed. I think it most objectionable. The purpose is to delegate to the Governor In Council and to a Commission appointed thereby, without any reference whatever to this House, the consolidation and codification of the whole of the laws passed since the last consolidation up to and including the present session. I understand that two precedents were given for that. The Dominion has adopted some such principle, and in Nova Scotia a similar principle has been adopted. I am not conversant with all the circumstances either in the case of the Dominion or of Nova Scotia; but in the case of the Dominion it is clear enough that no such power was given and exercised as it is proposed to exercise through this Bill. A reference to the Dominion Statutes makes it clear that those Statutes had to be confirmed, and were confirmed, by the Dominion Parliament before they were finally sanctioned. There is no such proposition contained in this Bill. Then again if I understand the position in Canada, the Commission appointed to do the work was composed of Judges and of eminent members of the Bar of Canada. It was in no way a political commission. In this case, however, the Commission does not include, if I am correctly informed, any member of the Supreme Court, but is composed solely of the friends and supporters of the Government of the day. Therefore, the proposition is that we delegate the functions of this House to a Commission of political supporters of the present Government who happen to be lawyers; and I am not going to assent to any such proposition. I don't think it necessary, Sir, to say more than that. We on this side of the House are not prepared to give our assent to any such measure, and we shall oppose it until a more reasonable proposition is put before us.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I would suggest to the hon. member that we read the Bill a second time, with the understanding that when we go into Committee the section to which he refers will be open to a full debate and amended if desired.

MR. LLOYD—The point is that you are asking us to concur in a very objectionable principle. I am dealing with the principle of the Bill.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I merely ask that the Bill be read a second time with full reservations; then we can have a full discussion on the principle in Committee. I may say that there is no desire whatever to take any powers in this Bill other than are absolutely necessary. As to the section to which my hon. friend objects, in my remarks on the introduction of the Bill I pointed out what the precedents are for that. There is a precedent in the case of the Dominion Statutes, the whole of which were consolidated in 1906; and there is also

a precedent in the case of the Nova Scotia Statutes 1900. When our consolidation took place in 1892, no such authority was given, but it was considered desirable that it might be given to the Commission in the case of the present revision. It is not at all likely that any advantage will be taken of that section. As to the fact of there being no eminent lawyers on the Commission outside of those who happen to be friends of the present administration, that is hardly our fault; it merely happens that nearly all the eminent members of the profession are friends of the Government. The practice which we followed was that of the past. No Judge of the Supreme Court, nor any person connected with the Supreme Court, has ever been on a consolidation committee. In the last consolidation, it was gentlemen like the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Clift, who were appointed on the Commission—men who were members of the Administration of that day. But I should be very sorry to hear it suggested that the mere accidental connection with a political party would in any way affect the conduct of any man on that Commission. I hope it will not be suggested that because a man happens to sit on either side of the House, his work in a matter of this sort would be influenced. Now, I make the suggestion to my hon. friend that the Bill go through without a vote; and when we go into Committee I shall be very glad to consider the suggestion which he has made in relation to the modification of that section.

MR. LLOYD—I will take no part in the sanctioning of the bill, for the simple reason that while there is no suggestion of wrong doing—I would be the very last person who would insinuate such—you are giving very extensive powers to that Commission. You are delegating to that Commission the functions of this Legislature, and are permitting them to make alterations and changes.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Within well defined limits.

MR. LLOYD—Within well defined limits, but that brings my point up—to show exactly what you are doing. After you define the limits they can only be altered by amending the whole consolidation. The Statutes, immediately after the work is done, and without reference to this House are repealed by the new Consolidated Statutes. I am pointing out that it is not only legislation by one side of the House, but it is delegating all legislative power from the House. Now, so far as the selection of the Commission is concerned—and my friend the leader of the Government may as well admit it straight out—it is not a question of the eminence of those selected. The practice has been, when a consolidation was necessary, to appoint the Commission from the Government ranks. It is not a question of eminence because if Mr. Kent was eminent enough to be moved up to the Supreme Court he was surely eminent enough to be on that Commission, particularly when you have a young practising Barrister on it as chief man. So that, as I have pointed out, it is not a question of eminence; it is a question merely of political connection. But the objectionable feature is not that; it is that you are delegating to a Commission of political supporters full powers of legislation, and then you go further, and permit the Governor in Council, absolutely without reference to this House, to proclaim what they have done as law. What they have done becomes law, and everything this House has done is no longer law, because it is all repealed by that Statute. No such course was attempted in the past. The consolidation came back to this House and was passed on by this House, and not proclaimed by the

Governor in Council without reference to the House. Now, I don't wish to continue the debate further—in fact, I am out of order now, except by the good grace of the Speaker.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am prepared to postpone the reading. I have no desire whatever to force a vote on the House. The present enactment was decided on after the greatest care, deliberation, thought and consideration in the interest of the work that was being done. I am quite certain that even with that authority nothing of an objectionable character would be attempted, and I am prepared now to agree to bring in an Act next session, if I am here, confirming every amendment made, if there is any amendment. This merely provides that the consolidators may make such alterations in language as are required in order to preserve a uniform mode of expression. Now, I can quite understand how very delicate and very careful that operation must be, for fear in doing that, an amendment might be made in the law.

MR. LLOYD—The easiest thing in the world.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER—That was discussed when the Bill was being prepared. I might say that the Bill was prepared after the most careful thought, away back in the month of November. Not one meeting but ten meetings were held at my office in relation to it—with the late Mr. Furlong, who had no interest except to do what was right, with the present Attorney General, with the late Attorney General, who was a Judge of the Supreme Court, and with Mr. Dunfield, who is also on the Commisson. We are only following the precedent which was established in 1906 in the Dominion Consolidation.

MR. LLOYD—There was a confirming statute in that case.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes. Now, I may say I anticipated that these objections would be made, and I pointed that out very strongly to my associates when the Bill was being prepared. I appreciate the arguments on the other side, and if the matter is considered serious it can be got over by bringing in a confirming statute, and confirming every change, no matter how small. My request for the bill to go through was in order that I might consider the question of eliminating these words altogether.

I suggest that you agree to a second reading, and I will consider in Committee the suggestions that have been made; and I will go further and agree now to bring in a confirming statute next session, so that this Legislature will be able to approve of everything that has been done.

MR. LLOYD—I want the matter provided for. No one can appreciate better than my learned friend what a change of language may mean. For instance, we had an admirable illustration the other day of how easy it is to change the sense and intent of a sentence by changing the context a little. In a speech which I attempted to make here I spoke of the members of the Government in the past having done considerable to help us roll up a majority against the Government in the next election. My hon. friend very cleverly twisted it into talking about "rolling over on the other side" and said what an undignified way of speaking it was. That just gives an illustration of what a change of speech may do.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think the hon. member has probably forgotten the words that he used.

MR. LLOYD—No.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—If he will refer to the notes I think he will find that the words he said were "helping to roll us over on the other side."

MR. LLOYD—No, no. That is only another illustration of how words can be twisted. However, these are merely points We have no objection to accepting the suggestion of the Government.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled, "An Act to Revise and Consolidate the General Public Statute Laws of the Colony and for Publication of same," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

UNION ELECTRIC CO. BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Lloyd the Bill entitled, "An Act to Incorporate "The Union Electric Light and Power Company," and for other purposes," 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. COAKER—I beg to draw the attention of the Premier to the fact that he promised some sort of a conference with regard to the cutting of pit props in Green Bay. I think the Department of Agriculture and Mines should take this matter up and have something done.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I understood that particulars were to be given by hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Jennings. I don't know whether he has received any invitation from the Department. I asked the Minister to send for Mr. Jennings the day after and get the details from him so that we might have a conference. I don't know whether that has been done.

MR. JENNINGS—I might say that I have had no special invitation. He promised to send a man down.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until to-morrow Thursday at half past two of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 30th 1916.

The House met at half past two of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

GOVERNOR'S REPLY TO ADDRESS

Mr. Speaker informed the House that in accordance with the intimation received, His Excellency the Governor would receive the Address of Thanks presently.

Accordingly, Mr Speaker and the House proceeded to Government House, 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—

Government House,
St. John's, Newfoundland

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present Session was opened.

W. E. DAVIDSON.
Governor.

30 March, 1916.

The Minister of Finance and Customs tabled the Public Accounts for the year ending June 30th 1915.

PETITIONS.

HON. MR. EMERSON—I beg to present a petition from St Jacques, from Robert Lee, and other members of the F.P.U. on the subject of the prohibition of large steamers prosecuting the seal fishery; and other matters. This petition is similar to a number of others already presented to the House. I acknowledge the courtesy of my friend, Mr. Stone, in handing me this petition for presentation.

MR. ABBOTT—I beg leave, Mr.

Speaker, to present a petition from the inhabitants of Canning's Cove asking for a grant of money to repair washout caused by sea last fall, also a sum of money to repair road which is almost grown over with trees, also that their local grant be raised from $37 to $80; also that Canning's Cove be made a port of call for the S.S. Dundee. This petition is largely signed and the requirements are very badly needed. The washout caused by the sea last fall requires immediate attention. The road referred to in the petition Mr. Speaker is exactly as the petitioners state,absolutely impassable. An increase in their local grant from thirty seven to eighty dollars is also absolutely necessary, because it is an impossibility to keep local roads in repairs in a locality like Canning's Cove with the small amount of thirty seven dollars. As far as making Canning's Cove a port of call for Dundee is concerned, I think the petitioners are fully justified in making that request.

So I kindly ask the government to consider the various prayers of the petitioners and do all possible to have their requests granted. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled the annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1915.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

The Hon. Colonial Secretary gave notice that he would on Monday next move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to Weights and Measures.

INFLAMMABLE OILS BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill, "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law in relation to Inflammable Oils" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

MR. WINSOR asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the amount of duties collected by each Sub-Collector in Bonavista district; also, an itemized statement of expenditure incurred by each for the year 1915 to date.

HON. MIN. FINANCE—I table this.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House a statement containing the total amount of Kerosene Oil and Coal purchased by his department for the calendar year ending December, 1915 and all vouchers relating to same.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS—I table this.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House a statement containing the total amount of Coal and Kerosene Oil purchased by his department for the calender year ending December 1915, and all vouchers relating to same.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES—This is in course of preparation.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement containing the total amount of Supplies furnished the General Hospital, Lunatic and Poor Asylum, for the calendar year ending December, 1915 and all vouchers relating to same.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS tabled the answer.

MR. STONE asked the Hon Colonial Secretary if any Commission has been appointed to enquire into the question of Compulsory Education, as outlined by the Right Hon. the Premier at the Session of 1913, as a result of the various matters brought before 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.—I have explained this to the hon. member.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement of all special grants sent to St. Jacques, Fortune District, from January 1st, 1915, to date, with copies of return for same, if any have been received.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS —This is in course of preparation.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House all amounts allocated from his department to Bonvista district during 1912-13, and the names of persons to whom the amounts were allocated.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES. —This is in course of preparation.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement (a) showing the amount paid by the government for telegraph messages in connection with the S.S. Newfoundland Sealing Disaster; (b) names in full of persons incurring the amount; (c) the amount incurred by each.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This is in course of preparation.

CONTROL OF TRADING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Control of Trading in Certain Commodities" 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.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order 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. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman. I would like at this juncture in the estimates to make a few remarks in connection with the department of Marine and Fisheries. I am well aware that retrenchment in the lighthouse service, that would interfere with or injure its efficiency would be almost a crime. Yet there are some matters where there is room for reform without having an injurious effect.

I would like to say that I have had occasion to approach the Minister of Marine and Fisheries several times in regard to rearranging fishery rules and have always found him very fair-minded and willing to meet me in any proposition that was advantageous to the people,and the alterations of some of these rules means hundreds of dollars added to the earnings of the fishermen in the district of Twillingate last spring. Any remarks therefore which I may make will be with the best intention and only with a view of pointing out needed reforms.

Dr. Lloyd in the course of his remarks the other day suggested the advisability of appointing a purchasing agent for the civil service. I believe this would be a good thing in connection with lighthouse supplies. I had the opportunity lately of visiting the station at Sergeant's Cove Head. As no doubt the Hon Min. of Marine and Fisheries is well aware the machinery connected with the light there is very delicate and complicated. The oil is held in a tank fixed by the side of the tower and is pumped into that tank, and the compressed air forces the oil through a small tube which has a steel cap fixed on the end of a short distance from the generator. There is a very small hole in that cap which only the finest needle can penetrate. It will be easily seen that it is very important that the oil used should be of the best quality as the

smallest particle of dirt will close the aperture and injure the efficiency of the light. I found that the oil supplied to that station was only 120 test and nothing less than 150 test should be used. Now, I don't suppose the Minister knows anything about this and I don't blame him in that respect. As I understand, the contracts are given to certain parties to send these supplies and they are paid for the best quality and it seems someone here saw their chance and took the advantage by supplying an inferior article. This however is a serious matter. This station is an important one, and I am glad to be able to say that the keeper is a very capable conscientious man who although he had the misfortune to lose one of his arms attends to his duties properly and keeps the light in good condition and it is not right that his trouble should be increased by having to use bad oil. I have had some experience of the same kind myself. I spent over four years at a lighthouse station and the oil supplied one year was so bad that the kitchen lamp would go out when one third full of this oil. However I reported it to the lighthouse department and they at once supplied a better quality.

Then again as regards the measurement of coal. The keeper has no means whatever of ascertaining whether he receives his proper measure or not. The plan usually followed is this. Certain parties contract to supply coal to a number of stations; the coal is brought and generally landed in a hurry and the keeper don't know if the certified quantity is landed or not. He will probably be able to form some estimate when he stores it but this is not often done till months after 'tis landed. Rumors have been notoriously circulated that coals were left behind in the bottoms of vessels supplying. I do not say this always happens. There is certainly room for improvement in this direction. Mr. Halfyard referred to the difference in the salaries received by those keepers. There are certainly a number of cases where the duties incurred are very much the same and the situation offers no special advantage one more than another where a great difference exists in the salaries received and when those keepers are pensioned the same unfair conditions will obtain if they receive two thirds of their salary. We hear a great deal about raising salaries, but I do not venture to suggest that those salaries should be evened up by raising the one below for the very good reason that our country cannot afford it. The earning power of the people who have to pay the revenue is not large enough to justify an increase and as the Prime Minister said the other day we have to cut the garment according to the cloth, if so, there ought to be a move made in the direction of levelling down the salaries of those who only perform the same duties.

There is one other item in connection with Sergeant's Head station to which I would like to refer. The lighthouse is built very near the edge of the cliff probably a distance of thirty feet more or less. The cliff goes sheer down a height of three hundred feet without a break and you want a fairly strong nerve to be able to look down over the edge and see the sea breaking at its base. There is no protection whatever on the edge of the cliff and I would suggest to the Minister that a rail consisting of wire cable passing through iron posts would be a reliable and yet inexpensive protection on the edge of the cliff the distance to be railed being possibly not more than a hundred yards.

However it is very necessary. I do not think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knew anything about it or he would have had it remedied. The wind from the west to north west

blows around the corner of the house with great force and on one occasion the keeper very nearly lost his two boys who were carrying coals from the store to the house. Now that the Minister knows about it I trust he will remedy it.

There is one other matter to which I would like to refer and that is the salary paid to the Inspector of Logging Camps. He is paid a salary of $700, and I think it is altogether out of proportion to the work done. The work performed this season did not last longer than a month, and I am not sure it lasted as long as that. Now I think honourable members will agree that $700 is too large a salary for that amount of work. There are hundreds of men in Twillingate district who would be glad to perform that work for $200 a year. When appointing a man for that work I think the man appointed should be in the neighbourhood of Lewisporte where there is railway connection that would enable him to travel easily to his work, not a man who lives on the outside and cannot get in to the camps only at certain times. The inspection this year did not take place until January when the runs caught over and made travelling safe, and if I remember correctly the dates of the reports they were dated February; which shows that the work did not take more than a month. I think a salary of $700 is out of all proportion for this amount of work.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I just wish to say a word on this matter. I am very thankful to the honourable member for Twillingate for drawing my attention to the matter of this oil. I have never heard of this thing before, and I think if the keeper of the lighthouse would only read over his instructions that should be posted in the lighthouse when such a thing as that would happen and would communicate with me and tell me that 120 test oil had been sent him, when it should have been 150 test, I could have the matter rectified. But they keep these things to themselves till someone like the honourable gentleman comes around and then pour out all their troubles. How can you expect to run a Department that way? Since I have been in the Department I have written a circular letter to every lighthouse keeper, that if any trouble occurred in the lighthouse in connection with oil or supplies or other matters, to write me—not the lighthouse inspector, because very often they write the Lighthouse Inspector and I never hear anything of it—but to write the Head of the Department; and if I am not there the Deputy Head of the Department will attend to the matter. The machinery of those vapour lights, of course, is very fine and it is necessary to burn 150 test white oil. Not only do we buy that, but we get a certificate from the firms abroad that are supplying it. It is the same kind of oil as is used in connection with the United States and Canadian lights. We have another of these lights at Cape Spear. To get the best results this oil should be strained through chamois; but of course all the keepers do not do this, as it means a little trouble. When any of these keepers have written to me making any complaints about these matters, I have always done my best to look into them and have them adjusted. Now, I know Sargeant's Cove Head very well. I knew it before there was a light put there. In fact it was on my recommendation that the light was put where it is. When Mr. Rowsell and the men from Twillingate went to put up the light, I myself gave instructions for the erection of a railing there, and according to the report which came in I believed that it had been put there. The man

or boy that falls over that place better say the shortest prayer he knows, because he will not come back any more. I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention.

Now, Sir, I wish to refer to the question of salaries. Since I have had charge of things I think the salaries of these men have been pretty regular, but before that I must say that the salaries were very irregular. Two years ago, in 1913, I asked the Inspector of Lighthouses to go through the whole system, take in all the lighthouses and try and rate them and give me something that I could bring before the Government in order to equalize the different lighthouse keepers around the coast. There are places where men are looking after lighthouses of just the same strength as others and their salaries are not equal at all. A man keeping the light on Penguin Islands or Wadham Islands needs a greater amount of money than a man on shore keeping the same class of light. They have to hire men to bring their provisions off to Penguin Island or the Wadham, and they charge quite a little sum to bring them off. You cannot always go to a store and get what you want, but you have to order supplies for two or three months ahead. These men send to St. John's and get their provisions down, and then they have to pay somebody else to look after them. I have tried since I have been there to get this matter settled. Now, while I am not one of those who blame everything on the war, yet this matter would have been adjusted but for the war. The matter of readjustment has been before the Government, but the Government has not seen its way clear to adjust the salaries that these men are getting. I have travelled around the world quite a bit, and while I do not know a big lot—not as much as many members of this House—yet I know for a certainty that our lighthouse keepers are the worst paid officials of that class in the world. Members have come into this House ever since 1833 and talked about these matters. I suppose if you go to the root of the matter, politics is responsible for it. If I had a great pull with the Government of the day and wanted a man appointed and wanted a certain salary for him; or if the Government were afraid of me, they would appoint the man and give him the salary. That, in my opinion, is the reason for so many inequalities as exist in this service. However, in the case of any lights that have been put up since I have been in charge, the salaries are pretty nearly equal, according to the lights the men are looking after.

Now, I might say to this House that while I was away this winter on my own business, I also made enquiries about lighthouses, and I suppose if I approached this Government or any other Government and said that I could furnish this country with lights that did not need any keepers, they would say that that would not do, as they would lose too many votes. But if you want to do things right, you have to put up with defeat as well as victory. Now, I am quite satisfied that I can furnish this country with lights that will not need any keepers, which will not need any kerosene oil, and which will be a lot cheaper than the lights we are now using. I may say that they are all right. Panama Canal is lit up with them from one end to the other. Great Britain is using them, and Brazil, Chili and Valparaiso are using them, and they are now furnishing them to the British West Indies and Canada. But how does this look to the gentlemen on the other side of the House, who have already promised lights to some of their friends when, as they say, they are

going to get the Government? You know you have promised to give Uncle George and Uncle John a light. You can say what you like, but I know you have the intention of doing the same as we have done if you get on this side of the House.

MR. COAKER—We will put in these lighthouses without men, if they work all right.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I hope you will remember that and carry it out. It is a splendid system. I was in the factory where they make them, and they demonstrated them to me and showed me a model which they were making. They were making two models, one for Kingston, Jamaica, and one for the Argentine Republic. These people cannot send men to go through the factory; therefore the next best thing was to send a model to these two places.

MR. COAKER—Why not introduce one and try it?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That's what I intended to do. I made provision for it in the estimates here, but I find that it is cut out, as we are too short of money, and then of course in a case like that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries naturally gets blamed. But I tell you that there is no one in the House or outside of it that knows the necessity of lights around our coast better than I do. I think if there is one Department of the Civil Service which needs the greatest consideration it is the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the lights and aids to navigation around our coast, and I hope the day will come when we will be able to give it that consideration and do things in a common sense way. We will have to put politics to one side and carry out these things for the benefit of the country. Politics has been the ruin of our lighthouses in this country as well as of many other things.

MR. JENNINGS—Just one word in relation to the matter I spoke of. I hope I did not make any insinuation in regard to that official that he was trying to make any complaints. I might say that he only discussed this in reply to questions which I asked. These questions were only asked by me as I am acquainted with lighthouse matters owing to the experience which I have had. The keeper there is the kind of man that would put up with a lot of inconvenience and spend a lot of time and trouble trying to make things right, rather than make any complaint. I would not like any imputation on this man to rest in the Department on account of anything I have said, and I take all the responsibility for it myself.

Then, again, I think I may safely say that I have no Uncle George or Uncle Dick to whom I have promised a job. I have always tried so far to keep clear of this kind of thing, whatever I may do in the future. The only man I ever tried to get a job for is the one-armed man at Campbellton.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I am not blaming that man. I only said that lightkeepers should notify the Department in cases of this kind. If any of these lights are out I am not the man that is going to suffer. The man who is going to suffer is the man who is out to sea and who is looking for that light. It may not be the fault of the keeper, but the lights may not be working, and the Department would know nothing about it unless the keeper sent in a complaint. But a man may be coming in from sea and looking for that light, and through the fact that it is not lighted a great many lives may be lost. If keepers would look at it in that spirit they would not be long in sending complaints.

I would like to do something for the man the honourable gentleman spoke of. Nobody has a greater sympathy for a one-armed man than I have myself.

MR. CLAPP—My reason for asking for that amount to construct a road to the lighthouse was that I have had letters from Englee lighthouse keeper, asking for a sum of money to construct a road to the lighthouse. Now, out of the small grant that I have, it is hardly fair to ask me to take the money to construct this road. It is the duty of the Government to provide a road. That is the only reason why I asked for the grant.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—We provide roads to lighthouses if the supplies for the lighthouse have to be sent over the road; but if the supplies can be landed at a wharf, that is done.

MR. COAKER—I notice that the vote for Puffin Island has been increased from $700 to $960. What is the explanation of that?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—That is for the lighthouse keeper and fog alarm keeper. Last year there were three men there, but the lighthouse keeper's son, who was one of them, left because of the fact that he was not getting enough money. In addition to that there was some little disagreement between the lighthouse keeper and the fog alarm keeper. The lighthouse keeper contended that he had enough to do to look after the light. We increased the grant, and there are three men there again this year.

MR. COAKER—It would have been much better if the heads of the various Departments had given us this information at the start, so that we could get through these estimates as quickly as possible. Now, the Premier promised to table a statement of the expenditures in connection with the Heart's Content wharf.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think that is a slight inaccuracy. The matter came up in debate. I think, if I remember rightly, the hon. member stated that the wharf cost $20,000. I pointed out that I thought the hon. member was in error, and that the cost was not anything like that, but that I would ascertain for him as nearly as possible the cost of the wharf and the cost of the portion that was added on account of the Harmsworth connection. I did not undertake to get a detailed statement. As a matter of fact I can give the information now to the hon. member, as I brought it here to-day for that purpose. The wharf has not yet been measured, and this is only an estimate; I cannot give him an exact statement, but what I can give him will, I think, be sufficient for his purpose. The wharf is 635 feet long. Without the addition, the cost would be about $8,000; the addition will cost about $3,400, and I forgot to state here the other evening that the Harmsworths have agreed to pay half of that. In other words, the Government Engineer estimated that the wharf which we were going to put there in any case as a deep-water terminal, having brought the railway down to the water, would cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of $8,000; then in order to make it sufficiently large for the Harmsworth's boats and all other coastal and Bay Boats to come there, we made an addition, which will cost about $3,400, and they have agreed to pay half of that. I cannot give the details until the wharf is measured and taken over.

MR. COAKER—Have you any idea how deep it is?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—About 40 feet, I understand, in some parts.

MR. COAKER—It appears, then,

that the Government is spending $9,-700 on that wharf, that is, $8,000 for the wharf as originally planned and $1,700 for the addition to accomodate the shipping of the Company.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is a public wharf. Anyone can go there. It is not intended to be used by the Harmsworths any more than by anyone else. The only thing is that they have put up large paper stores near it, and, of course, they will be using it; but if a cargo of coal came there to-morrow, for instance, the wharf could be used to unload for the whole Bay.

MR. COAKER—What claim are the Harmsworths having for the $1700 which they are giving?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—None whatever. It is a free contribution. Of course, they have the right to use the wharf.

MR. COAKER—Will the Colonial Secretary be able to let us have that report from Mr. Mercer about post office affairs before we get through the Estimates?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes. I will have it on Monday or Tuesday.

MR. COAKER—And the Public Analyst's report?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Analyst has already made a report to the Department of Agriculture and Mines to the 30th June. I have asked him to supplement it to the 31st December, and he is doing that.

MR. COAKER—And the Tuberculosis Department's Report?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I have not yet received that. No doubt I will get it in a day or two.

MR. COAKER—The Government will understand that it is essential that we have these reports, and we are justified in demanding them before we pass the Estimates. We don't wish to be blamed for delaying the votes, but we must have this information.

The other day reference was made to the pit-prop business and to some letters in that connection which were received from a man named Martin, and also a report from Mr. Bradley of Lewisporte. I have gone to the trouble of finding out something about conditions in this respect, and find that the statement made in that letter of Mr. Martin's, claiming that they shipped 70 per cent. of their wood last year green timber, and that they shipped 30,000 cords, is not true. They shipped less than 5,000 cords of green timber. He also stated that the reports from across the water condemned the burnt dry wood, and he claimed that for these reasons he was going to abandon the business this year unless he was permitted to cut on green timber areas. I understand that the reports from most of the dry wood buyers was very satisfactory. I happened to get some of these reports from exporters of dry wood and I read them myself, and I find that the people on the other side of the water who deal in that wood found it very satisfactory indeed. I understand that this man Martin had already erected certain camps upon areas containing dry wood, and as soon as permission was given to cut on the green timber areas he removed those camps to green timber spots. I mention this to show that there has been a certain amount of deception practised on the Government, and it is only right that it should be exposed in the interests of the wood and of the foreign markets, and in explanation of the conduct of the Government in giving permission to cut on green timber areas, contrary to law.

In reference to the matter that Mr. Jennings referred to—the Inspector of Logging Camps: I am very sorry to say that just what we pointed out last

year would happen, has happened. The present arrangement is not at all satisfactory, and no purpose will be served without the appointment of an inspector or agent representing the men. The present inspector is only an inspector in name. So far as he is concerned personally, I don't know but that he is as good a man as could be found in Green Bay for the work, if he would only put his best in the job. There may have been some reason for the way in which the work was done. He may have been ill.

HON MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes, he was ill.

MR. COAKER—Well, that explains it. But the inspection has not been at all up to what it should be, and there has been very little alteration. I have had numerous complaints from all quarters where logging camps are in operation. Now, the Upper House gave us to understand last year that if this arrangement of a Government Inspector only, did not work satisfactorily, they would approve of the appointment of an agent to represent the men, as we wanted, and we will only have to wait now until we can alter the Act, and get a man that will be satisfactory all round. The wage paid is excessive. $720 is $400 too much for duties covering only six months.

Now, in relation to this new light system that the Minister of Fisheries has spoken of so favorably this afternoon, I can say without the slightest hesitation that if a light could be introduced of the sort to which he refers, no one would be more pleased than members on this side of the House; and I hope the Minister of Finance will take the recommendation of the Minister of Fisheries, and restore to the Estimates the amount necessary to provide an experimental light of this sort. If the Minister has already found these lights working satisfactorily in other parts of the world, there is no reason why we should not have them here. It comes with very poor grace from the Government to turn down a recommendation of this sort from a Departmental Head, as he has stated has been done, and I trust that this matter will be taken into consideration and the vote for this purpose recommended by the Minister of Fisheries will be restored to the Estimates for the coming year.

There is another matter to which I want to draw the attention of the House, and that is one that requires serious consideration. During the last three or four months a number of men have been kept around St.John's or plying between St. John's and their homes in Conception Bay in connection with the investigation into the loss of the schooner "H.M. Stanley." These men believe and consider they have been treated badly. They are now not less than forty days here in St. John's and they receive 75 cents a day and expenses. They have had to leave their work during the past season; they have not had a chance to repair their traps for the coming fishery; most of them had tickets for the ice; and some of them had berths in the "Sable Island" and the "Florizel" and these berths they have had to abandon which means that some of them have had to abandon $150 they might have earned; and as compensation they have been paid at the rate of 75 cents a day and expenses. They have been kept from their families some of whom in consequence have had to remain half the winter without firing because there was nobody to get the wood for them. Some of these men's wives or children have been sick; and in spite of all this you kept them here in connection with this "Stanley" investigation—an enquiry that should have been over months ago. I have a letter from these men, which I shall now read to the House (reads letter). I

want to know if anything can be done to compensate these men for the time they have lost. These men cannot be expected to come here and spend their whole winter over a case that ought to have been disposed of in a couple of weeks and receive no other compensation but 75 cents a day. They belonged to the crews that sold fish to Mr. Roberts last year; and have had to beat about St. John's the whole winter in connection with the enquiry that is being held. In calling the attention of the House to this matter, I would also like to call attention to the disadvantages now so apparent of not having the Minister of Justice in the House to give information asked for in cases such as this and to give any explanations necessary. It cannot be expected that the Prime Minister should be ready at all times to give information asked for in connection with every government department. Are you going to treat these men like you did these witnesses in connection with the Snowden investigation held here last year? These men were kept here until late in June; had to give up fishing; had to leave their families unprovided for. I do not know if these men got any compensation. I remember they came in and spoke to me about compensation, and I tried to do something for them. The case now under discussion is a special case; and I trust the government will do something for the men referred to and provide them with some extra compensation at least for the financial loss they have sustained owing to the delays in this case.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman. As to the remarks of Mr. Coaker with reference to the men who have come here to attend the investigation into the loss of the "H.M. Stanley", I wish to say something to strengthen the remarks of the honourable member. The parties whose names appear in the letter Mr. Coaker read to the House are not all who are concerned, There are several others as well. Some of these men have earned, since last May, the sum of $90. Now they are all family men, some of them with five or six or seven children to support; and $90 was all they earned last year from May to October. From that time till Christmas they have been in the woods trying to get fuel for their homes for the winter. Just before New Year they got summonses to appear in connection with the trial of this "H.M. Stanley" case; and as Mr. Coaker has said in connection with the men who signed the letter just referred to, they have been held over here since Christmas until the present time and have had no chance of augmenting the $90 which represented their income since last May. The honourable members I know will agree with me when I say that when a man gets only $90 from May up to the present time, on which he has to support a family of five or six or seven surely something ought to be done to meet the situation. They might have had opportunities of getting employment, not alone at the sealfishery but on Bell Island, in the lumber woods, and at other occupations. They could have gone logging, they could have gone to Sydney; but they have been held over here since Christmas, and paid at the rate of 75 cents a day, or $4.50 per week; and on this sum they have had to support a family of seven. I think under such circumstances something ought to be done in order to augment that little sum they get to meet their expenses. I trust that the Government or the Prime Minister will take up the matter and see if some additional amount cannot be given to these men, because they badly need it. Four dollars and fifty cents a week is not enough for men to support and clothe their families. Let the Government do something. Keep the wolf from the door.

MR. CLAPP—With reference to the witnesses in the Snowden case last year: I called the attention of the Deputy Minister of Justice to the facts of that case and pointed out the hardships these men were suffering through no fault of their own. At that time, whilst they were detained over here, fish had struck in in Lobster Cove and other places in Bonne Bay, and they lost a season's voyage by being kept here. I think, when I pointed these facts out to the Department of Justice, something was allowed them, but what it was I cannot say; but it was nothing compared to the loss sustained by their being kept here through no fault of their own.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I shall be very glad to have this matter enquired into and see if anything can be done to meet the special hardships surrounding this particular case. I refer now to the "H. M. Stanley" case. The delays in that case can be accounted for. I think there were two distinct investigations; witnesses had to be brought on for the preliminary investigation; then for the Grand Jury; and when the trial was in progress a nolle prosequi was entered and the whole thing had to be gone over again de novo, and the witnesses had to be kept until the Grand Jury disposed of the case, and still further detained until it was known when the trial would take place. It is unfortunate, of course, that these people had to suffer, and I will have the matter looked into and see what can be done.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman: For obvious reasons, it is a somewhat delicate matter for me to say anything about this particular case; but I think it would be unfair to the hon. member for Twillingate and others interested, and to the men themselves, if I did not say to the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister that this is a case where there are very particular reasons why the greatest consideration should be given to the witnesses on the Crown side. The delays that have occurred have been unavoidable and unusual —enquiry will show this. I may say that there were three separate proceedings; there have been two enquiries—caused by the joinder of different accused and the substitution of some of the accused for others; and then there was the first trial and subsequently the abandonment of proceedings and the initiation of new proceedings, which resulted in the trial now about to begin. I think that now that this matter has been brought up, I, as a member of this House, with knowledge of the facts, should ask that the greatest consideration be given the witnesses referred to. I have often thought that it is a case where it is a pity that the ordinary allowance permitted by law to be given witnesses is so small. I do not think that expenses and seventy-five cents a day would by any means cover the loss of time of these men. There have been a considerable number of delays in connection with this case, and long absences from home, must have handicapped them in their ordinary avocations. I have much pleasure in supporting the claim made by the hon. members on the other side of the House, that the best consideration of the Justice Department ought to be given to the application now made on their behalf.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I suppose it is understood that all their expenses are paid. When I was in the Department of Justice we always paid all the expenses, travelling, board and lodging, and then 75 cents a day, so that now it is only a question of the difference between the 75 cents a day and what is a fair and reasonable amount . I think that pretty well everyone would be glad to come to St. John's for the winter if they got $1.00 a day with their trav-

elling expenses and their hotel bills paid. I do not not know, but it may transpire that these witnesses have received more.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I may say to the Leader of the Government that it is not so much a question of 75 cents or a $1.00 a day. The fact of the matter is that they have been handicapped in providing for their summer's work. They have been kept from doing in the winter any work necessary for their summer occupation.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I quite appreciate that. In some cases men have not been able to get into the woods to cut the wood for their flakes still if it transpires that they have received a $1.00 a day and all their expenses, the case would not be such a hard one.

MR. COAKER—Some of these men have had to give up berths in sealing steamers that are now going to pay their men $120 for just twenty days' work; that would be $6.00 a day, so that in those cases they deserve the most liberal consideration of the Government.

MR. GRIMES—I would just like to ask the Minister of Marine & Fisheries if it is the intention of the Government to have the light house at Cupids operating this year, and whether this vote of $250 is intended to cover maintenance and salary?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—No, it is only intended to cover the salary.

MR. GRIMES—Is there going to be a house for the keeper?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—No, the inspector has not recommended a house. I understood that you were going to recommend someone who lived alongside, in that case there would be no need for a house.

MR. COAKER—Might I ask the Minister why $250 is being granted for supplies for that station. They only allowed $50 for other Beacon Lights and this is only a Beacon Light.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—No, this is more than a Beacon Light. It is as good a light as the one on Bay Roberts point.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman: I would just like to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that on one or two occasions petitions have been presented from Norman's Cove, and that vicinity in relation to the erection of a light house at Old Paul Head in the District of Trinity. I do not whether the Government has given any consideration to the matter or not, but I would be very pleased if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would furnish me with the necessary information.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I would say Mr. Chairman, that this has been considered in the same way in which a number of other petitions have bene considered by the Government. Last year the Government did not see its way clear to grant any money for the building of light houses, but if they do grant money again, your petition will not be forgotten, and your place will get a light house.

MR. STONE—Mr. Chairman: Of course, I quite understand that we can't expect much in war times, but I believe that the people of Norman's Cove, New Harbour and nearby places are really entitled to a light house, and I think that if the Government can see its way clear at all, they ought to grant the request of the people who are living in those settlements.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: I may say there is a petition from my own district asking for a fog alarm on Harbour Grace Island. I have been doing what I can to get the money for that fog alarm, because it is one that would be a benefit not only to the people of Harbour Grace, but also to the owners

of all vessels coming from the North. You will doubtless remember that a couple of Falls ago a vessel coming from Mr. Winsor's district, in fact I think from his home town, was coming in the bay, and he could not get the bearings of Harbour Grace Island. He ran up to Bay Roberts and did not get his bearings there, and the first thing he knew he had run ashore. If that fog alarm had been on Harbour Grace Island that man would have known where he was, and would have been able to take his bearings and get into Bay Roberts or Spaniard's Bay, and would have had none of the expense and trouble which he had. In several cases we have had experiences in the past, and I can assure the hon. member that we are only waiting for the time when we think there will be sufficient money, so we will be able to carry out all the requests of the people around the Island.

MR. COAKER—Might I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if there is any information about that $41,000 that has been spent in connection with light houses, constructed the past year?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I am getting a report on that prepared.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman: I would just like to say a few words in connection with Shoal Tickle, in the district of Twillingate. That is a matter which requires attention almost at once. The old wharves there are falling in and the Tickle is almost closed. It is used by practically all the people of the south side of the Bay, and its condition is one that requires immediate attention. I believe Mr. Clift made representations on this matter to the Government last fall, and I would like to know whether any steps have been taken in connection with it.

MR. CLIFT—I may say that I wrote a letter to the Colonial Secretary in reference to this wharf and to the fact that Shoal Tickle was being filled up by reason of the fact that the old side walls or wharves had fallen in. I drew attention to the necessity of having the matter attended to at once and I asked that the government Engineer or some other competent person be sent down to survey the place and particularly to consider the question of erecting a concrete structure instead of the present one. I had the assurance of the Colonial Secretary that something would be done. I do not know whether the government engineer ever went down, but I would like to bring the matter urgently before the government now because it is very important that this tickle should be kept open. A very large number of people use it and it is almost impassable at the present time. I hope the necesary means will be provided to put it in proper condition.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—It is quite true that the Hon. member Mr Clift asked the government to send the Engineer down but the hon. member will remember that when he wrote me it was very late in the seasen somewhere about Christmas, and in my reply I pointed out the lateness of the season and that it hardly would be possible to make arrangements as suggested at that time but that it would be better to leave it to the spring to make a report.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. I am very glad to hear that the Hon. Colonial Secretary will send down the Government Engineer to attend to this matter. I am afraid that you will have to make up your minds that this work will require a large sum of money. In the past it consisted of a large number of wooden wharves but these have been allowed to fall into disrepair and now they are completely useless and project into the canal. What is re-

quired there is a concrete breastwork. It is no good putting up a wooden breastwork because that will only last five or six years. This canal has cost a lot of money in the past to governments especially the Liberal governments who spent thousands of dollars to improve it. It is a very necessary, being used by many in that section of the district, but it will cost a lot of money to put it in condition now. If you will vote $2000 we will be prepared to give $1000 of our Marine grants to aid the work although their grant is but $1500. I feel sure that the whole Bay would be prepared to make this sacrifice for this work. I think something might be done in supplemental supply in connection with this matter, and I trust the government will see its way to allow two or three thousand dollars for this purpose.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman. I would just like to call the attention of the government to the condition of affairs at Cupids. The Colonial Secretary will remember that it was pointed out to him that the wharf at that place had been washed away by a storm last year. Some money was allocated for repairs but it was only possible to do them in part, and part of the Road Moneys have had to be used for the purpose. Following on the washing out of the wharf another storm came and took away part of the main road. When it is remembered that 1800 people live between Riverhead Cupids and Burnt Head the government will recognize that there is great need for doing something special for that place. The road has been part ly repaired but it has been done at the expense of other sections of the district. A storm also took place at Port de Grave which damaged one of the wharves there and it will take four or five hundred dollars to fix that up so that it will be of use for taking fish or cargoes from vessels. Under the special circumstance of the case I would ask the government to make an allocation for that section of the district. The storm last fall at Cupids which washed away the wharf, should be attended to immediately. Not only Cupids and Burnt Head, but also a section of the Goulds have to use the same wharf. I think the government should give some consideration to so great a need and I trust that they will grant an allocation to cover the requirements of the people.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. It will be noticed sir, that under the head of Main Road there are quite a number of roads specified by name and special amounts put down for them. There are unfortunately in every district many Main Roads not provided for by special votes. There is a sum of money allocated to each district known as a special grant and out of that grant members are called upon to make recommendations. It is an unfortunate fact that during the past two or three years those special grants have not been suppiemented from any surplus, because no surplus has been forthcoming. The point of the matter is this that in many districts and I have had particular experience of Trinity, it may be that some other members are suffering under the same condition, there are many cases where main roads cannot be touched and have not been touched during the past year or two. In some cases I have approached the Minister of Public Works, and to his credit I can say that he has always tried to do the best he could do. I have always found him reasonable in trying to meet the difficulties of the situation. I have also had occasion to approach the government and I have always found them willing to meet the situation when it was possible to meet it out of the money on hand. I now rise to point out that in

Trinity Bay there are many roads and bridges in an absolutely shocking condition and which it was not possible to touch last year because of lack of money. These roads are going from bad to worse and it is a question whether or not some special vote, extra, some special vote should not be passed to cover the requirements of the roads. There is the case of the Shoal Harbor Bridge. Something will have to be done because in many cases roads and bridges are important connecting links between the places. I do not know what attention the Minister of Public Works has given to the matter but I feel sure that the matter has been impressed upon him by all the members of pretty well every district. I would like a little light to be thrown on the situation or to know what is being done or what it is proposed to do.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman. Of course we are in the hands of the House of Assembly. There is a vote of $30,000 of which each district gets its share. We are doing the best we can do under the circumstances. We are all in the same box as far as that is concerned. I have frequently myself been embarassed by the demands which the special grants cannot possibly meet and unless the government can see its way clear to vote more money it is impossible for the department to do any more than it is doing. It is a matter for the representatives of each district to expend the grants as best they can. I understand that as far as Trinity district is concerned it gets more per capita than any other district. If so then Trinity is getting more than any other district in the country, but I am trying to meet the demands of every representative as far as it lies in my power.

We tried our best to distribute the moneys equally last year, and I think it was fairly satisfactory. I think all except my friend Mr. Stone were accommodated, but I was sorry I could not get the money for him. Unless more money is found the department cannot do more than at present. I know that in the district of Hr. Main extensive repairs are necessary, but no money can be got. When we had a surplus the other year I got many of the public services repaired and put in good shape but since that time nothing has been possible. I think, Mr. Chairman this is all the information I can give the members.

MR. CLAPP—I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that Badger Brook bridge which spanned one of the rivers of my district on the West coast has been washed away. All the timber, wire, stone, piers etc., used in the construction has been saved, and it is only necessary to spend the cost of labor to repair it. It is a very important bridge, and it is very inconvenient for the people there to be without it. It was a suspension bridge about 100 yards, it is difficult for the mailman or any other traveller to cross. Everything is there ready, and the only money need be spent is in labor. I hope the government will see its way clear to grant this request. The bridge I may say was the one constructed on the plan of Mr. Hall, Gov. Engineer.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am exceedingly pleased with the reply of the Minister of Pubic Works. This question comes up every year, and I think something ought to be done. We had the same explanation from him on that occasion. It is no answer for the Minister to say that the district of Trinity gets more than other districts. If it gets more it is because the needs are greater. There are probably more roads and wharves there to be kept in repair. There appears to be no grant or a very small grant for work

of this class, and the money is usually exhausted before one quarter of the districts are supplied. The result is that the roads are always out of repair. Public buildings everywhere are out of repair for the same reason. We noticed it this afternoon in the very chamber in which we sit. One of the members opposite nearly felt the effects of it. He was in a dangerous position by a fall from the wall.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That's another reason why you shouldn't be desirous of coming across the House.

MR. LLOYD—Yes, it is a bit dangerous, but still we will risk it.

MR. MOULTON—The same thing might have happened on your side.

MR. LLOYD—In that case it would be the President of the Fishermen's Union who would suffer, and I think ultimately the government. However, I have no desire to charge the Minister with manslaughter or negligence, but it might be nothing more or less than an act of courtesy on the part of the present government to prepare the portion of the chamber where we are so soon to go, for us. It will not keep us from it nevertheless.

MR. MORRIS—Mr. Chairman, as the subject of roads and public works is now before the Chair, I would like to lay before the House a very urgent cause that came from the District I have the honour to represent. I think it is now time that the House took some definite action in this matter. In years gone by, when we had large surpluses, and when special allocations for the repair of roads and other public utilities were made, local district requirements were fairly well attended to, but within the past two or three years since this awful war has come upon us, the stringency of the times and the deficit in our revenue have made it impossible for the Government to vote any money beyond the absolutely necessary grants.

Years ago Governments of the past constructed a number of what is known as railway connecting roads, and after their completion there has never been an annual vote passed by this House for their upkeep, with the result that most of these roads are, at present, in a very bad condition. We have two or three of such roads in the District of Placentia, and although they are of the greatest importance and convenience to the different settlements adjacent to the line of railway, most of them are almost impassable, owing to want of repair. In some cases these roads are more important to the travelling public than the main line of road, which has a yearly grant for its upkeep.

There is another matter, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to bring before the House, which is of vital importance to the residents of the town of Placentia, as well as to the inhabitants of the Cape Shore. I now refer to the breakwater near the blockhouse at Placentia. This breakwater was erected by us within the past 3 or 4 years at a cost of between $2,000 and $3,000. Early in this year, owing to the existence of a great storm and very heavy seas. the Placentia breakwater was entirely swept away, piling some thousands of tons of beach rocks along the main line of road, and doing hundreds of dollars worth of damage to the houses and other property of the people residing in the neighbourhood. On reporting this matter to the Board of Works, Capt. Bonia was sent to Placentia to inspect the damage and report thereon. He estimated that the damage to the road and the rebuilding of the breakwater cannot be carried out for less than $3,000, and the answer of the Department to this report was, "We have no funds." Now, if this matter is not immediately attended to, and the breakwater rebuilt during the coming summer, the next

storm with high seas and tides, will make Placentia an Island, and if not entirely submerging the town, will certainly do inestimable damage, and cut off all connection with the main land by road. There can be no two opinions about this, and honourable members will see that the very existence of the town of Placentia depends upon the speedy erection of a breakwater. Now, it is evident from our recent experience that to erect a wooden breakwater at the cost of $3,000, will only be throwing the money away. It may stand for a year or two, but may be demolished by the sea within a few months of its erection. We spent $3,000 on this work within the past three years, and now it is gone; the same might happen a score of times. Mr. Chairman, my opinion is, the proper thing would be to put a concrete breakwater there which will only cost about $2,000 more than the estimated cost submitted for the wooden one by Inspector Bonia. This may appear a very high initial cost, but a concrete breakwater would in all probability last for 50 years. I want to make it clear to this Legislature and to the Government, that it will be absolutely necessary, if, as I have said before, the existence of the town of Placentia is to be preserved, that a vote be placed in the estimates for the rebuilding of this breakwater. From the remarks of the hon. members who have spoken this evening, representing the necessities of their different districts in the matter of public works, it must be apparent to the Government, that a special vote must be put in the estimates by the Finance Minister to cope with their different demands, and I think the time is opportune now, when the House should outline some policy for dealing with these urgent cases. It is a position which I think is not creditable to this House, that should know the urgent necessity of having these public works immediately attended to, and still we allow supply to go through without making the necessary provision for their repair and upkeep. This Legislature is the dominant power, and the Government will, if possible, carry out instructions.

MR. STONE—I am very pleased to be afforded this opportunity of making a few brief remarks upon this important subject now before the House. I am quite in accord with Dr. Lloyd, the Leader of the Opposition, when he says that the grant which we now have is not sufficient to meet the many wants in the district. As a matter of fact with such a small allowance as we now have it is impossible for us to do anything. I know that we cannot expect very much when we have no surplus to draw from, yet I think that some arrangement should be made, and as we are now considering the estimates, I think it would be well to provide a sum for the up-keep of Roads and Bridges all over the Colony. For instance in the District of Trinity, which I have the honour to represent, we have two bridges alone, one at Shoal Harbour and the other at Clarenville, which in my opinion would cost about one thousand dollars to build, to-day both bridges are unsafe for traffic, yet there is no chance of obtaining sufficient money to replace them. I think that some immediate steps should be taken to remedy such matters, or otherwise we shall soon be without any roads, bridges or anything else.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I am afraid next year when we come here we will be saying nasty things about the Government because we will be asked to vote a loan of $100,000 to repair public buildings and marine walls. Wouldn't it be better to follow out the suggestion the member has made in-

stead of coming here next year and asking for it then? Next year we might be able to make political capital out of it seeing it will be the eve of an election, but that might be avoided by doing it this year. There are great improvements necessary in all the northern districts, and I would urge upon the Government the necessity of taking this matter up. Why not raise a loan of $100,000 at 5 p.c.? I will help you float it here in Newfoundland. I don't think it would be much trouble to get the people to take it up. I see no reason why we cannot do this. Better days are coming for Newfoundland. I am hoping that Newfoundland will soon be in a prosperous condition again. I think it would be a very easy matter to raise this $100,000,and Newfoundland as I have said will soon return to her prosperous condition. We cannot do things without expenditure, and if we have not faith enough in the country for that, we may as well tell the folks up along to come down and tell us what price they are prepared to give us, and be done of it.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman: While this matter is under discussion I would like to make a few remarks on the subject. As far as Twillingate is concerned I believe you can spend with advantage one hundred thousand dollars on main roads which have been partially constructed by special or surplus grants but for which there is no regular allowance made to keep them in repair. Those main line roads are all the more important as the railway only taps one port in the district viz: Lewisporte, with the exception of the A. N. D. line at Botwood. Some of these roads are in such a wretched condition that if hon. gentlemen of this House happened to be benighted while travelling over them without a lantern they would have to stop where they were till daylight.

There is a kind of a road from New Bay to Botwood which if properly made would be of great benefit to the people living there, many of whom live to some extent from farming. They have a ready market for all their produce at Botwood, but if they want to get their meat in a fresh condition there, they have to drive the animal through the mud and stumps a distance of 12 miles, and kill it after reaching there. There is no possibility of meeting those requirements from the small special grant, and if the desired improvements are brought about something will have to be done on the lines suggested during this debate.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I rise for the purpose of supporting the remarks of the hon. member who just sat down. On behalf of my own District I would urge the Government if it can see its way clear, to raise some money more or less for the purpose of carrying out these measures. As a member of the Government I would have great pleasure in lending my support to any such effort. No one enjoys the luxury of driving more than I do. I take a keen interest in the roads of my own district, and try to do as well as I can with the means at my disposal. There are however, a great many demands on the small sum provided for that purpose. I think Main Roads and railway connecting roads should be kept in the best condition, and we ought to raise the necessary money to do that. I can assure the Honourable House that I will have considerable pleasure in doing whatever I can to advance the interests of the people with regard to these matters.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Chairman: I also would be very pleased to express my concurrence in the views expressed by the hon. member who has just sat down, and I also agree with every member who has promoted the idea of raising a loan for the purpose of build-

ing these roads. Roads should receive more attention and consideration at our hands in my opinion than the iron horse. I do not know if any members the Prime Minister excepted, have ever had occasion to visit St. Barbe. The roads of Twillingate and Placentia are pearly streets compared with those at St. Barbe. Indeed I would be safe in asserting that there are no roads worthy of the name to be found in that locality. I have travelled from Bonne Bay to Flowers Cove, and I should have liked to have with me for a companion one of the hon. members on the Government benches, so that I could show him the disgraceful condition of the roads there. I am sure that he would stand up and agree with me when I say that St. Barbe is the first district that needs attention. It has no railways, steam communication it has, but the great civilizing factor in a district is the Main Road. If this Government would only raise a million dollars to build a road from Bonne Bay to Flowers Cove, I think they could open up an agricultural country equal to any in the Island. It was suggested by a letter in one of the papers, that instead of building a railway to Bonne Bay, (which, by the way, has not been started yet), you spent a million dollars on a main road. you would benefit the people of that part of the District immensely. If we wait until next Session to raise a loan it will be twelve months lost, and would be considered an election dodge purely. Let the $100,000 be raised at once and spent as suggested by honourable members in main roads. It gives me great pleasure to voice the sentiments of those hon. members who said that we should this session have a bill brought down to borrow, say one hundred thousand dollars at 5 per cent. It would be money well spent. The fishermen will not think the less of you on account of this—indeed it will strengthen your cause. The people of St. Barbe are long suffering, and I do not think it is fair that because they live so far north of us that they should be neglected. I have always tried to do my duty to them, and whenever I could I have advocated their best interests in this Assembly. Let the greater portion of this loan go to St. Barbe District.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to endorse everything that has been said by the hon. member for St. Barbe. I have myself travelled that district in company with Mr. Mott previous to the 1913 election, and for a distance of seven hundred miles, if you include all the indentations of the coast, there is no Main Road. Indeed there are no roads there at all, and there was not a telegraph wire in that district until a few years ago but I do not think, however, that it is very much behind Burgeo and LaPoile. I remember I travelled through that latter district in an open boat with Mr. Moulton. I know there is a road from Channel to Cape Ray, but I think there is no such thing as a Main Line in that district; when you get into a harbor you must stay there, and unless you have a motor boat you must wait until the steamer comes. I think the same thing applies to the whole District from Channel to Fortune Bay. I know it applies equally to Fortune Bay. Trinity, however, is more fortunate, as it has a large Main Line grant. The building of the Main Line grants in this country arose in this way. After we were granted representative Government in 1833, year after year loan bills were brought in,moneys were received, and the main lines were constructed on capital account. I think in connection with the roads of St. Barbe, Fortune Bay and Burgeo and LaPoile that they were built,not out of capital account, but by special grants. Seven years ago, when the present Administration came into power, we found that nearly all the public works of the country, from want of annual

repairs, were falling down. There had been nothing done on many of them for years. I do not mean to say that it was the fault of the late Government, or of any Government; but the roads and wharves and the bridges—which were referred to here this evening—were falling into disrepair, by reason of the fact that the old grants which had been sufficient to maintain the old roads were not enough to keep the ever inceasing mileage of roads in repair. In that way, I say, the roads and bridges were falling down, and during the four years between 1909 and 1913 the whole surplus of $900,000 was spent on public works mostly—. on wharves and bridges and public roads—all over the country, and I think it will be admitted that a great deal of good was done all over the country in relation to these works. Well, we have now been in office over two years since the last election, and unfortunately there has been no surplus, and we have had all we can do to make both ends meet—in fact we have not been able to do that, having at first to use a portion of what has been called the "nest egg" in the Bank of Montreal, and last year the balance of it; in addition to raising loans. Well now the position to-day is this: we have had a better revenue this year, and up to-day there is a sufficient amount to meet all the pubic requirements, and equal the deficit of last year. In other words, if, in the next three months, we collect as much as for the corresponding three months last year, we shall probably make both ends meet. If we do better in the next three months, then we will have a surplus.

We will know more about that by the end of April after we have gone through the estimates fully, and the Minister will be able to come in with his financial statement in his budget, and I think I can say this to the House in reference to the suggestion made this evening that we shall be very glad to consider it, and if it is possible to do anything along the lines suggested here this evening, we will provide for it in Supplemental Supply. I am as anxious as anyone in the House to do what is necessary. Every District is in practically the same position. You cannot give to one without giving to another. Take the very District that I represent. We have a main line extending from St. John's to Broad Cove, a distance of nine miles. We are supposed to have that road kept up in apple pie order, so that automobiles and carriages and pedestrians can go over it. We are voted here to-day $100 to keep up that road. Of course, we cannot do it with that amount, and we have to take it out of our per capita grant, our ordinary local grant. Then we have to keep up the Topsail Road to within about a mile of Donovan's, which is our share of that line. We are voted $200 to do that. Two hundred dollars does not pay for the cartage of the material necessary to keep that road in the condition of repair in which it must be kept. The same is true of every other road in the district, Waterford Bridge, and all the other roads, and I have no doubt that the same conditions exist in St. John's East. The members do their best of course, they have got to keep the roads in the best possible condition, having regard to the nature of the traffic going over them. I was hoping that in view of the very large grants that were spent for the period between 1909-13, we would be able to bear the stress for a while of the pinch we have been going through the last few years, but if a sum can be found, if the Minister can find a sum for this purpose, we shall be very glad to bring it down.

MR. LLOYD—I am glad that the Government has gone so far as to give us this understanding that they will take the matter into consideration be-

fore the House closes, and either put a sum in Supplementary Supply, or give a pronouncement on the matter. From my own experience in Trinity Bay, I know the difficulty is great, and the need acute. We have bridges that are not safe—such as the very large bridge at Shoal Harbour, a long bridge taking in some important settlements —to go over. Then we have a number of connecting roads from the bottom of Trinity to the railway, and there is no grant for them, and we cannot get any money to spend on them. The very fact that very large grants were made within four or five years, only adds to the difficulty, because a lot of this money was spent in construction work the last few years. Nothing has been done in the way of minor repairs. When I say nothing, I mean very little. My colleague has pointed out that the disrepair of the roads is making very rapid inroads in the way of destroying both roads and bridges. Something has to be done. The matter is acute. I did my best to draw the attention of the Government to matters in Trinity Bay during the course of the last year, and I know they met me as well as possible with the money at their disposal. It is a matter that the House must deal with, and they can only deal with it on the recommendation of the Government, and under the circumstances, I hope the Government will see its way to do something this year. If you cannot take the amount out of the ordinary revenue, there is nothing to prevent you from raising money by way of loan. There is plenty of money in Newfoundland for such purposes, and all that is needed is a sufficient offer of interest over the interest offered by the Savings Bank. Savings Bank interest is very low as compared with the value of money today. If advantage was taken of that and we were to offer some inducement, say 5 per cent., which after all is only the interest to-day paid by the British Government and charged against us on the loan we have obtained from them. If something like that were done, there would be no difficulty in raising the money, even though the revenue was not sufficient to pay this amount out of.

MR. HALFYARD—There is one remark I wish to make, it is concerning the ferryman at Change Islands. It will be quite in the memory of the House that this matter was debated last year. The ferryman does not get properly paid for the service rendered. Letters were sent by me to the Minister of Public Works last year from the Justice of the Peace and the Road Board, and other repreentative bodies at Change Islands on this matter. The Minister of Public Works very courteously promised to take the matter up and see that something was done to satisfy the people and give a better service. I think the salary now in the Estimates is the same as last year. I do not know what the Government intends to do in this matter. I thought the salary would be increased, and I now bring it to the attention of the Minister of Public Works.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—In reply to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, I might say that it is quite correct that I promised to bring the matter forward. I kept that promise, and I think there was a small grant voted to that ferryman for repairing a shed or something of that sort. As regards salary, I would say that that is a matter for the Government, and he will have to deal direct with the Government in that connection.

MR. HALFYARD—I thank the Minister of Public Work for his explanation. I think that there was a sum of $7.50 paid this man for work in connection with the repairing of a shed; formerly all moneys for coal for the shed and repairs to the ferry boat came from the road grants, and I don't

suppose it is done in any other part of the country. There is a way in which this matter might be adjusted without any increased expenditure to the Government. There is a light erected at Eastern Tickle; it is a beacon light, I think—just a lantern, and it does not need very great attention after it is once lit; the ferryman lives quite near the light, in fact, the light is erected on his land, and it has been represented to me by the Road Board at Change Islands that if the two positions could be combined it would give satisfactory wage to the ferryman. The light keeper is paid, I think, $100, and the ferryman $110 or $120; and those two amounts together would be a half decent wage for him. The ferry does not run after dark, and the ferryman would be able to give satisfactory attention to the light. Now, perhaps the Minister of Public Works would take this matter up. If this could be arranged, it would make the service more efficient, and the man more satisfied.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—There is no reason why you should not arrange that with the Minister.

MR. CLAPP—I want to draw the attention of this House to the matter of the ferry boat at Bonne Bay. Now, I don't refer to this matter for the purpose of wasting the time of the House and obstructing its work; I do it as a matter of duty to the district which I represent. Up to 1913 the ferry running between Bonne Bay and Norris Point was an open boat; prior to the election of 1913 a motor boat was put there; after the election, the motor boat was removed and the ordinary row-boat replaced her. Now, I have presented several petitions to this House from the people of Bonne Bay,—clergymen, doctors, merchants, and fishermen—and I think it is only the duty of the Department of Marine and Fisheries or Public Works, whichever Department has charge of these matters, to put a motor ferry on that Bay. Hundreds of people cross over to Norris Point, and visitors to Bonne Bay coming up the shore from Flowers Cove. Bonne Bay is the centre of that part of the district. It is an open Bay, and with some winds there is a great deal of spray, and in crossing one is liable to get wet through and through. I noticed when I was at Trinity last fall, that there is a motor ferry plying between Trinity and Trinity East. I am positive that there is not near the traffic at Trinity that there is at Bonne Bay. Now, why the motor boat was removed I don't know except that it had served its purpose when the election was over. If motor boats are put on other Bays, why should not Bonne Bay have one? It is an important place, and fairly large revenue is collected there, and why should the people be allowed to suffer from year to year. I cannot afford, out of a grant of twenty-two hundred odd dollars to put a motor boat there, but I think that the Government might give a grant for the purpose of purchasing a motor boat to ply on that Bay. Sir Edward Morris must know of the inconveninece to the public in not having a covered-in motor ferry on that Bay when he visited there in the fall of 1913. As I said before, I do not bring this matter up for the purpose of obstructing the Government in any way, but I do it as a duty towards the people of Bonne Bay, and I would ask that the matter receive the consideration to which it is entitled.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—If I can help the hon. member in any way I will be glad to do it. I cannot help admiring him for his efforts to get all the grants and all the advantages that it is possible to get for his district. Of course, we are all working along the same lines. I have a sneaking regard for the hon. member and will do my utmost to have his

wishes carried out.

MR. LLOYD—May I point out to the Hon. Minister that if he wishes to take the sting out of his remarks, he will accede to the hon. member's request promptly. If he lets it stand over until next year the whole sting will remain.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I don't wish to leave a sting in any man's breast. I will take the matter up with the Government. I will make the necessary investigation and enquiries, and will then make my recommendation.

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 asked leave to sit again.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

EDUCATION 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, "An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to Education."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: When last we were on this Bill I was asked in relation to sections 16, 17 and 18, and as to how they differed from the old law. I may say that it is practically a re-enactment, the only difference being that the Boards are given a little more authority than they had before to bring about what is termed Amalgamated Schools. Sections 104, 105 and 106 are represented by these three sections. They were originally introduced into the law with a view of enabling Boards and School Inspectors to establish co-operative, joint schools in settlements where there were not a sufficient number of children of one denomination to warrant a school, so that these children would be able to receive some education. The last section is a verbatim copy of the old law and sections 16 and 17 are practically a re-enactment of the others, with a little of the stiffness taken out.

MR. LLOYD—What changes are there in Part 2?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Very little. Sections 19 and 20 and 21 no change. In section 22 there is a slight change; formerly it was 21, now it is 25; this change was made at the request of the Directors. There is a slight change in 23, in relation to the Board of Directors of St. Bonaventure's College. Then in 24, there is no change, except as regards the number of the quorum. In 25, no change; 26, no change.

There is no change now down to part 3. Now part 3 deals with the Council of Higher Education. There is a slight amendment in section 39 herein, namely, the reference therein to section 44 is incorrect, and should be to section 43. I have a letter here from Mr. Wilson, Registrar C.H.E., in which he points out the advisability of deleting sections 41 and 42, (letter is read.) I think there will be no objection to that.

MR. LLOYD—I would like to be clear on that point. I understand that it is desirable to give as free a hand as possible to the Council of Higher Education, but it appears to me that by deleting these two sections, unless you provide for it elsewhere you go further than that, namely, while the Act mentions the power to grant the Jubilee Scholarship, there is no power left to grant other scholarships

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Will you allow that section to stand over until the next time we discuss this portion of the Act?

MR. LLOYD—Yes.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— There is a slight change in section 43; a perusal of the section will show this, as follows:

43.—For the purpose of organizing the training and classification of teachers the Governor in Council shall appoint for each denomination comprising not less than ten thousand persons a Board of Examiners, to consist of three or five members of such denomination, of which Board the Superintendent of Education or Superior Educational Officer is hereby constituted chairman: Provided that the Salvation Army Board of Examiners may consist of members of that denomination or of such other persons as may be recommended by the Officer for the time being in charge of the Salvation Army in Newfoundland, and approved by the Governor in Council.

The Council proposes by this section to prevent the unnecessary multiplication of Boards, and it considers it an advantage.

Section 44 is for the most part really new, and merely sets out the duties of boards with their powers and functions. It is an enunciation of what has been the practice for some time, and an amplification of the powers and duties and functions of Board of Examiners the greater portion of which is set out in section 53 of the old Education Act. Section 45 is entirely new. Section 46: sub-section (a) of that section is the old section of the old Act with some amendment; and the certificate of Associate of Arts was recognized in practice for many years as a test to ground the conferring of an Associate Grade Teacher's Certificate, although it was not recognized in the Act itself, except by inference. The requirements set forth in sub-section (b) as conditions for obtaining a First Grade Teacher's Certificate are new. Sub-section (c) is the old law; Sub-section (d) is new, and a slight amendment will have to be made there, i.e., the proviso contained therein is really applicable to the Old Act, and should be set forth in this act as sub-section (e). Section 47 is in part the schedule of the old Act and the only change now is that candidates will have to be instructed in physical exercise. That is the only alteration. Section 48 deals with the manner in which a one-time teacher may return to the profession and become an accredited teacher again. There is then no change from sections 49 to 54 inclusive.

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.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

The Bill respecting Weights and Measures was withdrawn from the order paper.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 31st.

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

REPORTS TABLED.

The Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the following documents:

Report of the Newfoundland Agricultural Board, 1915.

Report of Government Analyst, 1915.

Report of the Postmaster General to June, 1915.

Report of the Grenfell Hospital Returns, 1915.

PETITIONS.

MR. STONE—I beg leave to present a petition from Whales Brook, Torquay, Brownsdale and Sibley's Cove in the District of Trinity, asking that the railway be continued down the shore to the end of the district. A petition I understand has already been presented to this House asking that an extension be made from Heart's Content to Lead Cove. This extension would have an important effect upon the large number of people who reside there. The people at New Melbourne have already derived much benefit from the Bay de Verde line and this is the reason why we are now getting petitions asking for the extension of the Railway.

The petition is very largely and influentially signed and should get every consideration. I remember that at our meeting which we held over at Winterton on March 17th, the matter was freely discussed and the people were unanimously in favour of having the line extended. I can only say that I hope the Government will see its way clear to continue this line. I have much pleasure in asking that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Keels, asking that a mail carrier be appointed at Plate Cove to bring mail from Plate Cove, Red Cliff, Open Hall and Tickle Cove to Keels and be detained at Keels two hours for return mail. The petition is largely and influentially signed by all the electors of that place. I understand that the present condition of the mail service there is very unsatisfactory. It takes a letter five days to get from that place, "Keels" to a neighbouring place "Tickle Cove" only six miles away. Keels is an important place, with a population of over 500 inhabitants. I hope the Government will give this matter their earnest consideration and I beg to hand it to the Department to which it relates.

QUESTIONS.

MR. COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister what action is to be taken to permit the District of Burin to elect Road Boards under the provisions of the Act passed last session.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I may say in relation to that that the representatives for the District are taking that matter up in Burin and with the Board of Works, and the information is likely to be tabled in a very short time.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to supplement the reply that has just been made by the Prime Minister I would suggest that there is nothing in the Act to-day to prevent the election of Road Boards, in the District of Burin, it only exempts Councils. The District has thirteen Councils and Road Boards—four Councils and nine Road Boards. Some four or five of these latter did not comply with the Act, why I do not know, except in the case of Fortune and Grand Bank where some misunderstanding of the Magistrate delayed the election. That matter is now before the Board of Works and I understand arrangements are being made for a subsequent election. The trouble with the Councils, particularly in the case of Burin, is the difficulty of defining the areas. There are, I think, twenty-three small places covered by two Councils. I may say that since the House met last year I have gone into this matter and have consulted various representative men of the District, and also members of some of the Councils. Some want the Councils to remain as they are and others want elective Road Boards in the smaller places. As far as I am concerned, I can speak also for my colleague, we have no

objection to elective Boards, provided the areas are properly defined. The matter has been brought to the attention of the Board of Works, and the people of the District are also taking an interest in it, and I hope the matter will soon be settled.

MR. COAKER asked the Ministers of Marine and Fisheries and Board of Works to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all grants, and copies of returns received, allocated by the respective Departments to be expended in the District of Burin during the years 1913, 1914, and 1915.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That has been answered.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—The second part of that question has also been answered.

MR. COAKER asked the Minister of Public Works or Marine and Fisheries to table detailed statement of money expended last year in connection with Stag Rock Beacon Light, situated at Burin Hr.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That has also been answered.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend Cap. 44 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (second series), entitled "Of the Rebuilding of Carbonear."

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting Trading with the Enemy."

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to amend 5, George V, Cap. 4, entiled "An Act respecting a Volunteer Force in this Colony."

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., ...$111,824.00

Roads Bridges and Ferries, ... 178,426.00

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.

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.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, is there any information available as to when we will get the report of the enquiry into the Postal Telegraph Department.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I wrote the Commissioner, Mr. Knight, the day before yesterday. I have had no reply since. If you wish I will telephone him now and ask when it will be ready.

MR. LLOYD—I have not followed the matter very closely, and I would like to know if the enquiry has been finished.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—No. The enquiry was postponed. Mr. Knight was taken ill and had to go away. On his return he took the matter up again. I understand it is now nearing completion. I will find out before this sitting closes as to when it is likely to be completed.

MR. LLOYD—What about the Post Office Inspector's Report.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I had a telephone message to-day from him in connection with that. He told me that it would take three or four hours to finish. We will have it this afternoon, or certainly on Monday.

MR. JENNINGS.—I would like to ask a question as to why there is such a discrepancy between the Estimates and the Public Accounts. The Public Accounts for the year 1915 gave the amount paid for Couriers as $64,677.00, and in the Estimates for that year the amount was $59,879, a difference of $4,798. I notice that the figures for this service are still continued for the year 1916-17. Now, I would just mention one particular instance. I have not had time to go through them all, and I only mention one case; and that is the case of the Courier from Moreton's Harbour to Farmer's Arm. In the estimates before us to-day the vote is $68.00, and the Public Accounts show the amount paid as $140.00, or more than double the amount of the Estimates. There are several cases similar to this, and this matter has been talked over here for the past two years. Why is this continued? Certainly the amounts paid should be provided in the Estimates. I should like an explanation of this matter. The total difference is something over $4,000—$4,798.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—I don't know of any explanation that I can give for that. I will look it up, and have the Postmaster-General supply the information. I don't know of any reason why that difference should be there.

MR. COAKER.—Wasn't that difference caused by having to keep the couriers on later, owing to the ice blockade?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—It may have been. I will get the information later.

MR. LLOYD—What is the present arrangement in relation to the Port aux Basques service? What arrangements were made between the Reid-Newfoundland Co. and the Government in reference to the taking off of the two boats that plied on that service?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—There was no arrangement that I know of, except that they received permission to sell two boats to the Russian Government and put on the two boats they are now running. They made arrangements within the last fortnight to put on a special boat to take the freight from Sydney to St. John's as soon as ice conditions will permit a boat to get to Sydney. I know of no other arrangement.

MR. LLOYD—Was there no arrangement made in connection with the taking off of the Lintrose and Bruce?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—They had permission to sell those boats and to substitute the boats that are now running.

MR. LLOYD—Can we see the correspondence in relation to that? Will you table it?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. CLAPP—May I ask the Prime Minister what boat is going to ply between Bay of Islands and Labrador?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I could not say right off, but I will let you know within a day or two.

MR. CLIFT—What is the explanation of the change in the Bay of Islands vote?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—The S.S. Port Saunders was put on that service last year. It was found to be impossible to get a boat to do the work for less than $6,000. Tenders were called for, and the Port Saunders tender was the lowest.

MR. LLOYD—Who is the contractor?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—I think, McNamara.

MR. LLOYD—Was there any change made recently in reference to the Trinity Bay service? I mean, as regards ports of call.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Nothing has been done as yet.

MR. LLOYD—Is it under consideration?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The schedule is being arranged next week.

MR. LLOYD—In reference to the Bay de Verde Branch: May I ask what was the reason for not opening it earlier in the fall? What was the cause of the delay?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Company claimed that it was not ready for operation up to the time when they did open it.

MR. LLOYD—Is there any report from the Government Engineer on that?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I suppose it is included in his general report. There is no special report. His report is in course of preparation, and will be ready some time next week.

MR. LLOYD—Are the Customs returns tabled yet?

HON MINISTER FINANCE—They will be tabled the next time we are sitting.

MR. LLOYD—In reference to the clearance of vessels from the Customs, what are the arrangements after 3 o'clock?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—The office is open until 4 o'clock every day except Saturday. The arrangement is that the Assistant Collector is always around, and can be got at any time in the afternoon either at his office or at his home. When a vessel is about to clear, he receives notice before hand, if they want him between the hours of 3 and 9 at night.

MR. COAKER—May I ask why the Department has not filled the vacancy in the position of first clerk in the Customs?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—Mr. Fox is acting there.

MR. COAKER—Why not fill it? Why continue the position if you do not intend to fill it?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—We intend to fill it.

MR. COAKER—Has not Mr. Fox been drawing another salary?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—No; Mr. Fox's work as first landing waiter is being done by the next in the office; and Mr. LeMessurier is doing a part of his work.

MR. COAKER—They are not drawing double salaries?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—Mr. Sandy LeMessurier got an extra $50 last year.

MR. COAKER—Have you filled the position of examining officer yet?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—No. Mr. Jardine was Examining Officer there for many years; and within the past four or six years we have given him two assistants, one at the Post Office, Mr. Gibbs, and one at the Examining Store, Mr. Carter; and we are seeing if they can perform the work now without the assistance of a third man. In that way we may be enabled to save one man's salary. That is why we have not filled the position.

MR. COAKER—I am satisfied with that explanation, if that is your idea; but we must object to having those two positions vacant; if there is a necessity for them, they ought to be filled; if they can be kept vacant for a year or two, why not abolish them? Why the excess of offices in the Customs Department if you need not put a man in an office that, like these, has been vacant a long time? You created these positions; you put these men there; and you must either fill these positions or cut out these votes.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—We are endeavouring to find out if we cannot dispense with

one of these positions; we are giving our new method a trial.

MR. COAKER—I am satisfied that you are all right with regard to the position of examining officer. Generally speaking we have too many vacant offices. The position of Registrar of the Supreme Court is vacant; and there has been no appointment made to the District Court vacancy. How long are you going to continue this state of affairs? It is bad enough to have the office of Registrar of Supreme Court vacant, but to have the District Court Bench dealt with in the same way, is going too far; and in addition to all this, you have now two or three vacancies in the Customs Department waiting to be filled. As you intend to fill these positions with your political friends, why not say so immediately? At least the Government should give some information with regard to these matters. Year after year we vote these salaries for the Custom House; for a long time they have been vacant; and no appointments have been made except acting ones. The Registrarship of the Supreme Court has been treated in the same way, and the District Court similarly. We want definite information in relation to these matters. If you find it desirable to fill the last two positions to which I have referred, by appointing your friends on the other side and so entitling them to these votes, we shall be glad to know it; but something ought to be done with regard to these vacancies.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, I would impress upon the attention of the Government the points raised by the hon. member for Twillingate. With regard to the District Court Judgeship: the vacancy therein has been somewhat lengthy, but nothing like as long as the vacancy in the clerkship of the Supreme Court. I think something should be done to remedy this state of affairs, as speedily as possible. I do not consider it right for the Government to remain silent about these very important matters.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman. I was just about to rise when my learned friend, the hon. leader of the Opposition began his address. I quite appreciate the position taken by the honourable member for Twillingate as well as by Dr. Lloyd in relation to the matters referred to. As regards the Custom House appointments. I do not know that I can add anything to what has been already said by the hon. minister, except to say that at a very early date these appointments will be considered by the government. In relation to the other two vacancies, viz, that in the Supreme Court and that in the District Court; I think I can say the same thing—at a very early date these positions will be filled.

MR. COAKER—By your own friends?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—All I can say is that up to the present there has been no application from anyone on this side of the House

MR. LLOYD—I think I can assure the Rt. Hon Prime Minister that he will not be harrassed by applications from this side of the House; there will be no importunity on our part in relation to these appointments. We think it would be merely a waste of labor.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance and Customs whether within recent times any official of the Custom House has been allowed to leave his position to go and perform other duties for private reasons?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—An official was loaned for a week to certain parties; but it was nothing unusual.

MR. HALFYARD—I can quite appreciate the fact that one civil servant may be transferred from one depart-

ment to another; but I understood this man was transferred from his position and put on private work.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is quite correct. Last year we lent a man—a certificated master mariner—to the Reid Newfoundland Co., to take charge of their ship that was being sent out to search for some missing men who had been driven off to sea. We were asked to lend the official as the man in charge of the search ship had not a certificate; and we lent him.

MR. COAKER—I notice that the Custom House has added to its functions. It has now become an employment bureau. It is a nice condition of affairs to think that the Customs Department has come to such an undignified state that it has to loan officials from its department to any private individuals in town.I understand that Capt. Marshall was taken from his position last year and loaned to the Newfoundland Produce Co. Who was the official you loaned to the Reid Nfld. Co?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I think it was Captain Snow.

MR. COAKER—I think these officials should have tickets.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Well they had masters' tickets; that is why they were loaned.

MR. COAKER—I mean they should have tickets on them notifying the public they are there to be loaned if necessary. But I draw this to the attention of the government and hope it will not happen any more. These private individuals can find plenty of men to do their work; and it is not fair that these men with permanent jobs in Customs should be taken out and treated that way at any individual's pleasure; and I object to any further continuation of this rule and hope we will hear no more about it. I suppose there are good reasons why it had to be done; but it certainly will not be insisted upon that such procedure is justifiable.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman. I may say that at the time this man was loaned no man other than he could be obtained in the port. Last year the Reid Nfld. Co. was sending a boat around the coast on urgent public business—searching for missing men —no man with a certificate could be obtained to take charge of the ship (the man ordinarily in charge did not have a ticket)—and we were requested to and did loan an official for the purpose—(Capt. Snow). He was on that duty for eight weeks. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries—Mr. Piccott—was on the same boat. We were specially asked to do this; and I want to say that while I have charge of the Customs I will do what I think is right and proper—in such cases I will not be dictated to. I consider it perfectly correct for this captain to be loaned—and if you come down and require the loan of an official for similar reasons I will loan him to you.

MR. COAKER—My opinion is that the Minister has done wrong. We now have his opinion.We take the stand that it was improper for any man to ask for the loan of an official. We take the stand that if Minister of Finance and Customs has been a party to loaning these men that he did wrong. Again you say that while you are in charge of the Customs you will do what you think is right and that you will not be dictated to. I say that this is the House of Assembly, that this is your master, and you must take your instructions from it.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—But you are not the House of Assembly.

MR. COAKER—That is quite apparent to anyone who looks around; but when such questions as these are asked there is no reason why the Minis-

ter should get up and say he will not be dictated to. If you have done these things and think they are right by all means defend them. I do not want to dictate to you, but I certainly have the right to criticize any action of yours.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Chairman. Might I ask whether there was a tide-waiter acting at Baie Verte last season? My reason for asking is that I have a petition here in regard to the matter. It appears that he was brought from Conception Harbour to Baie Verte and this petition which I have asks for an appointment of another man in his place.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I will look into the matter and will let you know to-morrow.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. Might I ask why the tidewaiters at Botwood are receiving $25 and $30 respectively for board and lodging. They are receiving $391 and $400 as salaries and I see that you vote them an additional sum for board and lodging.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—They live at Botwood at certain times of the year. They do not live there except during the open season and they require this money for their board. That is the rule we carry out in all these cases. As far as other places are concerned there is a vote for them.

MR. JENNINGS—Where do these men belong to and where do they go when the season is over?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—One of them is Mr. Collins of Placentia, after the close of the season last year he went on board the "Fiona" and went West with Inspector O'Reilly for work that he required him for.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. I wish to ask a question in reference to a fund which is handed over to St. John's. I mean the coal taxes. I presume the same matter will crop up when the City Charter comes before the House, but I want to obtain some information as to whether the dropping of these taxes has been considered by the government.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER. No.

MR. LLOYD—In that case I would like to impress upon the attention of the Government the desirability of taking into consideration the question of these duties. In principle it is wrong for any government in any country that is looking forward to any kind of encouragement of manufactures to tax coal. It is a great tax on manufactures and under any circumstances even at the best of times, not to speak of the difficulties of the present period, coal is a very costly article in Newfoundland. It makes it exceedingly difficult for industries to thrive with such heavy taxes on coal. I have never agreed with the policy of taxing coal, and I should very much like to see the matter taken up and see if some other form of taxation cannot be substituted.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman. There is a great deal in what the leader of the Opposition says in relation to the coal tax, but the position is this that it is really a matter for the Municipal Council in St. John's. It is one of their sources of revenue and amounts annually to about $70,000, a year. Now if we remove this tax they will have to find $70,000 immediately in some other way by taxing the rate payer. I do not know but that it might be found that the Commissioners could devise some other way of getting that $70,000, but of course we could not cut out the coal tax until some similar provisions for similar revenue had been made, for the reason that this $70,000 is one of their main sources of revenue the largest one of the individual sources and it goes to pay for the contracts under which they work and for the

services they are giving the city, none of which could be suspended. It is quite true what the leader of the Opposition says that such a tax is a handicap on industries where coal is the motive power. In many of the indutries in St. John's like the Boot and Shoe Factory and the Ropewalk that do not use electricity and where they have no gasolene engines they all have to use coal but where the city is getting the greatest advantage is that it is receiving this revenue of $70,000 which is easily collected from sources from which it would be difficult to collect any revenue except on the coal. Every tramp that comes in here for coal pays something towards the City. Then again all the Anthracite coal that is consumed is burnt by the well-to-do in the city. All the coal for commerce such as steamers and trains entering the city also contributes. Of course the tax might still be left upon Anthracite coal and coal purely for commercial purposes making coal for domestic purposes free. With the exception of Harbour Grace, Carbonear and Placentia and one or two places where they have water services there is no tax upon coal in the outports.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. The reason of my bringing up this matter was that we are I presume going to consider this session the City Charter From what I can gather from an examination of this document it looks as if the whole system is to be perpetuated. I do not suggest the dropping of the duties but I think the Commissioners should meet the government on the matter, and see if some alteration cannot be made. If it is to be passed in the City Charter it will remain indefinitely. The simple fact of the case is that this coal tax is a means of taxing the poorest people in the community. That is the sum total of it and in addition to that it is a hardship on this community because it is a great handicap to industry. If we look around the world it does not matter where we look, you will find that all the big industries of the world are placed where coal is cheap. The great cotton industry of Lancashire is built on the Lancashire coal fields. The West Riding Woolen Industry is built on the West Riding coal fields. The great Rolling Mills and Cutlery establishments of Sheffield are built on the South Yorkshire coal fields. In the centre of England "the black country" as it is called the Birmingham trade is worked on the Staffordshire coal fields. The great pottery industry is built on the North Staffordshire coal fields; all the great ship-building yards of Great Britain are built near the coal fields. The Tyne ship-building yards afford most employment in connection with the ship-building industry. That work is carried on from the Northumberland and Durham coal fields. The great Clyde ship-building business is placed and worked on the Lancashire coal fields All these industries owe their existence mainly to the fact that they can get cheap coal. I have no need to go further into the fact. A cursory glance at the facts proves it beyond doubt, It is therefore essential if we look forward to any development of industry that we ought to do our best to make coal as cheap as possible and it is a false policy to increase the price of coal by taxation.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman. Might I ask what the government intends to do in regard to the amount due by Smyth's estate to the government, $20,576.00?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—The matter is in the hands of the Attorney-General.

MR. COAKER—I suppose that that means that the Colony has to forfeit the whole amount as nothing has been done to collect it. This matter has been in slings for three years. If the government intends to take this mat-

ter up, they ought to make a statement to that effect. If they are not going to take it up and if they intend this amount to be lost to the Colony then let us have an understanding on the matter once and for all. It is a very serious matter that we should be the losers of $20,000 for bonds from which good value has been derived and if the estate cannot pay the government, then those responsible for those bonds ought to be asked to pay up. I note that more bonds are still being used in the Customs and that there is still a balance of $400 or $500.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—No it has all been paid up except about $160.00.

MR. COAKER—Then I notice that there is $36,000 due to the Department of Agriculture and Mines for fees on Crown Lands. What is the government going to do about this?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—That is also in the hands of the Attorney General. I do not know what action he has taken.

MR. COAKER—That means I suppose that they are not going to be collected.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Last year they collected quite an amount of it.

MR. COAKER—I see that the Auditor General says that of the $36,000 about $19,000 have been collected,and that is very good. If that is considered good then it ought not to take a very tremendous effort to collect the balance. The men who hold these areas are men of property and they ought to be able to pay.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is really not the reason. There are a number of Labrador areas unpaid for and the boundary question is still unsettled and the government cannot give them a clear title and it is doubtful if they can collect the amounts due until they can give them a clean title.

MR. COAKER—Then they ought to cancel the title altogether. There are a lot of people who think these properties are valuable, and if they are and the holders are not prepared to pay, then cancel the title and let them revert to the Government, and when this boundary question is settled we will have these valuable areas in our own hands. Now, these are serious matters, of which we ought to have had some explanation, but it appears that not one on the other side of the House considers it serious that the Smyth estate owes the Colony $20,000. Then there is another matter. I notice that $1,000 more is being granted for the services on the South West Coast. Why is this?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—We have sent an additional man over to Port aux Basques. There was a pressure of work on over there, and Inspector O'Reilly went over to look into the matter. There is something like 17,000 people travelling by that route every year and there were only two tide-waiters there, and when a ship would arrive there was no one to look after the luggage and at the same time attend to the other business. Inspector O'Reilly went over, and after investigating he recommended the appointment of another man. We sent a man over to take charge of that luggage, and I think you will find that his work has paid for his salary 20 or 30 times over.

MR. COAKER—I notice that in this report under the head of supernumeraries, sub-collectors, etc., there has been an overdraft of $7,600 last year. This year there is a vote of $1500 and an expenditure of $3,424 for outport supernumeraries up to Dec. 31st, 1915. I wonder why it is you cannot vote enough for this service without this continual overdrawing. That is why I make these remarks. It is not a

very good business that. Then there are repairs to Government House that have cost $9,000 in 1914-15. That seems an abnormal amount. I wish I knew how much of that was spent on repairs and how much on furnishings. It strikes me that you could furnish quite a large house for $9,000. I suppose that after his increase in salary, every effort was made to make the Governor comfortable, but there ought to be some account of the expenditure of this sum. I asked for it the other day, but it has not been tabled yet.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I am having a detailed statement made in connection with it.

MR. COAKER—What amount has been paid to relieve the Inspector of Fisheries? Have you spent the grant the past two years that we have voted here for the Inspector of Customs? Have you paid that $1,000 per year to Mr. Walsh?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes.

MR. LLOYD—Does the Finance Minister hope to get through Contingencies on $10,000?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—We'll do our best.

MR. LLOYD—That's a very diplomatic answer.

MR. COAKER—What amount was spent last year?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—$20,000. We will try to do it on $10,000.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Before the Committee rises I would like to say a word or two in connection with the Postal Telegraph Enquiry. I have found out that Mr. Knight is sick in bed. He is not suffering from his former trouble, but from la grippe, and it will be some time before he will be in a position to give his report. This is the report that he gave an official from my Department who visited his house this afternoon. There is a lot of matter to be looked into yet, and it will consequently take some time to get the report in shape. If there is any suggestion I would be glad to receive it.

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 asked leave to sit again.

On motion, this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

EDUCATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill, "An Act to amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Education."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—With regard to section 54, page 18, that is section 64 of the old Act. The schedule is changed to have uniformity. Schedule (j) is a form of agreement. (Rt. Hon. Member read section.) Section 56: This is the old Act. Section 56: No change. Section 57: No change. Section 58: Duties of teachers more clearly set forth. Sub-section (c) is new. Section (j) is new. Section (k) deals with the keeping of log book. Part 7: Section 59, old Act. Section 60 is Section 75 of the old Act, so changed as to deal with subject. 61, 62, 63 and 64 have not been changed. Section 65 makes legal what has hitherto been the practice. (Rt. Hon. Member read section). It has always been done, but has never been legalized. Section 66 is old Act. It concerns Superintendent's duties. Sub-section (c) is new, but it has been the practice. (reads.) Section (i) is partly new. (reads) (j) (k) have been practice. Section 67 is

new. It empowers an inspector to inspect the schools of another by mutual arrangement. This is a great advantage, though unfortunately there are some objections to its general adoption. There are no further changes in this Bill except in section (j.)

MR. LLOYD—Suppose a teacher of, say, fifty-three years of age, who may have been thirty-five years in the service of his profession; has he or has he not the same rights as if he had been sixty years old?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The section means that if he becomes inefficient by reason of illness, etc. he may, if those in authority deem it fit, be retired and given his pension.

MR. LLOYD—May that stand over?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Certainly. None of the sections up to 79 is new. Section 79 is put into the act merely for the sake of convenience. A teacher never had at Common Law any right to inflict any punishment that was not moderate. There is no further change in this Act.

MR. JENNINGS—Might I ask what are the rights of redress of a parent whose child has been ill treated. I myself have known of cases where nervous children have been badly treated by teachers. Indeed, I heard of one case where the child died. I was very interested the other day in the speeches that were made relative to education, and particularly the education of the teachers. Teachers are inclined to treat all children alike. However, what exact redress would a parent have under this section?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—At Common Law the teacher, like the captain of a ship, or a parent, has always had a certain authority to punish within reasonable limits, and if the teacher oversteps these limits he, as well as the captain of a ship or a parent, is liable to an action at law. Of course the onus of proof would lie on the children or the parents to show the extent of the injury complained of.

MR. LLOYD—The whole difficulty about that section before referred to (as to pensions) on page 26, lies in the word "retire." It implies that a teacher of 54 or 56 who has served his thirty years cannot get his pension if at that time he adopts another occupation, but must wait until he gets sixty years of age.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—If he were not able to do the work, those in authority might pension him.

MR. LLOYD—Would that entitle him to a pension at once?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, after the age of fifty-five. I may say in conclusion that the remaining pages have been gone over carefully by the various superintendents, and I think that we may rest assured that it is perfectly correct in every detail.

Schedule B. is simply the course of study in the public schools. The course that now prevails in the schools.

Schedule C. is an account of expenditures of the Boards. The form is the same as it now is.

Schedule D. is a list of furnishings and equipment which every school and department should be supplied with.

Schedule E. is a list of deductions authorized to be made, etc.

Schedule F.: general regulations concerning certifying of teachers.

Schedule G. is regulations for admission of pupil teachers.

Schedule H. is the indenture for pupil teachers.

Schedule I. is the form of engagement of teachers.

Schedule K. is the rules and regulations and scale of payment governing Augmentation Grant.

Schedule L. is the annual returns, with explanatory notes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chariman from the Committee

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

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

STATUTES CONSOLIDATION 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, "An Act to revise and Consolidate the General Public Statute Laws of the Colony, and for publication of same."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: It will be remembered that when this matter came before the House last evening, exception was taken by the Leader of the Opposition on the grounds that the powers conferred by section 3 were too extensive, and on that occasion I pointed out that I was prepared to consider the matter, and I now suggest the leaving out of section 6, that is in reference to the issuing of the Proclamation. I think that will meet the case.

MR. LLOYD—I think that will meet the case, that with the necessary amendments that follow. As there are various amendments concerning this, I would suggest that the draft go back to the Solicitor, and that the Committee rise.

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 motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

PASSENGER ACCOMMODATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend Chapter 115 of the Consolidated Statutes, (Second Series), entitled "Of Passenger Accommodation on Board Steamers and Sailing Vessels," was read a second time.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker: I move the second reading of this Bill. I may say by way of explanation that during the past year or two several complaints have been made to the Customs in reference to motor boats carrying passengers. I might quote Bell Island, Conception Bay, as an instance. There, several motor boats are engaged in this traffic, and in case of accident they have no means of life-saving. This has been severely criticized by parties in Conception Bay and elsewhere, and this amendment is for the purpose of bringing these boats under the same law as is already provided for in Chapter 115 of the Consolidated Statutes. At the present time, as I have already said, these small boats carry absolutely no life-saving apparatus. They do not tow a small boat or dory, and they have no life-belts or life-buoys; and the Government have thought it wise that they should be subject to the same inspection as other vessels carrying passengers.

MR. COAKER—This only applies to passenger motor boats?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Yes. In my opinion, that is all it should apply to, because if a man is down north or to the westward, and wants to go from one place to another, there is no reason why he should not get a loan of, or hire, a private motor boat.

On motion,this Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that

when the House rises it adjourn until Monday at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 3rd, 1916.

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

PETITION.

MR. DOWNEY—A short time ago certain petitions were presented to this House asking that the use of motor boats in connection with the District of St. George's should be discontinued, and to-day I beg to present a counter petition from the same place asking that the use of motor boats with respect to that district be not prohibited. I do not think personally that such a course would be justified and, indeed, subsequent events tend to prove this. I respectfully ask this House to refer this petition to the Department to which it relates.

I also beg to present another petition from Port au Port in the same district relative to the herring fishery. This is a matter of great consequence to the people of that place. The fishery regulations as regards taking herring for bait affect the locality in question because of the fact that the Spring herring will come earlier there than any other part of the Island. The bankers will gladly avail themselves of any facilities which the Government can grant to their bank fishery. Owing to the prohibition of the use of herring nets and seines, several parties have been compelled to go to the Magdalene Islands and other parts of Canada where the rules are less restrictive. I may say that the majority of bankers are strongly in favour of this being done and on their behalf I beg to present it for the most earnest consideration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. LeFEUVRE—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition. I am of the opinion that the request of this petition, if granted, would be of immense benefit to the people of that place and would result in a much better fishery. I shall be glad to give to this petition my heartiest support.

MIN. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I must confess that I am not surprised to find these petitions appearing in reference to the use of motor boats in the District of St. George's. Some time ago when Mr. Downey presented a petition to this House asking that motor boats should be done away with altogether in that locality, as the noise they made tended to frighten away the herring, I may say that I anticipated these counter-petitions, because I thought that such a regulation would be detrimental to the fishermen of the country and would seriously affect the herring fishery. I have no doubt that there exists a spirit of jealousy among a few which prompted these former petitions. The time has come when every fisherman who can afford to purchase a motor boat must get one, regardless of the fact of the increased cost of kerosene and gasolene oils, because if he refrains from so doing he will have much trouble in getting that class of men to go with him that he had in former years. As for the difficulty that the noise of the motor presents, I can only say that every precaution should be taken to muffle the engines. We have already had petitions from Bonne Bay against motor boats going over the herring grounds, and on the occasion when they were presented I stated in this House that the fishermen could easily get over that difficulty if they were more careful, as the noise can be made quite slight with care. This petition will get the very quickest consideration

when it goes down to the Department.

Now, with reference to the trapping of herring at Port au Port and these places. I consider myself that the Government should not do anything detrimental to the fisheries, and I know they will not. The Fishery Board will give this matter their consideration. Quite a number of our vessels have been forced spring after spring to go a distance of a hundred miles out of their way. I might say that they have to go up to the Magdalene Islands where they are nearly always sure of getting a bait supply. I consider that the time has come when we should try to keep this money in our own country, and this can only be done by granting the prayer of these petitioners to allow them to use these herring traps. It is only for a few weeks in the summer, and the bankers cannot afford to be waiting around to get herring out of nets, and as my friend the member for Burin stated, herring taken out of nets do not stand as long when put into an ice-pound and knocked around aboard of a banker, as herring taken out of a herring trap or seine, and I am sure the Board will give this matter their consideration and consider the advisability of granting the prayer of the petitioners.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to table reply to a question asked by Mr. Abbott under date March 30th, question No. 8;

Also correspondence with the Reid-Nfld. Company as to the transfer of the Bruce and Lintrose;

Also Dr. Rendell's Report, re Tuberculosis;

Also the Report of the Marine Disasters Fund for the year ending Dec. 31st, 1915;

Also the Report of the Department of Agriculture and Mines for the year 1914;

Also a return of Crown Land Grants for the year 1914-15;

Also a Return of Mining Licenses for the year 1914-15;

Also a Return of 99 year Leases for year 1914-15;

Also a return of the Fee Simple Mining Grants 1914-15;

Also Report of the First Surveyor for the year ending Dec. 31, 1915;

Also the Report of the Second Surveyor for the same year;

Also Report and Statement of the Newfoundland Fire Patrol for the season of 1915;

Also the Report of Timber Inspector Phillips for year ending Dec. 31, 1915;

Also Report of Timber Inspector Thistle for the same year.

SUPPLY RESOLUTION.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

Customs $260,715.00
Contingencies 10,000.00

The said resolutions being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

MR. CLIFT—Might I ask the Colonial Secretary when the Report of the Cashier of the Savings Bank will be tabled?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I have not received it yet. I will make enquiries to-morrow.

REBUILDING OF CARBONEAR BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill, "An Act to amend Cap. 4 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Second Series) entitled of the Rebuilding of Carbonear," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

TRADING WITH ENEMY BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill, "An Act respecting Trading with the Enemy" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend 5 George V. Cap. 4 entitl,ed "An Act respecting a Volunteer Force in this Colony," was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

MIN. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I wish to lay on the table of the House the Report of the Inland Game and Fisheries Board; and also the answer to a question asked by Mr. Abbott on the 30th of March.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table the statement asked for by Mr. Halfyard; also a statement asked for by Mr. Grimes with reference to coal, oil, etc.; also a part of a statement in answer to a question asked by Mr. Coaker on Friday last in relation to the $9,000 expended for Government House. I may say that this was used for structural repairs and alterations both inside and outside. New floors were laid down, and painting and papering was done; also grates, furnishings, etc., were required. The amount covers the years 1914 and 1915. I will have a detailed statement in a short time.

Messrs. Coaker, Abbott, Clift and Lloyd gave notice of question.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement showing (1) the salary paid: (2) the nature of the employment of each of the following persons—James Croke,Railway Inspector; W. Liddy, Torbay,and Rhodie Kennedy, Holyrood.

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

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing how many fur coats were imported in the Colony for residents of Conception Hr., Hr. Main District, during the years 1913, 1914, 1915, and by whom.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Speaker. In reply to the hon. member I may say that nothing has been imported.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the following particulars: What amount of money was allocated for the main line from Quigley's Marsh to Turk's Gut, Harbor Main District, for the years 1914 and 1915, the names of the parties to whom the money was sent and the amount sent each; also, copies of the returns of said Expenditures if received by the Department; also, copies of the returns of all moneys spent on Salmonier line from Holyrood to Central House, Harbor Main District, for the years 1914 and 1915; also, copies of all Local Grants for Hr. Main and Chapel's Cove for the years 1914 and 1915.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Mr. Speaker. I will have that information for the hon. member as soon as possible.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement showing what was the annual or monthly salary paid Miss Penny as Postal Telegraph Official while she occupied that office at Musgrave Harbor, Fogo District; also, what salary is being paid the present, Postal Telegraph Official at Musgrave Hr.; also, a statement showing what salaries were paid

the Mail Clerks on the S.S. Fogota and the Earl of Devon for the year 1915 also, a statement showing the number of trips made by the S.S. Fogota and S.S. Susu to Fogo District during the year 1915; if any ports of call were missed during the year,give dates and reasons for the steamers not making the ports of call.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That information is being prepared.

MR. COAKER asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to give particulars of the payment of $25,000 to the Reid Newfoundland Company, and $22,071 to the Newfoundland Produce Company, account of Home Defence, as per statement recently tabled.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—The account has not yet been received from the Bank. I will have it tomorrow.

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.

MR. CLIFT—Might I ask the Minister if the Fire Patrol has made any report in connection with its work?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I cannot answer that right off.

MR. COAKER—The Fire Patrol report was tabled to-day.

MR. CLIFT—That is the Chief Ranger's report. I mean in connection with the Fire Patrol.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—The Chief Ranger is in charge of the Fire Patrol

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. With regard to that vote of $700.00 for the Inspector appointed under the Logging Act, I was given to understand by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, when this appointment was made, that the Inspector would only be paid for the actual time that he was employed. That is, if he started on the 1st November and ended on the last of April, he would be entitled to six months' wages.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—That is all he is getting.

MR. COAKER—You are paying him for the whole year.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—No. He is only being paid for six months, at $60 per month. That $700 includes expenses and all. The reason why he did not send in any report earlier was because he was sick for some time—I think, for two months.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I have already tabled, at the request of Mr. Coaker, three reports from him,—January, February and March.

MR. COAKER—I thank the Minister for his information in relation to that vote. He has been very courteous. Now, there is just one other little matter—it is not very important I notice in Finance Contingencies votes for Thomas Glasco, for sheep destroyed, $30; Patrck Horan, for pigs destroyed, $40; P. Monroe, for hens destroyed $10; Otto Rusch, for ducks destroyed, $4.50; Agnes Whelan, hens destroyed, $10.50; and M. J. Walsh, hens destroyed, $3.00. I would like to know why these amounts were paid. What is the principle? Were these killed by the railway or in what way?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—If the Minister of Finance will permit me,I would explain that these amounts are paid through the Magistrate's Court. It arises in this way. For the last ten or fifteen years, perhaps a little longer than that, but certainly fifteen, there has been a Dog Act in force in St. John's, East and West. Every person with a dog has to pay a license. At the end of the year the

Magistrate holds Court, and compensates all the people in the two districts who have lost sheep and cattle. If it is shown to the Magistrate that a person on the Topsail Road, for instance, or at Broad Cove or Portugal Cove, or anywhere else in either of the districts, has had sheep or heifers killed, the rule has been for the Magistrate to deduct from the license fund a reasonable amount for the person owning the property and compensate him, and then the balance is sent across to the Board of Works by the Magistrate, and it is put to the credit of St. John's East and West for road purposes. That has been going on now for fifteen or twenty years. I think latterly they have broadened the principle out a little, and in cases where poultry has been killed by dogs, they have been compensated also.

MR. COAKER—But why is it in the contingencies of the Finance Department.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—The Finance Department pays the amount under order of court.

MR. LLOYD—Is there not a special trust fund for this amount collected from dog licenses?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It goes to the credit of St. John's, East and West.

MR. LLOYD—When it gets into the Finance Department, to what account is it credited?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—To the Board of Works, and goes to the credit of the two districts.

MR. LLOYD—How is it paid out of general contingencies?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I will get all the information to-morrow. I know we pay it under order of the Magistrate's Court.

MR. CLIFT—I take it that the amount is paid by the Clerk of the Court into the revenue?

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER.—Yes, into the Exchequer account. It ultimately goes to the Board of Works and is then apportioned by the Chairman between the two districts. That is the balance after all claims are paid. My recollection of the practice is that the claims have always been deducted by the Police Magistrate before the amount is sent down.

MR. CLIFT—I asked for a statement of expenditure from the end of June to the end of the year, in connection with the vote of $20,000 for agricultural purposes. The report of the Board of Agriculture was tabled a day or two ago, but I have not had an opportunity of examining it, nor have I had an opportunity of examing the detailed statement of expenditure under that head, that is, the $20,000. I should like to comment on that before the vote is finally passed.

MR. COAKER—I wish to say a few words in connection with this matter. I am very pleased to find that the Minister claims that $5,136,000 worth of agricultural produce was raised in this country during the year 1915. Now, if that was the case, I wish to convey my congratulations to the government on its agricultural policy, but I am very much afraid that the estimate is exaggerated. This is certainly a large amount. It really means half the value of the whole fishery exports for the year 1915. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines give the credit for this to the agricultural policy inaugurated by the present government. The reason why I have my doubts is because when I turn to the reports from the different societies, I find that they are very conflicting with regard to the success of the agricultural policy.

Take the Reports of Agricultural Societies at:

Flat Island, P.B.—No cattle, no bull.

Musgravetown—Very little increase in cattle.

Princetown—No increase in cattle.

Wesleyville—No increase in pigs. (My friend Mr. Winsor might explain how it is that agriculture and stock-raising in particular are doing so well in this district, and the information he gives might be utilized by Mr. Devereaux for the benefit of the country generally. The question is, why is it that there is no increase in pigs in this section?)

Salvage Bay—No increase in cattle.

Port Blandford—Sheep, slight increase, (this is a fine place for sheep-raising; still there is only a slight increase.)

Brooklyn—Dealing with sheep the Report says: "No increase as there were a lot killed this Fall for mutton." I do not know what sheep are raised for if they are not to be killed.

Freshwater—Sheep some increase; pigs no increase.

Old Perlican—Some increase in sheep.

Broad Cove, B.D.V.—Pigs a decrease.

Carbonear — Want thorough-bred heifers as well as bulls; thorough-bred ewes as well as rams; and thorough-bred sows. Why do they ask for these? I venture to say that you might keep on sending thorough-bred animals to the outports for the next fifty years and there would still be no improvement in the stock if they are not fed and treated properly. Improvement in stock only comes from good feeding and proper treatment; and if you start raising cattle and feed them on hay only—and give them only one-third of the quantity they require—you will have no increase in size. If you want to get good cattle raised you will have to get the people to feed them properly. They must feed them on something similar to that used by the farmers around St. John's. You cannot hope for improvement in pigs, sheep, or cattle under the present methods of feeding them as is in vogue in the outports; and I venture to place that statement against anyone else's in this country.

Joe Batt's Arm:—Cattle and sheep increase 3 per cent; pigs a failure.

Fogo:—Cattle and sheep, no increase.

Musgrave Harbour:—Sheep, very little increase; pigs, no increase.

Change Islands:—Cattle, no increase.

St. Alban's:—Cattle, no increase.

Belleoram:—No increase in cattle the past few years; pigs, all sent died.

Spaniard's Bay:—Cattle increase 5 per cent.

Bay Roberts:—The report from this place, under the head "Suggestions," reads: "The members of our Society would like to see the bonus on new land continued, believing it would be a stimulus to agriculture in general, and an encouragement to all concerned." Very few pigs kept. Cattle increase 5 per cent.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I think the reason these people ask for the continuation of the bonus on new land is that it is thought that in this way greater facilities for cattle-raising will be afforded and the industry bettered.

MR. COAKER—Kelligrews: —In this report it is stated that "The Society has no bull in its possession at present, as Mr. Albert Rideout received permission to kill the bull that he had belonging to the Society as the animal had become vicious." I am very sorry indeed to hear about the viciousness of that bull. I think, however, you ought to go over to Kelligrews and enquire why there is no increase in sheep over there. It is a funny thing that no increase in sheep is noticeable here; the locality is ideally situated for the carrying on of this industry; and there should be

no difficulty in raising sheep in this district.

Harbour Main:—Dealing with pigs, the report says: "No increase whatever, as the pigs the past years supplied by the Board did not give satisfaction." I am surprised to find the Minister of Public Works did not pick out the best pigs and send them out to this place.

Placentia:—Sheep and pigs, no increase; cattle, slight increase.

Haystack:—"Have no pigs left in our part of the section whatever. Sheep are much more valuable than pigs are to us."

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The idea there is that sheep are valuable in the sense that they crop the grass and fertilize the fields; pigs do not eat hay. That, however, only applies to Haystack.

MR. COAKER—I know pigs do not want hay. If sheep are valuable because they eat the grass I hope they will come across some of the "two-blade" quality, some time ago referred to by my Rt. Hon. friend the Prime Minister. Why does not the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister say: "You ought to forget that two blade of grass?"

Branch:—"There is not a single pig in this section. During the past year pigs were repeatedly asked for but none could be procured." I hope you will be able to send some pigs to Branch.

Trepassey:—Pigs decreased.

St. Joseph's, Salmonier:—Pigs decreased. Would like sheep and pigs of good breed.

Salmonier, North:—Under the head "Suggestions," this report suggests "that an acclimatized class of rams be supplied." That would be a good idea, and would no doubt prove satisfactory. Sows sent not very good.

Argentia:—Pigs are unprofitable. No increase.

Merasheen:—Pigs decreased. Those sent by Board perished.

Riverhead, St. Mary's:—Seeds and potatoes sent not beneficial.

St. Bride's:—Pigs supplied all perished.

Brigus:—Sheep, no increase. Want better stock sent.

Seal Cove, W. B.—Pigs a failure.

St. John's East and West—(Note that the sheep increased in St. John's East and the dogs increased in St. John's West. One of the things that often astonish me is why so many dogs are allowed to roam around St. John's. I understand that there is a law dealing with licensing them. If the Board of Agriculture could come forward with some recommendation relative to this matter, and the doing away of some of these dogs, it would be doing something good. I should imagine that there are as many as fifty thousand dogs in St. John's. Every place one goes he sees swarms of them. No wonder the Society says that sheep have increased in St. John's East, and dogs have increased in St. John's West).

Port Rexton:—This is quite a lengthy report; but I see that pig-raising is a failure there. It suggests the importation of thorough-bred bulls and rams be continued if cattle raising is to be carried on successfully, and great care should be exercised in their selection. I cannot understand why suggestions of that kind are necessary, because I understand that the Board has been sending out thorough-bred cattle to this place, and I cannot understand why so many complaints come in from there.

Heart's Content:—I see that there is trouble there about the dogs. I should imagine that under the Local Affairs Act they could deal with the dog-evil in this place.

Catalina:—Cattle, very little increase. Sheep, slight increase.

Hant's Harbor:—Cattle, no increase. Four bulls sent, three perished.

Britannia Cove:—Cattle increase 5 per cent.

St. George's:—Very poor report concerning cattle. I cannot understand why that reflection on the Board should be contained herein. It says that the young animals are very poor because the kind of male animals furnished by the Board are almost valueless. I should say that my friend, the hon. member for St. George's, Mr. Downey, ought to know something about cattle, and should not send anything inferior to his own district.

Clam Bank Cove—Pigs, no increase.

Port au Port:—Pigs a failure. Cattle very little increase.

Crabbes:—No increase in cattle. Sheep, slight increase. Pigs decreased past three years.

Curling:—Dogs increased to an alarming extent. In one instance children going to school were menaced. I hope that steps will be taken to control dogs, in order to safeguard the children of the place.

Lark Harbour:—Pigs, none; all died, supposedly from want of knowing how to be fed and kept properly.

Woods Island:—Cattle, no increase; sheep, no increase, as people kill the increase during the Fall; pigs, none kept for breeding purposes, as they find it is not profitable to keep pigs all winter.

Robinson's:—Cattle, no increase, owing to the shortage of hay; pigs, no increase.

Burlington, District of Twillingate:—Cattle, no increase; pigs, no increase.

Fortune Harbour:—Cattle, no increase. "Suggestions:" "It is evident that both our cattle and pigs are both diminishing and deteriorating." I presume they have had an improved breed of cattle sent to them, as it is evident that the breed is deteriorating, instead of improving. That does not bear out what the Minister himself says in his report, when he said that "this splendid showing justified the hope that the Board's full grant of $40,000 would be restored again as soon as possible. I would be sorry indeed to see the Government restore the grant for Agricultural purposes from $20,000 to $40,000, which amount has been annually spent the last few years, because I do not believe that the country is getting good returns from the expenditure. Here you have statements from your own societies which show that no substantial progress has been made on the expenditure of $300,000 made during the last seven years. If all the societies sent in favourable reports, things would appear different. Of course, we do not expect favourable reports from all the societies, but we do expect that there would be favourable reports from some of them, instead of which the general report is that they have bad cattle, no increase in pigs or sheep. It is about time for the Board to get down to business to investigate this matter. I cannot understand why they cannot make the raising of pigs a success. There is nothing encouraging about this report. Twenty thousand dollars was spent last year, and you got just as good a return as you got from the $40,000 the year before. I do not agree with the Minister when he says that this policy is a success, or that the Government should add another $20,000 as soon as possible. I am sure that Mr. Devereaux one of the Commissioners is very anxious that the country should get the best possible benefit from this policy, and I feel that no one can blame him for the results shown in this report. If he sends out the cattle and the seeds and looks after the work in the office here, I cannot see how he can be blamed for what happens on the West Coast or to the North. If the societies do not look after the animals, and do not take the precautions that they should, the Commissioner cannot be blamed, unless scrub animals are sent out instead of pure bred, but I do object to any more money being

spent by the Board on this policy, and I do not approve of the suggestion of the Minister that the vote of $40,000 should be restored.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS— Mr. Chairman: I just wish to say a few words on this very important subject now before the Chair. The hon. member for Twillingate has shown up the defects and losses made by the Board in their endeavour to improve Agriculture in the Island, but there is one thing that he might have referred to, and that is the section referring to cattle. It seems that in the past three or four years cattle have decreased, but the reason is that they have been butchered. There is such a demand in St. John's for fresh local beef that the butchers have not been able to keep up the supply from their own districts, and they have had to work hard in order for the supply to keep up with the demand. Now there are 65 butchers in the district of Harbour Main, and if there is any industrious people in the district I must confess that they are the butchers. They are continually on the go round the other districts, Conception Bay, Trinity Bay, and even Bonavista Bay, looking for good beef. They even go up the Southern Shore as far as Trepassey on the same work. They leave their homes at three or four o'clock in the morning, and travel for two or three days from harbour to harbour purchasing cattle. They go in all directions on this errand. The same thing probably applies to the butchers in St. John's. It applies certainly with great force to the district of Harbor Main from Topsail to Holyrood. Last year, while on this very subject, I advocated, as I now advocate, the granting of a bonus for the keeping of young cattle. As soon now as they are three or four months old they are slaughtered, and the consequence is that the stock is decreasing. If these men were granted a bonus of $6 for the first year, and $6 for the second year, it would be worth their while to keep their cattle, and in addition to increasing the stock they would have the stable manure which is as valuable as the cattle for keeping the land. The land is neglected for not having stable manure; every one uses the fish manure, and we all know that this forces out the substances on the soil. Any practical farmer will agree with me in that statement. I am sure that Mr. Dwyer the hon. member for St. John's East, will agree with me. If I remember right, a few years ago a very practical man, Rev. Brother Slattery, gave us a suggestion for encouraging agriculture in this country, that the farmer should give attention to his stock of cattle, and always keep the stock replenished, so that if he sold one or two he would renew his stock. The result would be that the number would not be depleted, and he would always have a good supply of stable fertilizer. You cannot keep the land in good trim without stable manure. Last year while on this subject, I contended that if you wanted to encourage agriculture you ought to give a bonus for cattle which you gave for land a few years ago. When I and my friend, Mr. Morris, represented Harbour Main some 27 years ago, we took a good deal of interest in the organizing of Agricultural Societies, and a grant was given in this manner: For every dollar that was subscribed by a member of the Society, $2 was granted by the Government, and such member would then apply to the Secretary of the Society and get the benefit of the $3, which would be expended by the Secretary on animals, seeds or implements, whichever he thought best, and I contend that if you give a bonus to a man for keeping cattle, a man instead of selling them to the butchers will retain them in his possession for two years, and by that time he will

have a valuable animal. Now, I contend that Agriculture should receive every encouragement that is possible. You say that a fisherman should get a bonus for every quintal of fish he catches; I think the same thing applies to Agriculture. There was a bonus given for clearing land, but I understand that the failure of the policy was due to dishonest abuses which crept in, and the Government of the day dropped the matter. The same thing applies today in regard to lobsters. Who is at fault, I do not know, but you have lobsters packed in cases, and in the centre of some of the tins you will find some kind of offal. The same thing is done in regard to herring, and I believe a report came from Gloucester the other day complaining of the matter. Of course, all this reflects upon the country. No one is responsible for the inspection of the barrels of herring, and the country is getting the blame. Some such abuse crept into the matter of clearing land, but I do not believe in cutting out the grant for the encouragement of Agriculture in toto. I would no more cut out this grant than I would the grant given to Dr. Rendell and his staff. Of course you have to be careful. I do not believe myself that any wrong has been done in this direction, and I believe the societies and boards are doing their best.

There is a great lack of agricultural implements in the country, and the matter ought to be taken up seriously by the Boards. The moneys sent to the Boards are in their hands, and it is left to them to do with as they consider best. In my long experience in Harbour Main, I have known of large numbers of hard-working farmers whose implements were of the roughest kind, very few of them had hay rakes or mowing machines, not to speak of harrows or ploughs. If the hon. member for Twillingate will look up some of the sections in the report I think he will find more room for encouragement than he has given to the House at present. These sections will encourage the House to some extent, and they will encourage the Commissioners of Agriculture, Head of the Department, and also the Government to continue the grant, and if possible to increase the amount.

MR. DWYER—Mr. Chairman: After looking through the reports which have been made during the past seven or eight years, since the Government started this policy, I am struck with the fact that thousands of dollars have been spent and you have seen no improvement in the land or in the amount put under cultivation. I am bound to say that as far as improvement in Agriculture is concerned it is absolutely at a standstill; and why? At your meetings there was not one competent agriculturist to give information as to how the work could be made to improve the country. Animals have been imported and sent to societies which are not suitable for the place to which they are sent. The Government has been really generous in the amount voted, but they have not had a competent agriculturist to direct them. The Premier made a statement in which he has said that you cannot make a farmer out of a fisherman. That is not true. Farming as well as any other trade, is simply a question of "practice makes perfect." You have fishermen of Newfoundland who are giving a good account of themselves at the front, and whatever work they undertake they always succeed in doing it well. If you give them an object lesson, show them what they should do and how they should do it, I am sure you will get results which would enable them to work their land and get great advantage from it.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman,

I rise for the purpose of making a few observations in reply to the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker. The subject seems to have infused into the debate a little more ginger than has been lately evident. I cannot compliment the hon. member on the way in which he has criticized the various reports of the Agricultural Societies—especially those situated outside the city. His critique has left an impression of insincerity and unfairness particularly in regard to his manner of reading isolated extracts, and part sentences from the different reports submitted to the Agricultural Board. He cannot but be aware that the agricultural policy of the Government has been a great success. It is most unusual to criticize any subject in the way which the hon. member has adopted this evening, for he has not attacked the principle, but has satisfied himself by severely criticizing a few small matters of detail. I imagined he would have attacked the principle, and not isolated extracts taken here and there from the various reports submitted. The hon. member devoted a large portion of his speech to what he called the failure of pig propagation and contended that all the work performed in this connection was absolutely of no advantage. My reply is that the comparatively low price of pork and beef during the past two years, has had the effect of decreasing the breeding of pigs, particularly in certain sections of the country, and in addition to this the price of feeds has been abnormally high. The Newfoundland fisherman-farmer is, after all, a common sense man, and is fully cognizant of the fact that it is unprofitable to raise pork when feeds are so unusually high and difficult to procure. The natural consequence of this condition of affairs, not as the hon. member has stated, failure in the breeding of those animals, but of the peculiar circumstances surrounding the whole situation at the present time. The hon. member also contended that cattle raising has not increased as he expected. It is true that in some places there has been no increase—but why? Take, for instance, Kelligrews where there are 67 butchers in and about that neighbourhood. These butchers travel annually and almost continuously during the summer and fall, through the Southern Shore, Trepassey, St. Shotts, Peter's River, St. Mary's, Salmonier, Cape Shore, making an exceptionally large circuit, returning to the Kelligrews centre with many heads of cattle, for which high prices have been paid. Notwithstanding this great business in cattle and sheep, the reports from the various agricultural centres give an increase yearly. This is but a sample of what is doing in various other centres favourable to agriculture. There will be found in the report, figures in regard to the amount of hay, oats, and other produce brought over the railway or by the coastal and bay boats from the various ports of call in the Island. We have provided a system by which the railway clerks and other officials give particulars in relation to the transportation of live stock, cereals, etc., so that we receive the most of our information in accurate form, because of the system introduced by the Agricultural Board. Nothing similar to this has ever been attempted—that is to get accurate information as to detail and the aggregate—for instance, we can tell you how many head of cattle or sheep were bought or sold in any Agricultural centre touched by the railway or coastal boats. One other particular I might add in relation to production and the advantages which have accrued through the Agricultural policy of the Government—it is now possible for the fisherman-farmer to place in the ground his new

seed potatoes, and there is no necessity to purchase in Canada or elsewhere a commodity so absolutely needed, and if we had now to purchase outside the Colony it would cost more than one hundred and fifty per cent. more than that paid by our people during the past few years. Does this not show that the policy pursued by the Agricultural Board is bearing great fruit? It is impossible to show you just here, but if you were at the offices of the Board you could easily procure salient facts which would prove beyond a doubt that during the past five years we have gained very rapidly in the matter of Agriculture—not only in sheep, cattle and hay, but in a great many other articles which I find it impossible to enumerate at present. And this notwithstanding abnormal conditions and unfortunate circumstances which confront us and have confronted us for nearly two years.

In the early spring of last year Canada through her department of Agriculture, advised the farmers to go in for increased crops, plant and avail of every piece of cultivated land in the country, so as to make it possible not only to enrich herself but be of valuable help to the Empire. The result of that patriotic endeavour of the great Dominion is now to be seen in her full granaries and unprecedented prosperity. We have followed the example of our great neighbour as far as it was possible for us to do—we attempted to do in a small measure what she was doing on a much larger scale and I am glad to be able to say that we have been in a measure as successful, which goes to show that the policy inaugurated by the present Government is suitable and advantageous to our people.

I am not here today to defend individual societies or any particular agricultural society in the Colony, because as hon members must be aware that it is not possible to make a success of every society. Take, for instance, different sections of the country; some are favourable for sheep raising, others cattle raising, and others are favourable to the breeding of pigs, and there are many places not favourable to either. I might point to certain portions of certain districts where efforts were made but failure followed.

It is true we have attempted the impossible in some places and have failed, and because we have done so, unsympathetic anti-agriculturists have sneered, although knowing full well we were but attempting to carry out the wishes of the people. This is one of the reasons why I think the hon. member for Twillingate is insincere when he attempts to adversely criticize and condemn the various agricultural societies all over the Island. If you look up these reports you will find that almost in every one of them it is shown that the general aspect of Agriculture in this country is better than ever before. If you examine further you will find that this advancment is due mostly to improved methods, to the literature which has been distributed, Agricultural shows, and various other forms of information spread throughout the Colony by the Agricultural Board and its agencies. Agriculture has improved because of the fact that you have a policy which has been of the greatest benefit to the fishermen and the fishermen-farmers, and because here they acknowledge through their various societies these great benefits bestowed upon them by this policy. We can now place in the ground sufficient seeds of all varieties required to give sufficient produce for the ensuing winter—and yet hon. members will claim that they are sincere in their criticisms when they state they are delighted with the prosperity of the fishermen-farmer, while almost in the

same breath they contend we are making no progress, that the energy of the Board and its societies are futile, and that it would be wise on the part of the Government to withdraw the vote of $20,000 dollars for the advancement of Agriculture. But for the inception of this Agricultural policy and its active operation during the last six years the Government would be compelled to import this spring thousands of barrels of seed potatoes to be distributed throughout the Island as a pauper's dole—this should be done in order to prevent absolute destitution during the ensuing winter. But owing to our progressive policy, circumstances are quite the opposite.

One report stated, as noted by the hon. member that the rams forwarded to that centre were dead. Well, what if they are? They are not supposed to live for ever. In the next line, however, the report goes on to point out that the progeny of these rams were remarkable for their good health and fine physique, and the inference is that even here some progress has been made. I recommend you to look up the records in reference to agriculture previous to the inauguration of the present Agricultural policy, that there were thousands of acres of cleared land (cleared under the land bonus act) lying without a fence, and no attempt made to cultivate it. But if you look up these acres now you will find all in a state of fertility caused by the application of the regulations and bye-laws governing the various societies throughout the Colony. The cultivation of these acres have been a triumph for those of us who believe in the proper encouragement of the farming industry in this Island. The great result of which is more than one-third increase of vegetable and cattle production. We have endeavoured to place the fisherman-farmer in a position of comfort and independence, and we have not failed to instruct and encourage them to apply themselves more intelligently to all that appertains to the science of Agriculture.

The year 1915 shall mark an epoch in the production—the home production this year is much greater in value and volume in both meats and vegetables than the aggregate importation of these articles. I do not exaggerate the policy of the Government when such results can be shown, and next year I believe a similar report will be brought in showing a similar increase in the home product. All this leads one to the belief that the policy instituted by the present Government is the correct one, and if applied to the various Agricultural centres in the country with energy and intelligence will be the means of making this land capable of producing sufficient meats and vegetables for home consumption.

You will perceive, Mr. Chairman, judging from the reports submitted by the various societies, that we have had but very few cases of potato disease. I can imagine myself listening to the lengthy speeches which were delivered in this House in plaintive strain when referring to the potato disease or canker five years ago. All the ill-effects were attributed to the inefficiency of the men who composed the Board, they were made responsible for the introduction of this disease called canker, although it was well known to be in the country many years previously. At present there are but few cases of canker, if any. Owing to instructions given to the various centres where canker was discernible by the Agricultural Board, this insidious disease has been completely conquered, and now we find even a report of this disease is exceptional. It is easy to criticize, and it is an easy matter to make a statement that sheep raising has not been

a complete success. There are, I admit, many places in the Colony unfavourable for the raising of sheep or cattle, yet if you take up the census you will find that we have made considerable advance, and that we have proved to the country the usefulness of the policy pursued up to the present. It is most unfair to the Board, to the Government, and to the thousands of intelligent men who have taken to plough instead of the spade, the mowing machine instead of the scythe, to deprecate and stultify the efforts made to improve themselves by the application of science to their work. These men who were attempting to cultivate the land intelligently ought to be encouraged and assisted in every way commensurate with the importance of the industry, and no man, in my opinion, should criticize the details of such a measure without being prepared to discuss the principles of such a measure. To make light and unfair criticism is not enough, nor is it sufficient to say that the work accomplished is not what one expected. I am somewhat surprise because of the hon. member's attitude towards this subject, and considering the responsibilities in connection with his position both in this House and outside, I regret that he has deemed it necessary to offer such frivolous criticism, because it may have an effect upon many who regard anything he might say in reference to the subject as of great consequence. I have known the hon. member for many years, and have listened with interest to his speeches on many occasions. It seems to me, however, that on a measure so important as that of agriculture he should be chary of creating a false impression. The man behind the plough must be encouraged. And I feel quite positive that the concensus of opinion in the country at the present time is favourable to the present policy, and the methods by which that policy is carried into effect.

Mr. Chairman, before taking my seat, I should like to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Trinity Dr. Lloyd, in his new position as Leader of the Opposition. The position which he now occupies is of great importance, almost as much so as that of Premier of the Colony. I have no doubt that he will maintain all the traditions in connection with the Leadership. I do not say that I hope that he may occupy that important position for many years; I do not. When the people desire it he shall come to the left of the Speaker's chair. I believe that he will be most successful in his present position, and I have no desire to wish him further success. In my opinion we have in the present Leader of the Opposition, one who will maintain not only the position of Leader, but the proud prerogatives of Parliament.

MR. JENNINGS—I do not intend to delay the House with my few remarks, but I cannot help after listening to the glowing speech of the Honourable member on the Agricultural policy of the Government coming to the conclusion that there has been unfair distribution. I will confine my remarks to what has come to my actual knowledge, not to what I have heard from reports. Now in the Agricultural Report there are only three societies in the District of Twillingate referred to. Whether or not there have been any more societies formed in that District I am not aware; but the actual knowledge I have of the condition of affairs there will not allow me to speak very favourably of the agricultural policy as it has been brought out in the District of Twillingate.

With regard to the potatoes which the hon. member mentioned as having such a beneficial effect in the country, I may say that on two occasions I applied for seed for people

who sent to me who said they were destitute of seed, or in all probability they would be, and therefore I tried to procure this seed from the agricultural society, and on both occasions I received the reply that there was none to be had. Now that was very discouraging, and certainly does not speak well for somebody. If one part of the country had lots of seed and was getting the advantage, and another part of the country could not procure any, it goes to prove the point I made when I commenced, that there had been unfair distribution.

I had occasion to find out from the secretary of a certain society in the district of Twillingate, as to the cost of fertilizer—as to whether you could procure it through the Society, and at what cost. The information that I received from him was that fertilizer could be bought outside of the society at a cheaper rate than through the society. Now, that again is very discouraging for anybody who wanted to purchase it. Now, one of the best societies working in the District of Twillingate has to go to outside places in the bay and buy potatoes from folks who never had anything to do with these societies in the way of procuring seed. They have got to come down to buy hay. I have seen men coming from the vicinity where societies are operating to outside places where the societies never touched, hauling up loads of hay.

I saw some sheep that were said to have come from the Society, and I must say they were good sheep; but I am sorry to say they were owned by one of the best off residents of the place—a man with a pretty good bank account behind him. Those sheep that were said to be provided by the Agricultural Society did not belong to a poor man at all. Now in the District of Twillingate I think we have one of the best kind of potatoes grown in the country—the Black Mignon. The trouble the people find who grow that potato in the District of Twillingate is that it rots in the ground. Now I would like the Society to introduce the Bordeaux mixture or whatever it is that prevents potatoes from rotting.

Now I would like for the hon. gentleman to come down to the District of Twillingate next summer and let the District have the benefits of his knowledge, and he will see if my remarks will not be borne out in regard to unfair distribution.

MR. DEVEREAUX—In reply to the hon. gentleman, I might say in relation to the fertilizer that it is not distributed. We do not distribute fertilizer. It costs quite a lot of money, and owing to the short grant, it would be impossible to distribute it. We only import it for a farmer who leaves an order. We give notice in the early part of the year that we import fertilizer and sell it at cost. That notice goes to every society in the Colony, and if a farmer wants a half ton, or two tons or three-quarters of a ton his order is taken, and the fertilizer sent at the first possible opportunity.

Now with regard to the distribution of potatoes, the hon. member knows just as well as I do that it is very hard to treat everyone alike, especially in a country like this. For instance, we get the potatoes as early as possible in May. At this time the whole north coast may be frozen. It is impossible to get the potatoes down. Sometimes we have orders from the District of Twillingate, and even as far as Daniel's Harbour, and other places in St. Barbe District, and it is impossible owing to the condition of the coast to get them to them. Last year it was impossible even for the mail couriers to get along. The consequence was that these seeds could not be sent, and though they eventually reached these centres it

was too late. If as in some cases, the society is unsympathetic, and is only too glad to be able to criticize, you will find in the report the next year only just the one reference, "the seed came too late," or "the seed did not reach us in time." That is unfair. That occurred last year. This year we asked them to state fully the conditions before making a statement like that. Now you cannot have an even distribution in a country like this. It is impossible. We have tried for the past four years to get seeds to the societies up north at such time as they would be of use to them, and we have succeeded two or three times. Last year we could not. It may be the same this year. We have arranged to send the smaller seeds down by mail. Now, I am sure the hon. member had no desire to be unfair in his remarks. In anything he has said in this House the dominant charactertistic has been fairness, and I am sure that having heard this explanation with regard to the distribution of seeds that he alluded to he will, when he goes down to his District tell the people what he has said and what the reply has been from one of the Commissioners of the Board of Agriculture. I hope this year to be able to visit some of the centres in Twillingate; and I know that I will receive a hearty welcome from the hon. member, and from his constituents also, many of whom I am acquainted with for many years

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: Fearing that my silence on this subject may be an admission that my opinion has been changed as regards this agricultural policy, I take the opportunity of saying that it is not changed. I expressed myself on this matter when I first entered this House, and I have seen nothing so far to change my opinion. I think I then designated it as an agricultural farce, and I hold to that still. Nothing that the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's, Mr. Devereaux, has said this evening has had any influence with regard to changing my opinion on the matter. The hon. member said the hard work of the Agricultural Board, including himself, I suppose, had brought about many benefits to the country. Now I think that the hardest work the Commissioner has done since he assumed office has been in delivering this speech this evening. He has exercised himself very much over the few remarks that the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker, made. He, Mr. Coaker, only read from the report. He added nothing to it, and took nothing away. He simply read what was put into the report by the Commissioners and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. The report is not very encouraging. Then there is another thing: do you think if you had no agricultural policy as you have it today there would not be some slight increase in the acreage of land under cultivation and the production of potatoes, pigs, sheep, etc., around the country. Why do you assume that the people of the country would not be desirous of raising enough of agricultural produce for their own use. That idea had been growing with the people all the time, and it has become stronger lately owing to high prices. He talked about importing meat. That is almost out of the question now. It has been said that last year we produced more meat than we imported. Perhaps the high prices was the cause of that. Perhaps there was not so much used. People cannot afford to use it. It has been said that we have been finding fault with individuals. We have been finding fault with the policy. I daresay the societies are doing the best they can with the small grants sent out. A grant of $100 is expended amongst five or six thousand people, and several sections of a district. What can be done? As I said before,

we cannot do any more than we did before we had any Board of Commissioners. You can only send out a sheep or a pig when requested, and the old Agricultural Board could do that. We have been unfortunate in sending out pigs. They have not been acclimatized, or something has been wrong. In several cases that I know of they have had the best of care, but the pigs all perished. I think it has been suggested that the price of feed has become so high that the people did not care to continue raising pigs. It is not that. The pigs did not live. In some cases they were given every care, but they perished. Of course that is not the fault of the Board.

It has been said that we are finding fault because $20,000 will be sent to the fishermen of this country. Well now, if that twenty thousand dollars was sent to the fishermen of the country to help them in their actual work, I do not know that we would find much fault with it. But where does the $20,000 go? How much of it is taken up in salaries for Commissioners and Secretaries and other clerical work? I think the amount spent in this way is about $7,000, which, I think will be admitted, is a very high proportion. That is what we find fault with. The idea of spending $7,000 to distribute $13,000, is ridiculous. If our teachers, who have to spend a large amount of their time in preparing themselves to teach, were paid at this rate, we would find no fault; but when men are paid to instruct the public in connection with a matter of which, we have been told, they know nothing, it is worse than absurd. These men are not agricultural experts, although they have been derisively termed so; they have no knowledge of that which they pretend to teach; and yet they are being paid this exorbitant wage. Doesn't the Government know that it is being ridiculed on this account? The Government of the day, with regard to its agricultural policy, is the laughing stock of the people of the country. That $20,000 could be distributed for $1,000, and the work done just as effectively as it is being done now, by paying a secretary a proper salary to do it. That is the reason why, I may say your policy stinks in the nostrils of the people—whether you like it or not. Now, the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Jennings, has cited cases where places in which agricultural societies were established, could not raise enough hay and potatoes for their own use, and had to get them from places which did not come under the influence of the Agricultural Society at all. These outside places had received no seeds, and yet they could produce enough produce for their own wants and have a surplus to send to places where agricultural societies were established. And still the Government insist upon taking credit for any agricultural advance which has been made since they assumed power. The advance which has been made would have been made just the same without this policy as with it; and therefore we despise that policy, because it is not giving us returns commensurate with the money which is being expended.

MR. LeFEUVRE—Mr. Chairman: I listened with interest to the address of the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's on this subject, and I am sorry that the hon. member for Fogo has not seen his way clear to change the opinions which he has held in the past with regard to the agricultural policy of the Government. Now, I don't know anything about agriculture, and I don't pretend to know anything about it; I am not keenly interested in the subject, but I do like to see fair play. Now we in Burin make no

claims to any agricultural pretensions, because Burin is not an agricultural district, but I do know that agriculture has advanced in Burin district as a result of this policy. Some years ago we got practically all our produce from Prince Edward's Island. We could bring in any amount of it and be sure of finding a ready sale. Now we have to be careful in bringing it in, because the people are raising a lot of the produce which they require for their own consumption. I know people in Burin who are raising potatoes now who never thought of doing it five years ago. One phase of the policy with which I am particularly in sympathy is that of agricultural exhibitions. That, I believe, has been the means of giving the impetus to agriculture that we have had in Burin during the last few years. Now, the hon. member for Fogo referred to the fact that some places which were not receiving any assistance at all from the Agricultural Board had done much more in regard to the raising of produce, than places where agricultural societies were established and where seeds, etc., were being received from the Board. Well, that may have been because of the fact that the places first referred to had a much larger amount of acreage under cultivation and had greater natural possibilities. We, of course, in Burin can put up no great showing as compared with certain other parts of the country, but we are doing much more than was being done in the past. I am sorry that the report from Burin does not appear in the Minister's report. I don't know what the reason is. I know that it has been compiled, and should have been sent on some time ago.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I am not worried over the remarks of the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's, because there is very little in them which calls for a reply. He accused me of insincerity in regard to this matter. Now, he knows my opinion in regard to this policy, because I have expressed it on three or four occasions, and I did not say this afternoon one-fifth of what I have said on former occasions. This afternoon I simply disputed the right of the Minister to say in his report that the agricultural policy of the Government, as we have seen it during the past six or seven years, has been responsible for the wonderful agricultural progress which is claimed to have taken place in the country during recent years.

That is the statement which I am criticising. I simply challenge that statement, and I cited returns from your own agricultural boards to show that the policy of the Government has not been either successful or satisfactory in many places, and that in some places it has been a failure. I didn't comment very much on any of these reports; I simply read them. I cited from fifty societies to show that no progress had been made—in fact, the opposite has happened in some cases, because it appears from some of the reports that there has been no increase in cattle, that cattle have died, that sheep have died, and all that sort of thing. And yet the hon. member accuses me of insincerity because I stated the facts. If I had commented on them, if I had reviewed the whole situation, and given my own idea as to what should have been done, he might be excused for thinking that I was not sincere and that I was getting up merely for the purpose of hearing myself talk; but I simply challenged the statement of the Minister in his report to the Government, and I am justified in doing so. If I have any rights at all in this House, I certainly have the right to criticise the report of a Minister. Now, I have not the slightest hesitation in repeat-

ing my own opinion on the matter once more. The agricultural policy of the Government is a mere farce, and I say that as a man who has had 18 or 20 years experience in agriculture. With regard to cattle, I took that matter up because I believe I know something about stock-raising. I was very much interested in stock-raising, especially in sheep-breeding, and I find nothing whatever of an encouraging nature in the reports in that connection. If there were anything there that would lead me to believe that this policy would end eventually, say in four or five years in improving conditions, I would be only too glad to give it my support. I have my own ideas of what ought to be done. Don't think that because I am finding fault with this policy and endeavoring to show that these reports are not encouraging that I have no wish to see agriculture progress in Newfoundland. I don't claim that Newfoundland is an agricultural country. It is not and never will be. But something can be done to assist the people in this direction; there is not the slightest doubt about that; but I doubt your figures when you say that the value of produce last year amounted to over $5,000,000. I want to get something reliable to substantiate these figures before I am prepared to accept them. Statements taken from Reid's agents along the line, and people of that sort, are not sufficient to convince us. We want some evidence that we can have confidence in.

In the past you have made up your statistics in that way, but you cannot expect us to swallow them. If. however, the value of agricultural produce in this country is anything like $5,000,000, then I say that we ought to congratulate ourselves. I don't say that we ought to give you credit for having done very much to improve conditions. Take the north, for instance. I have gone through it and found every sort of dissatisfaction with the animals which have been sent out, and all sorts of complaints. I don't know half a dozen places that have been satisfied with what has been done. Last year I met men at Lewisporte, who were in a row with the Board. These men are as much interested in agriculture as any man in the country, and they were simply disgusted with the procedure of the Board. Why such dissatisfaction, There may have been fault on both sides, but the fact remains that the Boards and the societies have not been working in harmony. The Board I suppose, tries to do the best it can, and that the people have not been able to work in harmony with it is a great pity, especially in view of the fact that I don't know of any people in the whole North who take more interest in agriculture than the residents of that same section.

Now, with regard to the potato canker. The Commissioner has gone as far as to say that the Board has exterminated this germ that got into the potato known as the Canker. Now, the very report of the Minister contradicts that.

It proves that the frost killed the canker, and the hon. member actually went as far as to lead us to believe that it was the efforts of the Board that had destroyed it. With regard to seed potatoes, I know that you have sent out some seed potatoes,and paid fancy prices for them. You probably did what you thought was the right and proper thing to do for the encouragement of agriculture so far as the growth of potatoes is concerned, but the policy has been anything but a success. In the North those potatoes have been thrown to the pigs; people won't eat them; they have gone back to the old seeds that they sowed years ago.

I have no doubt that the potatoes

sent to Harbour Main and around Conception Bay generally gave satisfaction, because the people living in these sections are enabled to put stable manure on the crops, and do not need to use fish manure; but in the Northern districts it is all fish manure that is used. In the latter places, therefore, there is no chance of the potatoes turing out dry if the wet variety of seed potato is sent. The potatoes spoken of by Mr. Jennings are Black Meighen, and reds are raised successfully where fish manure is mostly used, and they turn out dry; but as a general rule, potatoes sent by the Board require stable manure, and if they do not get it they will turn out anything but dry. I expressed the opinion last year that one would require to have oil clothes on to handle some potatoes. I am glad to see that the Commissioner brought out some interesting points in his address. It is apparent that his four or five years' experience of the agricultural Commissionership have not been spent in vain; it is evident that he has learned something; and if he was worth $1800 7 years ago, he ought to be worth $2500 now—if the salary paid is in proportion to his experience. Sometimes he has been a little astray in his policy; but he has done something—although we can appreciate that he has to do something to justify an expenditure of $2,000 on his salary. This afternoon he would have been alright if he had not accused us of insincerity. But I assure him, I was not insincere. My remarks were based on the information supplied by him; I merely quoted from the reports compiled by himself and his department; and surely he cannot accuse me of insincerity because my remarks dealt with reports that showed very poor results. I had nothing to do with the making of such reports. I used what he supplied us with.

MR .DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman. I would just like to explain some matters in connection with the Lewisporte Society. There was some disagreement in that section over the Agricultural Society; and the reason why dissatisfaction existed there was because the Society, for some reason, did not expend the allocation sent it. It was left unspent from one year to another; and because of that the Agricultural Board took action. That was the only disagreement that we have had as regards the Lewisporte Society. But the only thing that this action of the Lewisporte Society shows is apparent—lack of interest. I was especially disappointed at the results achieved there because, judging from the personnel of the Society, particularly its chairman and Secretary, great things were expected. I knew the Chairman and Secretary of this society; I made their acquaintance in Lewisporte and they treated me most kindly when I was there; in fact they treated me in a way that I shall ever remember—and I feel glad this afternoon to state this and bear testimony to their kindness to me. The fact was, however, that nothing was done by that Society; they refused to expend the grant given to them; they might have done a lot for agriculture there; but the fact remains that nothing was done. If my honorable friend, the member for Twillingate, would consent he might advise with the Board; enquire what was the trouble; and this matter might be cleared up. Speaking on behalf of the Board I may say that we shall be very glad to have the honourable member for Twillingate consult with us on this point. In this way I think a great deal could be done for Lewisporte. There is no reason why good results should not be apparent from this place. It is a centrally situated district; and distribution there could be carried out suc-

cessfully; and we would be only too glad if he would help solve the difficulties surrounding this section.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— I would like to correct a few statements made here this afternoon in relation to this matter. First: I never made any such statement as that just quoted by the Honourable member for Twillingate, that we could rear potatoes here to average thirty barrels to the barrel of seed. What I did say was that that had been done, and that the reports from officers of the various societies bearing reputable names, for instance those of the chairmen and secretaries, during the last three or four years, show that thirty barrels had been raised and as high as forty in some cases; but we all know that that cannot be an average. These satisfactory results were probably obtained from a certain seed and with particular attention given to the cultivation of the potato; because no matter what seed you get, unless the potatoes are properly cultivated (I do not mean to say putting the potatoes in the ground in April and not earthing them or cultivating them until October) you will obtain good results. Cultivation of the potato is vital and is the essense of the whole question of raising potatoes. In a sense the seed does not matter; no matter how careful you are in the selection of seed; no matter how well cut the potatoes are; no matter what fertilizer is used; unless it is properly cultivated—every week, every fortnight, or every month—you cannot get results. There are half a dozen things essential in the growth of potatoes which I need not detail here this afternoon. My honourable friend Mr Coaker says he has been a farmer. Well, I have had fifteen years acquaintance on my own farm, and I know a little about the cultivation of potatoes; and I say now that I have always contended that you can double the crop of potatoes in Newfoundland, without any more labor, without any greater quantity of soil, without any better manure, if you get good seed and cultivate it properly; It will not cost you a solitary dollar more, but first you have to get good seed. My honourable friend on the other side quotes me to the effect that I said that some of the potatoes grown in the country were no bigger than marbles. I have gone around the whole of this country and I have seen the people digging potatoes not bigger than marbles—the seeding, manuring and labor gone for nothing. The cause is that, first of all, it is worn-out seed that is used. Good seed is as necessary in potato-growing as in stock-raising or in anything else. You cannot have the same seed for thirty or forty years without degeneration setting in. Our policy in relation to agriculture is to get the best seed we can; and before embarking on our policy we undertook to get the best advice we could and obtained the services of Dr. Robertson, the eminent professor who for twenty years had charge of the government Model Farm at Ottawa—who carried off all the honors as a chemist and scientist —and who was approached by Professor McDonald and given two million dollars and told to go and build an agricultural college with it and do anything he thought requisite for the advancement of the science of agriculture We brought him down here —we brought down the man who transformed agriculture in Canada, who revolutionized the dairy industry of the Dominion—a man who had travelled all over the world—a scholar—a scientist—a recognized authority. He came down here as the guest of the Government; he stayed here for three weeks; went around the country and examined the farms and saw ev-

erything for himself. Read his report and see what he said. He told me: "You can double the potato crop here, using the same land, with the same amount of labour, and you can get a good merchantable potato from it—if the proper methods of cultivation are used." He said there was nothing so sad as going around the country and seeing the potatoes being dug. Here and there only, he said, you saw a merchantable potato, because generally the potatoes were not cultivated; one large potato and a dozen small ones. You cannot expect to get fifteen or twenty potatoes from a small piece of potato—not half the size of your watch—which you place in the ground and let the soil bake and become encrusted with the action of the sun, heat and absence of proper irrigation. But you will do it if you have good seed and will cultivate it. The soil must be continuously loosened up so that the potatoes in growing will have a chance to expand. If you put the seed in an iron or wooden box or chest it will not grow. As I said, the soil must be kept loose, a flat, swampy ground must not be used, the crop should be planted on a gentle incline; and there is a number of other things which are vital to the carrying on of this industry, but which I need not delay the House with now. One of the principal planks in our agricultural policy was to advise the country and people as to the right kind of seed to use and the proper cultivation to apply; and I have no doubt that if it was not for the war which involved the necessity of reducing that grant; if we could have gone on importing good seeds, and could have reached with them every settlement in the country that the results today would have been more convincing.

My friend, the hon. member for Placentia, has put it very correctly when he pointed out that as far as our policy is concerned it has been a new birth for agriculture; although the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Dwyer, a man for whom I have the highest regard and esteem, and whose opinion as a farmer I value very highly, and for whose experience in agriculture I have the highest respect, went one better than my friend, the hon. member for Fogo, Mr. Halfyard, (who stated that the policy of the Government was a farce) and said that nothing had been done at all during the years that we have had charge.

Mr. Coaker, the member for Twillingate, objects to the clause in the report which states that last year the value of our local produce was $5,000,000. He says there is nothing to justify the making of that statement. Now I take issue with the hon. member, and I claim that if he will consider the whole report carefully he will find that six million would be nearer the mark. I would go one million better in the total of Newfoundland local products during the past year. You will find that six million is nearer the mark than five million. If the hon. member is desirous of disputing this, he should produce the facts and figures to support his contention.

It is inconceivable that a responsible board would make a statement like this without having facts and figures to back up the statements. Now, what are the facts? I will not weary the House with going through them, but would just touch on three or four which have come to my attention while sitting here this evening. If the hon. member for Twillingate will follow me, I will try to show him. I have no desire to state anything that is not entirely correct.

There is set down for hay, 70,000 tons, and the price is calculated at $21 per ton. Now is there any objection to the quantity? Is that too high?

Do I understand the hon. member to say that that is too high? I am basing this amount on the 1911 census returns, and allowing a reasonable increase since then. There was certainly as large a crop this year as there was then. All the facts are not in the report. They need not be there. They can be obtained from the department. The report is as complete as necessary, and justifies my statement. Because the hon. member cannot see it is no reason why it is not justified. Take, for instance, the item in relation to eggs. Here the value of local eggs is put down as $64,000, or to be exact, $64,864. Now, do you claim that that estimate is too high? Now, it is not my intention to go right through the items enumerated here, and I do not intend to delay the House, but as I have said, I will take one or two of these estimates and see if they are not correct. Of course, I do not expect to convince the hon. member. I am dealing now with the returns as outlined in the Census of 1911. There were one million dozen eggs laid in Newfoundland that year. Now is that disputed? I am talking about the value of the eggs laid in this country during the year 1911. One million dozen of eggs are recorded. One million dozen. There is absolutely no reason whatever to believe that there were not more eggs than this this year. Let us see. In 1901 when the Census was taken, there were 200,000 fowl. In 1911 there were 300,000. This will not be disputed, I am sure. This happened during the time the Bond Government was in power, and Mr. Clift was the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. The increase was therefore 100,000 hens. Now, if from 1901 to 1911 the increase was 100,000, it is only fair to suppose that since 1911 the same or even a larger increase has taken place, but for the purpose of my argument let us suppose that there has been no increase whatsoever. For the purpose of my argument then let us take these figures. One million dozen eggs. Now let us say the average price is forty cents a dozen. That would make the annual value $400,000. If that is too high, say 20 cents. That would make $200,000. This is a low estimate. Not high enough. This is taking the number as recorded in the Census 1911, and since that time there has been great encouragement given to this industry. However, taking it as I said, first, one million dozen eggs at forty cents gives you $400,000. If forty cents is too high say twenty, which will give $200,000. This estimate of $200,000 is a very low one, but here in the figures which are complained of, it is given as only $60,000.

Now to leave the subject of eggs, which we have seen is a very low estimate let us look at that of butter. According to the Census of 1911 there were 6,955 pounds of butter 6,900 at 40 cents per pound, comes to $263,000. I think that is under the average value. The annual value set out in the estimate complained of is only $233,000. It might have said $260,000 without being at all incorrect. The price is probably nearer 45 than 40 cents. This amount is taking for granted no increase whatever since the 1911 Census.

Next take the potato estimate. Only $650,000. The estimate is placed at the rate of $1.50 per barrel. You can buy potatoes nowhere now at that price; $2.00 would be nearer. There are places here where you must pay $3.00 per barrel. For the purpose of this estimate, we have reckoned at the rate of $1.50 on the amount of potatoes as in the 1911 Census, which I feel sure, all the hon. members will agree is a very conservative estimate.

Now, the hon. member, Mr. Deveaux, charged the member for Twillingate with being insincere,—not in any

offensive sense, as was evident. But the reason he did this was, because the hon. member came in here this afternoon and read only from those reports which apparently showed an item here and there which did not give good results, and anything of a favourable nature was omitted and not referred to by him. That looks like insincerity. If he wanted to convey to his constituents a fair estimate of the year's work he should have selected from every report. When we came in here seven years ago, there were only one or two agricultural societies in Newfoundland; Today you have a hundred. The hon. member today quoted from about seventy reports from seventy societies, but only those particular items which showed occasional failures were cited, just because before you came in here and sat down you went through the report and put a tick across these items which suited your policy. Will you deny that?

MR. HALFYARD—No.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will take your word for it, but what about the hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. COAKER—I read them all.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That may be, but there was not a solitary quotation in favour of the Government.

MR. COAKER—I quoted from St. Brendan's where the increase was one hundred and fifty per cent.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, you did, only to show up the backwardness of a place right near it. But what are the facts? My friend quoted meat statistics from Kelligrews, but you cannot expect any increase from that settlement while they carry on the large meat trade there. You have more butchers in Kelligrews than in St. John's. There are fifty men in Kelligrews engaged selling cattle. You will have a different result if you include the cattle killed there every year. Take again, Clarke's Beach; my friend very conveniently left out Clarke's Beach; cattle have largely increased there; sheep have increased a hundred per year for the past four years. That is an Opposition district as well. St. Barbe District and La Scie sheep have increased fifty per cent. the past three years, and cattle have increased ten per cent. for the past five years, but we have no mention of either of these districts.

MR. COAKER—But there is nothing wonderful about that.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is very wonderful, having regard to your argument. I am not quoting for the purpose of showing that there was something wonderful in the farm products, but merely to show that your criticisms were not fair. There is not one report that apparently shows indifferent results that cannot be explained. Now ,take for example, Port Rexton. There was no reference made to that place. There was a large increase there.

MR. COAKER—Pardon me, I referred to that.

RT HON. PRIME MINISTER—Well, then, I accept your correction.

At Port au Port there was a large increase of sheep. At Lark Harbour they have been doing away with their cattle and taking up sheep instead, because they are more profitable. Then you can take Codroy, where there was a large increase. Milk averages two gallons per cow; fifty pairs of pigs are kept for breeding purposes; young pigs are sold at $1 and $1.50 each; at Lewisporte cattle have increased thirty-five per cent; pigs have increased twenty-five per cent., but there was no reference to Lewisporte from that standpoint, but Lewisporte was merely mentioned because there was some slight trouble down there. The position the Gover-

ment takes with regard to this agricultural policy is this, that when we came in here agriculture was as dead as Julius Caesar as regards any effort being made by the Government.

MR. COAKER—It does not appear so from the Census of 1911.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—When you get into power you can adopt your own policy. In 1901 there were seventy-eight thousand sheep in Newfoundland; in 1911 there was a falling behind of three thousand. In 1901 there was eighteen thousand head of horned cattle in Newfoundland; in 1911 there was thirteen thousand; there was therefore a falling behind of five thousand in ten years; that was what I mean when I say that agriculture is as dead as Julius Caesar. However, the lateness of the hour prevents me from continuing. No doubt another occasion will present itself when I can further justify the actions of the Government in this respect.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. 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 motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

MESSAGES FROM LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively: "An Act to amend 3 George V., Cap. 14, entitled: 'An Act respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador'"; "An Act to amend the War Measures Act, 1914"; "An Act to Incorporate the Salvation Army," and "An Act to amend the Law respecting the Naturalization of Aliens," without amendment.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 4th, 1916.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. CURRIE—I beg to present a petition from Very Rev. A. J. Maher, P. P., and some 135 other residents of St. Lawrence, in the District of Burin, asking that a breakwater be erected to protect the road running along the side of the harbour to the public wharf. Apparently during a recent storm ice was driven in over the road and caused considerable damage. Petitioners think that a small breakwater, costing one hundred and fifty dollars would protect the road from a recurrence of the trouble. I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition, and I think probably that when the new grants are available it may be possible to allocate the amount asked for this particular work. I move that the petition be received and sent to the Department of Public Works for immediate consideration.

MR LeFEUVRE—Mr. Speaker. I beg to support the petition just presented by my colleague. I know the place very well. I have been talking to a man from Burin who was in St. Lawrence when the storm occurred, and he tells me it was a very rough time there. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bunyan's Cove in the District of Bonavista asking for an amount to repair bridge and road at that place. The bridge and road re-

ferred to by the petitioners is in an impassable condition and need immediate attention. The petitioners also ask that Bunyan's Cove be connected by telegraph with Musgravetown. This also is something which is absolutely necessary. Bunyan's Cove is situated, I think, about four miles from Musgravetown; the road which divides the two places is all stumps and stones, and altogether in a very bad condition, consequently it is quite a difficult job to get to and from Bunyan's Cove. Telegraph connection Sir, would be a great blessing to these people, especially in cases when a Doctor's services is badly needed. I hope that the Government will do its very best to grant the petitioners' request. I now ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present to the House to-day a petition from the inhabitants of Herring Neck on a subject already dealt with in a number of petitions presented some time ago. I ask that this one be received and considered along with the rest.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Trinity West. It is signed by a number of the inhabitants and relates to the Labrador Mail Service. I understand a petition on the same matter was presented by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a short time ago.

I have also a petition from the inhabitants of New Melbourne. The petition is of the same nature as others presented a few days ago, referring to railway extension. The inhabitants pray that the original intent of the Railway Extension Act be carried out and that the line be extended along that shore to Old Perlican.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Winterton, Trinity Bay, in relation to the use of steamers exceeding five hundred tons in the sealfishery, and in relation to other matters. Petitions of this kind were presented here a short time ago. It is signed by Ernest Barrett and a number of other residents of Winterton.

I have also a petition from the inhabitants of Snook's Harbour on the same subject. I ask that these petitions be referred to the proper Departments.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the answer to a question asked by Mr. Abbott on March 26th.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Hon. Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to Weights and Measures and the Inspection of Lumber.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: In placing these Resolutions before the Committee, it is not my desire to make any lengthy remarks in relation to them. As we go along, and each separate section is read, the opportunity will present itself of fully discussing them. I would like however, to crave the attention of the Committee for a moment or two whilst I endeavour to explain the reason why these Resolutions are before us today. For the past year or two the Board of Trade in St. John's have been making strong representations to the Government in relation to the imperfections of the present Act, particularly in so far as it related to the standard weights of different commodities that, through the evolution of time, have changed their meaning as to certain terms. It is well known, Mr. Chairman, that to-

day in the city of St. John's, as well as in other parts of the Island, such commodities as hay and straw are sold by the ton. Now, Sir, a ton formerly meant without question, 2240 lbs. weight. To-day, when hay and straw and other such articles are quoted, it doesn't always mean that quantity, because we are living now in a time when what is known as the 'short ton' is generally meant. This commercial expression is today generally understood by commercial men, but in so far as the unsophisticated are concerned, there is often a great amount of deception and improper dealing carried on under this terms. What is true of a ton is also true of a hundredweight. In the past a hundredweight meant 112 lbs.; to-day it is a common commercial experience to have an article quoted to you at such a price per hundredweight, meaning 100 lbs.; and a contract is often made without the purchaser knowing that he is buying 100 lbs. and not 112. Now, Sir, one of the objects of these resolutions is to standardize the weights in relation to these commodities—as to what is meant by a ton and what is meant by a hundredweight. In future, the resolutions set forth, these commodities shall be sold at 100 lbs. per hundredweight, and 2,000 lbs. per ton, or what is now known as the short ton or cwt. This is done on the recommendation of the Board of Trade, not alone in commercial interests, but in the interests of the people of the whole country; so that recognized standards will apply in all cases where a purchaser and seller negotiate the transfer of these articles. In the past a great deal of deception has existed, and a great deal of confusion has occurred, and I think that the resolutions that we have before us will tend in a great measure to conserve the interests of those whom we should consider first, that is, the great majority of the people. People will not longer be receiving 100 lbs. and 2000 lbs. for their money when they think they are purchasing 112 lbs. and 2,240 lbs. It will be understood in the future that when a man purchases a ton of hay or straw he is purchasing 2000 lbs, or a cwt. of these articles he is purchasing 100 lbs., and prices should be governed accordingly. In the case of articles being sold by the hundredweight, I think sugar stands out predominant. Only two or three years ago, when one got a quotation on sugar per hundredweight, it invariably meant 112 lbs. The alteration has drifted in without any recognized authority. One day we were purchasing sugar at 112 lbs. per hundredweight; the next day we found ourselves purchasing 100 lbs. per hundredweight. I contend that that is a very undesirable condition of things, and should be remedied, and the object of these resolutions is to remedy it. Another very strong representation of the Board of Trade was that parties doing business here in St. John's, importing different articles such as provisions of different sorts, viz: oatmeal, rolled oats, beans, calavances, and articles of that kind, and cattle feeds like bran, molassine, and such like, found that the sacks or packages in which these articles were, varied from 15 to 20 lbs. It is known that the same article has been sold on this market in packages which vary in weight, some of them containing 112 lbs., some 100 lbs., and some as low as 95 lbs. Now, Sir, that on the face of it is most unfair for the bona fide and honest trader who sells these articles at the full standard weight. If he is to be protected, if the public are to be protected, some recognized standard should be adopted to make the weight of these articles uniform. It is therefore suggested in the resolutions that all feeds and provisions of that na-

ture should in future be standardized at 100 lbs. to the sack, and the net weight marked thereon. I think the suggestion is one that will commend itself to every member of the Committee, and one, if adopted, will be in the interests of the whole country.

Another article of commerce that has occupied a very ambiguous position in our commercial life is oats. It is a most extraordinary thing that in Prince Edward Island oats are sold at 34 lbs. to the bushel. (I mention Prince Edward Island because we get the greater portion of our oats from that place)—it comes through our Customs (34 lbs. to the bushel)—but when the seller deals out the oats he is supposed to sell it at the rate of 38 lbs. to the bushel. It will be seen that herein lie many opportunities for improper trading, because a great number of those who use oats are hard-working people who are only able to buy it in small quantities—perhaps a sack at a time—and therefore they have not the facilities or means to find out what quantity of oats they are getting; and it is quite possible for traders to import sacks of oats at 34 lbs. to the bushel and sell the same sacks at 38 lbs. to the bushel. Of course, I am not attempting to say that this is the practice, but I say there is a possibility of its so happening, or it may happen accidentally, and therefore they may unwittingly wrong someone. It will therefore be seen that this article should be standardized, and under these resolutions it will be standardized at 34 lbs. to the bushel; then we will have a uniform standard of weight, both as regards our importations, passage through the Customs, and sale afterwards.

Now, Sir, another very important point in connection with these resolutions, is the fact that in the trade generally here, certain articles are put up in small packages, such as cartons, bottles, kegs, boxes, and such like, and I am sorry to say that there have been instances cited which show that articles contained therein that have been represented to contain 1 lb. or 2 lbs., as the case may be, upon investigation have been found to turn out short weight. It is a well known fact that articles sold in some quarters here upon representation that they contained 1 lb. upon investigation have proved to be less than 14 ounces in weight. That is a condition of things that hits directly at the poor man; he has not the facilities to find out the difference; his eye is not quick enough to detect the difference in appearance; his hand is not expert enough to detect shortage in the weight; something should be done to protect him from deception; and therefore the object of the resolutions is that all packages should bear net weight marked thereon, either in pounds or ounces.

Shot is another thing sold here that requires attention, and those members from the outports will appreciate the fact that in very many cases shot sold in bags which should contain 112 lbs., or in half-bags that should contain 56 lbs., or quarter bags, 28 lbs., are today sold in bags containing 100, 50, and 25 lbs. respectively. There is scope for deception in such cases; and the matter is one that calls for some remedy, and we have embodied in these resolutions a remedy by standardizing a bag of shot at 100 lbs., and the half-bag at 50 lbs., or a quarter bag at 25 lbs.

Another feature of these resolutions is one that regards the sale of paints and oils. A person goes into a store to purchase a gallon of paint or oil; he takes it, and thinks he has what is known as the "imperial gallon." We have the imperial gallon and the American gallon and the latter is one-sixth less than the imperial: but the trouble is never taken to inform the

purchaser that it is an American he is buying; he is not informed that the contents of the package which he is purchasing and believes to be an imperial gallon, is an American gallon, one-sixth less. I suppose the seller considers that it is not good business method to say anything that would prevent sale; but it is the business of this Legislature to protect the public and therefore the object of these resolutions is to standardize this commodity and to make the imperial gallon the measure for all such gallons and proportions thereof.

The question of pit props which has been receiving considerable attention in the Legislature during this session, is one that has become acute; and it is opportune that this measure should cover it. The section in the resolutions that refers to pit props calls for 128 cubic feet of pit props that can be properly stowed in that space, and no deductions are allowed for air spaces between them. This is a necessary provision, and a measure which will protect those who in the past have been compelled to accept deductions that were improper. I am sure that when this measure is discussed we will have some more light thrown upon it, and I feel it is one that will commend itself to the House and those people who in the past have not been given a square deal in this respect. Therefore, I have very much pleasure in saying that this very important matter will be covered by the resolutions now to be considered.

Towards the latter part of the resolutions you will find a table of fees, to which your consideration will be directed. I am informed by Mr. O'Mara, Chief Inspector of Weights and Measures, that the question of fees is one that has a great deal to do with the efficiency of the inspectors and the carrying out of the Weights and Measures Act. It does not affect us here in St. John's as it does in the outports. In St. John's, as in the outports the law at present, is:

Five cents each for weights of and under one pound.

Ten cents each for weights over one pound.

Ten cents each for a beam and scale.

Ten cents each for a measure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if one considers what an inspector of weights and measures has to do for ten cents, one will readily see—and the people, especially in St. John's, have recognized the fact, that the fees are inadequate to compensate an inspector for his services. You can picture any inspector having to go over to the South Side to inspect the scale of Messrs. Morey & Co., or having to go to Messrs. Harvey & Co. for similar purpose, and taking with him all the paraphernalia that he requires to inspect these large platform scales, and spending a whole afternoon—perhaps the best part of a day—in adjusting them and fixing up these scales properly; and after his work is over receiving the munificent sum of ten cents each scale. However, that state of affairs does not exist; these firms and other firms have paid the inspector compensation somewhat on the lines laid down in the scale of fees attached to these resolutions. Mr. O'Mara who performs the duties of Chief Inspector, has done so with a great deal of tact and ability and he informs me that this consideration on the part of the firms was the practice before he assumed office, that he had not to inaugurate it or to induce these people to pay anything extra, they gave it as a matter of course, are doing so today, and therefore the fees laid down in this scale will not make one jot of difference in his income for the coming year or other years; as a matter of fact, he anticipates a shortage in his income in future, because of prohibition—it is a well known fact that in the wines and

spirits trade a great number of measures are in use, and from the inspection of these he received a considerable income; in the future that will be cut off, and therefore he will have to depend on other means of bringing up the shortage in his income, but he does not anticipate that the fees now charged will compensate him for what he loses because of prohibition. As regards outport inspectors: it has been represented to me through the Chief Inspector ,that the inspection of weights and measures in the outports has not been satisfactory, and the main reason assigned is that those who have that duty to perform can make so little, receive such small compensation, that they have become very indifferent as to how they perform their work. In the past, the only fees they collected were those laid down in the Act. The new scale gives them an opportunity not to collect from the small man, but to collect from the big man a little additional to help them carry on their work and give them proper remuneration for their services. This is a matter that the hon. members for outport districts will be able to throw some light upon; but my impression is that this will allow the outport inspector to receive only fair remuneration for services rendered.

There are many other features in relation to the resolutions that we can well leave until we take them up separately; and I am sure that when we shall have gone through the Resolutions we shall have a Weights and Measures Bill that will be of great usefulness to and serve to protect the whole interests of the Colony.

With the consent of the Committee, I will just refer to the Resolutions and suggest proposed alterations: In the first resolution the only alteration is the insertion of the words "except as otherwise herein provided." That is to provide for short ton of 2000 lbs. There is no change in the second resolution; no change in the third; a slight change in number 4; no change in number 5; number 6 repeals sections 6 and 19 of the 1912 Act, and refers to the repairing of weights, scales and measures, and provides for their destruction if not approved of by the Inspector. Number 7 is the same as before; section 2 of number 7 is amended and provides for a second penalty. Sections 8, 9 and 10 are the same as 13, 14 and 15 of the 1912 Act. No. 11 is the same as 16 of the 1912 Act. Sub-section 2 of 11 is new. That was put in on recommendation of Mr. O'Mara; 12 to 17 are the same as before with some slight verbal alterations. 18.—In the old Act, verification was obtained from the Customs. Under this Act you get it from the Chief Inspector; 19 to 22 are the same as before; 23 repeals 12, 13 and 14 of the Consolidated Statutes; 24 and 25 are new; 26 and 27 make no change. In section 28 there is a slight printing error. A line is left out between the word "and" in the second line and "twenty-four" in the third line. It should read as follows:—"and" forty pounds if sold by measure there shall be two hundred and "twenty-four."

In 29 there is no change. It is the same as Consolidated Statutes section 18; 30 is the same, except that the last paragraph is added; 31 is the same as 20 of the Consolidated Statutes; 32 to 36 are all new; 37 is the same as Consolidated Statutes 21; 38 is the same as Consolidated Statutes 23; 39 is the same as Consolidated Statutes 24, except that the words "pit props" are inserted. I may say that all these sections are slightly transposed so as to bring the different articles in their proper order in the Act, more regular in their sequence.

Forty is the same as Consolidated Statutes 25; 41 is the same as Consolidated Statutes 26, except that the

words "pit prop" is put in; 42 is new. It relates to pit props and the measuring of lumber; 43 is the same as Consolidated Statutes 27; 44 is the same as Consolidated Statutes 28.

I might say that Mr. O'Mara has pointed out that he made an error in the section dealing with fees. The fee for 56 lb. weight should be 20 cents, and a 28 lb. weight 15 cents.

Thirty-five is the same as Consolidated Statutes 29; 46 is the same as Consolidated Statutes 30. The last two sections simply deal with repeals.

MR. LLOYD—How far has the third resolution been carried out up to the present?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I understand that the Chief Inspector has an Inspector in every district, and that each Inspector has a set of weights which have been verified here.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: The section dealing with the gauge of oil is one about which there has been quite a lot of misunderstanding. I noticed a letter in the Daily News this morning in reference to this matter. I have given some consideration to the measuring of cod-oil, and we have discussed it at several meetings of the Union. We have arrived at the conclusion that there is no way of making any improvement on the system that now exists. It is quite true that a kerosene oil cask holds 3 to 4 gallons more than it is gauged for, and if it were sold by weight there would be more oil. If you compel people to sell the cod oil by weight there would be no end of work over it. There is no one in the country who sells by weight except the large exporters like Bowring's and Job's, but all the small business men sell the oil one to another by gauge, and if they buy by gauge and sell by gauge they do not make any profit on the transaction. If you alter the system it will not make any difference to the fisherman, because business men will simply give less for the oil. A kerosene oil cask contains more oil than it is gauged for, but in buying oil the business men allow for the addition in the value of the oil by the tun. The use of kerosene oil in Newfoundland is very general, and if you do away with the use of those casks there will be thousands of casks utterly useless to the fishermen, and they would have to buy some other barrel in which to put their oil. There is nothing to be gained by interfering with the present system of selling oil. If you are giving more in a cask you must also remember that you are getting more per tun than if the cask only contained the amount of which it is gauged. I make these observations, Sir, in order that a statement may go forth in contradiction to the letter in the News this morning. The letter may be read by a number of people. On the face of it, it looks as if there were something wrong in connection with the measurement of oil, but we have given it every consideration and there is no means of improving it that will benefit the fisherman who sells.

MR. JENNINGS—I would call attention to the fact that there is provision here for a ton weight, but none for a hundredweight.

MR. COAKER—The usual weight of hay goes as 2240 lbs. If you are going to cut that down you will have to do very extensive advertising. In the past there was the short ton of 2000 pounds and the long ton of 2240 lbs. The Canadian ton of course is 2000 pounds, and the hundredweight 100 pounds. It is necessary, however, to fix some standard.

MR. DWYER—I think it is much better to have the hundredweight and the ton in round figures. I would agree with this policy of having a ton 2000 pounds, and hundredweight 100 pounds. It would be as much better than the present system as the dollar

system is better than the sterling system of England.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, Mr. Dwyer, for answering the member for Twillingate. This is one of the changes strongly recommended by the Board of Trade. I feel quite sure the hon. member for Twillingate will appreciate this position.

MR. COAKER—Yes. But how much is the member for St. John's East going to make out of this? I understand he sells this produce.

MR. LLOYD—That change of Mr. Jennings has been made, has it?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, it has.

MR. COAKER—May I suggest to the Minister that some provision be made to establish in the city of St. John's two public scales, one in the East end and another in the West, so that the people purchasing coal may have the satisfaction of knowing what weight they are really getting. At the present time we are trusting the dealers. Personally I believe that in many cases we are getting short weights, and I think that the people should have the satisfaction of knowing whether they are getting their proper treatment. I think that the adoption of a plan somewhat like this would be very beneficial.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I was discussing this very point with the Inspector, and used the very same argument as my friend. His reply was, however, that it was the Municipal Council who ought to do this. It would not be proper for me to advocate the erection of these scales and come to this House and ask for payment. I think it is a matter entirely within the duties of the Municipal Council.

MR. COAKER—That reply is alright, but I would ask the Colonial Secretary when that Municipal Bill comes up to put in a section to provide for this.

MR. COAKER—Has there been no such thing as a standard weight for jowls and beef by the barrel, in the past? How much of this is new and how much is old?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The last section only is new.

MR. COAKER—You would be surprised to find how many barrels of beef and jowls and such like are short weight. I know that personally I imported a lot last year, and on going through it found that some which had been packed by the most reliable packers in the States were from 10 to 20 pounds short weight. This is a serious matter. For when we sell the barrels as received as having a certain weight we are personally blamed when the shortage is discovered. Indeed, at the time this incident occurred, I was very much tempted to go into the Board of Trade and quote the names of these parties who sent the pork. There is no reason why every barrel of pork or beef should not go 210 to 215 lbs. They would certainly get heavier, because the pickle would saturate the meat and in the course of a few months or so the weight would very much increase. Had these barrels I have just described been sold we should have lost our reputation from a business point of view for ever. You should have some official visit the warerooms and he could prevent cases of this kind arising. You cannot expect to have the names of those people who send short weights down here published. The people in the United States would call us trouble-makers and no good would result, and our business connections would be injured. The proper people to move are the Government. I would very much appreciate any effort the Minister might see fit to make in the direction of remedying these conditions.

(Sec. 30: last Resolution, page 7.)

MR. COAKER—I am afraid that I must object to this section because I think that that section gets at the root of the trouble. All you say is that when a case of shortage in weights arises a proportionate deduction shall be made by the vendor in the price agreed upon. But I do not think that this will in any degree suffice to rectify this trouble. The man who sells the article or his agent should be punished when the article is under weight, for unless this is done how are you going to get after the vendor? At least I think this is what the section sets forth. Am I right in assuming that this is what the section means?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—This is the law that has been in force for the past twenty or thirty years. I. the purchaser finds that there is any shortage the vendor must make it up. There is no penalty save when he refuses to make such deduction or have the article weighed. The vendor might sell butter that was in his store ignorant of the fact that the butter was short weight, and I think that it would be a very arbitrary thing to take that man and punish him. I merely cite this as an instance.

MR. COAKER—But what can be done to remedy this? I can see your argument as far as butter is concerned, but would it apply to other cases?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It might be said about meat, I think. It is a difficult matter to penalize the man in this case.

MR. COAKER—But you must protect the man who takes this pork and sells it, ignorant of the fact that it is under weight, to some poor fisherman. However, can we let this matter stand for the present?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Certainly.

(Sec. 32.)

MR. LLOYD—Will you explain what is meant here by "packages?"

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Certainly. It means that the articles referred to must come in the original packages and not in other packages they may have been put in. It must be the package stamped by the manufacturer. It is only inserted, this section, to insure the goods not being tampered with.

(Sec. 33.)

MR. COAKER—This section should be advertised among the fishermen, otherwise you will have considerable trouble. The people must understand what the law is on this subject. They must know that it means one hundred pounds. Otherwise you will have endless trouble.

(Sec. 38.)

MR. COAKER—I do not think that this is correct. Lumber is not sold in two qualities only, merchantable and refuse. There are three kinds of merchantable alone, Nos. 1, 2 and 3. You haven't mentioned this.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, but there are two kinds roughly. It may be No. 1 Merchantable or No. 3 Merchantable.

MR. COAKER—Will you please let that stand over.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—But I think you will find that the number is not marked as a rule. There are two main kinds. The number refers to the quality alone. The number marks the different quality only. I think the hon. member understands what I mean.

MR. COAKER—Under our present system of appointing surveyors of lumber the surveyor may not be competent at all. His name is simply sent in and he is appointed. There ought to be some kind of an examination. You cannot let every one be a surveyor of lumber. The usual thing is to appoint as a surveyor the servant of

some Company running a mill, and when that lumber comes up here before a St John's surveyor he often rejects as much as forty per cent of the lumber that has been passed by the outport surveyor.

HON. COL. SECRETARY.—The appointment is subject to the Department.

MR. COAKER—The department cannot tell if a man is competent without some kind of an examination. I know that you cannot expect every man to come up here and pass an examination before being appointed a surveyor. I think you should allow the surveyor to mark on the board whether the quality was number 1, 2, or 3. Even that does not fill the bill, but it would be better than having only two qualities as at present.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think it would meet the idea of the honourable gentleman if the section read as follows . . . . . and to mark the quantity therein upon each piece and upon such as shall not number 1, 2, or 3 merchantable to mark the letter "R". Will that do.

MR. COAKER—That might do, but I think it would be better to consult some of the lumber surveyors. They may have some suggestions.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—All right.

MR. JENNINGS—May I ask what is the meaning of the word "importer" in this section. I take it means the agent for someone abroad. Am I right?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It would mean anyone importing lumber, whether he represented an exporter or not.

MR. LLOYD—I would suggest that the words "vendor or purchaser" be inserted.

MR. COAKER—Would that cover a pit prop cutter.

MR. LLOYD—Yes. He is a vendor, as he is selling to some one.

MR. COAKER—With regard to the measuring of pit props; I have a statement here that was sent me by one of the men who has been cutting pit props. The statement is from a buyer of pit props, and he puts in here different piles of pit props marked No. 26, 27, 28, 29. 30, 31 and 32. That would be seven piles of pit props. He puts in one lot at 140 ft. to the cord another at 135 feet (all this is dry wood); another at 135, another at 135 feet and another at 140. There are two measures in that. One hundred and thirty five and one hundred and forty. Then you come to the green. There are three different measurements on the face of that statement. It will give you some idea what these purchasers of pit props have been doing. I think the House would be justified in making that cord 128 feet.

MR. LLOYD—May I point out, Mr. Chairman that it might be well to go back to section 39, and make it read as follows:—"The duties of such surveyors of lumber shall be to survey and measure upon request made by the vendor or purchaser."

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That section has not yet been passed.

MR. COAKER—I think it would be unwise to have such a charge as we have here on Scales and Beams over one hundred pounds. Up to one hundred pounds the charge is only fifty cents and over a hundred pounds it is one dollar. If a man had a scales that weighed over a hundred pounds —supposing it was only one hundred and two pounds—he would have to pay one dollar. I think you ought to make it seventy five cents up to five hundred pounds. All the other charges seem to be very fair.

MR. MOULTON—Do those charges for beams and scales cover the weights

that go with them. The custom in the past has been that there is always a separate charge for each weight Now here a counter scales to weigh five pounds would be twenty cents. Does that include the weights or not.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.— The charges for the weights are on the next page.

MR. COAKER—What was the scale before.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.— The scale in use before is set out under section 28 of the Consolidated Statutes as follows:

Five cents each for weights of and under one pound.

Ten cents each for weights over one pound

Ten cents for a beam and scale,and ten cents for a measure.

I am given to understand by the Chief Inspector that there is trouble in the outports over the inspection of weights; that the inspectors do not get enough compensation; in some cases they may get sufficient—as has been stated by the honourable member for Bonavista—but in other places they have to go long distances, have to employ horse and waggon, and when they come to deduct their expenses from their fees they have nothing left for themselves; therefore they are indifferent in the performance of their work and desultory in doing their duty.

The reason for the new scale was to see that these men did their work—to make it worth their while to perform their duties—make them more particular—and allow the Chief Inspector to see that they were doing their work and sending in their reports. As far as St. John's is concerned I do not think it will make any difference in the increase of the Chief Inspector. He makes this amount every year and I do not think it would make any difference to him. If the outport members have any suggestion to make I would be glad to receive them.

MR. COAKER. — Mr. Chairman, spring balances weighing 30 lbs. and under are charged at 50c. You can buy some of the small balances that are being used for 20 or 30c. They don't cost more than 70 or 80 at the outside, and 50c. is an outrageous fee to charge for testing them, that is if no one is allowed to use one of these without having it inspected. You cannot expect people to pay 50c. for the inspection of an article that only costs 25c.; 5c. would be enough to charge for these trivial things.

MR, LeFEUVRE.— Mr. Chairman, I must agree with the hon. member for Twillingate. Fifty cents is fully the value of the article, and if you charge that amount you will find that very few of them will be purchased, and as a consequence they will not be used at all. I should think that 50c. would be a sufficient charge for the highest balance under this heading.

MR. MOULTON.—Mr. Chairman, I consider that this charge will bear more heavily on the small outport trader than it will on the big merchant who is buying fish in St. John's. Take one of those big stores. They have a couple of scales, and some 56 lb. weights for the purpose of weighing large quantities of fish. The outport man with the small business has got to have a scales or beam and 56's to weigh a draft, and he has got to have all kinds of small weights. Then if he sends out a small trader, he has got to have a scales or beam and weights on her; and in that way he is paying more than many men who are doing a large fish business.

MR. COAKER. — I think. these charges for spring balances should

be reduced. Fifty cents is enough to pay as the highest fee; 5c. is sufficient for a balance weighing to 30 lbs. or under; 7 or 8c. for a balance weighing from 50 to 100 lbs., and 10c. over 100. The charge of $1.50 is outrageous.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I might say in reply that the matter of those cheap scales is one that has received a great deal of consideration. It is an unfortunate fact that there are spring balances sold in the community for as low as 25c., and it is one of the things that the Chief Inspector is very much concerned about, because, he says, they are never right. They may be all right when they are purchased, but after a little usage the spring gets stretched and they are seldom or never in proper order; and the question as to whether or not they should be prohibited altogether is one which was discussed. These balances are used particularly by vendors who come in here from the suburbs, selling fish and salmon and meat and all that sort of thing, and the purchasers are very often cheated out of their rights on account of these balances. The people who are using them think they are all right; they have no means of ascertaining whether they are correct or not. I know that in several cases the Inspector has been compelled to seize scales of that sort that came under his observation. There is another feature of the spring balance that has cropped up during the last two or three years, and it is this: It will be noticed that practically all the grocery stores and butcher shops use those scales; they have no other. They have no weights, and consequently this one tax is all that they are called upon to pay; and the Inspector thinks that they ought be called upon to pay a proportionate amount. Now, we don't want to be harsh in the matter of these smaller scales. I quite agree that 50c. would be considered adequate. It is quite a big jump from 50c. to 5c.; but as for the other charges, I don't think they are at all too high, as they mere ly cover those scales which have lately been brought into general use. However, I will let this section stand, and we will have it arranged.

(Measures of Capacity.)

MR. COAKER. — Mr. Chairman, with regard to the charges for half-gallon and gallon measures, a half gallon measure would not cost any more than 15 or 20c. This rate has been in force for some time and there has been a lot of objection to it, and I think the objections have been quite justified. In the first place, this charge has meant an increase in the cost of the measure of 50%, because the makers have to make the measures inspected, and they naturally add the cost of the inspection to the price of the article.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—These measures were all 10c. before, now they are only 5c. We have taken it off the smaller measures and put it on the larger ones.

MR. COAKER.—These fees are still too high. I think what you ought to do would be to encourage every man in the country to have a half-gallon and gallon measure, so that he could protect himself in buying; but by putting on this tax you are preventing him from providing himself with them.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Do you think 10c. a gallon would be fair?

MR. COAKER.—That may be alright. Smaller measures, 5c.

(Weights.)

MR. COAKER.—With regard to that charge for 4 lb. and smaller weights: As you know most business people have the oz. and the ½ oz. Are you going to charge 5c. for those?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That is the law to-day.

MR. COAKER.Yes, but there has been a lot of objection. I think it is very unfair to charge 5c. for a ½oz. weight; it is more than its value. There ought not be any charge for a weight under 1 lb. You might make provision for the 2 lb. and the 1 lb., say 2c. for the 2 lb. and 1c. for the 1 lb. Under that, they should be inspected free.

MR. TARGETT.—Mr. Chairman: I agree with the hon. member for Twillingate. I think that the charge is too high on all these weights. I always thought that the old rate of 10c. was too high. In the outports there are a great many people doing a small business; all these people have scales and weights, and you are asking too much when you are asking them to pay for inspection at these rates. I think, for instance, that a 7 lb. weight should be 5c. instead of 10c. The rate is too high altogether.

MR. WINSOR.—Mr. Chairman: I must agree with the hon. member who has just spoken. I consider these charges too high. There is a vast amount of difference in these rates and the rates that were charged before. Under the old rates, an outport inspector, for an average day's work, would make about $5.00, which might be considered fairly good pay. Under these rates, he could easily make $20 and sometimes $30 a day. In the business which I look after, it used to cost us between $2.50 and $3.00 when the Inspector would pay us a visit; now it is going to cost us $12.00. Well, where is it coming from? It must come from the consumer. We will have to put on an extra charge to pay for this extra expense. So after all it is coming direct from the poor man. I consider the smaller business man will feel the effects of these charges most, for he must have sufficient weights and measures to do his work with as well as the larger business man. Further, it means that some may have one salt tub and one coal tub inspected, whereas they may have three of each. If the Government consider that some inspectors are not getting paid equal to the distance they have to cover or the amount of work to be done, then it's up to the Government to give him a fair salary for that work, and not make such extra charges as are sought to be raised here.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions with some amendments and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "Weights and Measures Act, 1916," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

MR COAKER asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier if Hon. D. Morison has any claim against the Colony on account of fees for the Hague Arbitration, if so, for what amount, and if paid.

RT. HON. the PRIME MINISTER.—Yes; Mr. Morison has a claim against the Government which he made last November. No amount is named but only a general claim for compensation. The claim is for services rendered in connection with the Hague Arbitration. He was paid, I think, $6,000 in 1911. The position taken by the Government is that he pursue the same course as did the Estate of Sir James S. Winter; that is, sue in the Supreme Court. In that case I think the judgment was for $17,000.

MR. LLOYD.—I would call the attention to the fact that the Auditor General says that $14,000 has been

spent which included $13,000 and costs on this account, less certain reductions.

RT. HON. the PRIME MINISTER.—The judgment was, I think, $17,000. There was due the Government on the Cairns Estate a few thousand dollars which came out of the judgment. I will have a complete statement made for the hon. member.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement, showing the amount of able-bodied poor relief given out by Relieving Officers or others at each settlement in the District of Bonavista, from January 1st 1915, to date.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This is being prepared.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House (a) copies of all correspondence asking for changes of telegraph operators in the district of Bonavista 1915, to date; (b) how many applications were received; (c) names of applicants; (d) how many new appointments were made; (e) who recommended the appointments; (f) the names of places where changes were made.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—This is also being prepared.

MR. LLOYD asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance to table a statement of amounts expended under General Contingencies from March 1st, 1915, to March 31st, 1916.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—This is tabled.

MR. CLIFT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary what steps have been taken, if any. to carry out the suggestion of the Auditor General relative to the appointment of Directors on the Boards of Companies, on the capital of which the Government guarantees payment of interest.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—In reply to the hon. member I may say that the Government has not done anything in this matter yet. The matter has been dealt with in the report of the Auditor General and I have had one or two informal conversations with him, and the government will consider the matter at an early date.

MR. COAKER—In connection with this matter I may say that it is in my opinion not necessary for the government to appoint any director in the case of companies who have succeeded in paying 5%. All that is required is to appoint them in cases where the Government has been obliged to help them. Those which are paying ought not be molested.

MR. CLIFT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs for a statement of all loans if any, obtained from the Bank of Montreal, or any other bank, from 30th June, 1915 to date.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—In reply to the member I may say the only loan raised was the one under 6 Geo. 5 Cap. 22; Public Service Loan for $25,000.

MR. CLIFT asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all expenditures made under the Head of Encouragement of Agriculture, from 30th June, 1915, to April 1st, 1916.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I will have that for the next session of this House. It is being prepared today.

MR. LLOYD—I would point out that I have not had any reply to the question I asked in connection with Bank matters.

MR. STONE—I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a question I asked on Friday, March 24th.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS.—I beg to table that information.

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the 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—I would ask that the Agriculture and Mines votes be withheld until the question of Mr. Clift, the hon. member for Twillingate is replied to.

MR. LLOYD—I would like to say that before we take up the Postal Telegraph, it would be well for the House to know what the trouble was at the Post Office. There is the statement promised by the Colonial Secretary in reference to some recent trouble. It is very desirable that we should have this information before the House closes. Then there is the trouble of last year. It is essential that the report should come up before this legislature this session. I raise the point for the consideration of the government.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I would like to say for the information of the House that although it was hoped that this enquiry would have been finished ere this, yet by an act of providence it was delayed. It was indeed very unfortunate that Mr. Knight had to leave the country for medical treatment and was again taken ill soon after his return here. I regret exceedingly the fact that this enquiry is not terminated, and may say that the government is most anxious that all the facts in this connection should be placed fairly before this House, so as to enable this House to express its opinion thereon. I will bring this matter before the government and see what can be done.

MR. COAKER—With regard to this measure I feel pretty safe in saying that the government would not be appreciating the position if they closed this House without this matter coming up. I feel safe in saying from what I know of the enquiry which has gone on before Mr. Knight that some revelations made there were such as would be of the highest interest to the people of this country. The enquiry however has not been along the lines which were necessary. Grave charges were made by Mr. Stone in connection with this Department. He specified certain charges. Up to this moment nothing has been reported in answer thereto. The Commissioner has been occupied with information sent him by the Colonial Secretary's Office, and from the 12th of July to November has been occupied with matter of a frivilous nature in connection with the Post Office Department.

I do not know why it was done probably there were very good reasons, but I know this much that I know sufficient about the goings on of that Department to convince the country that something must be done before we close the session, and I advise the government to have some report made to give us the information we demand. We are taking these things up in the regular way and we are passing these votes year after year and conditions remain as they are. but nothing is done by the government to remedy conditions that prevail. Things have gone from bad to worse and I hope the leader of the Government will take these things into consideration, and lay in due course something before the House that will give public satisfaction.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I rise merely for the purpose of justifying myself and the Department in relation to any misconstruction that might be placed upon our actions in this respect, the statements made by the hon. member, who has just sat

down, that a lot of matter was sent by the Colonial Secretary to the Commissioner which had nothing to do with the charges made by the hon. member for Trinity last year in this House. I would like to enlighten the hon. member on this point. When the Commissioner was appointed, prior to his acceptance of that appointment he came to me and made a stipulation that he would not be requird to go into the administration of the Department. I acquiesced in his desire, but I informed him that any documents or evidence that might be in my department that he could in any way find useful for his enquiry would be at his disposal. Indeed it was only upon these lines that he would undertake anything in the nature of an enquiry, and the documents which I sent down were only those which I had in my department, and which in any way related to the matters in question. I know the hon. member did not intend to create a false impression, and I merely rise for the purpose of protecting myself and my department from any construction of an unfavourable nature that might be placed upon his words.

(Vote for Tuberculosis.)

MR. COAKER—When this matter was before the House before I think I suggested that the twenty-four thousand dollars might be transferred to pay the Old Age Pensions. I find in the report tabled here yesterday that out of the one hundred and seventy-nine patients that have been admitted to the Consumption Camp, only forty-nine belong to the outports, that is to say, that we are paying out twenty-four thousand dollars on these people, one hundred and thirty of whom belong to St. John's. Are we going to establish this thing and let it go on? We know that there are more than forty-nine people in the Outports who require attention. I will not criticize the work which has been done by this Institution, but the selection of patients should be more general if you are going to spend such large amounts. In the Doctor's report he remarked (hon. member quotes report.) This is a very important statement. He says that the most important work is prevention and not the camp upon which we spend this money. Why do we not follow in the work laid down by the Hon. John Harvey and others, and send our doctors and nurses to point out and teach the people of our outports how this thing may be prevented? The Doctor sent out a couple of nurses to the outports, who visited Placentia, Trinity, and other places, and the reading of their account is anything but pleasant. From what Miss Godden says it would be much better to put this money to more general use than wasting it here around St. John's. Her description of conditions that she saw in the North is astounding. She goes into this matter in detail and sets forth in this report where she visits a place near Brigus where eight families had every member of the family dying of consumption. It seems to me that something must be done, we cannot go on spending this money unless we feel it is for the general good of the country. If we must spend this money, would it not be better to follow in the steps of the Hon. John Harvey and others and send lecturers all over the country and have nurses travel around and teach the people how to prevent this disease? I could spend an afternoon in criticism on this matter alone. My only aim is to make the Government realize how matters stand. Perhaps these reports have not yet been read; they only have been tabled a short while. I think it would be much better if this money were devoted to Old Age Pensions than being spent as it is at present. I do not know if the Gov-

ernment intends to continue this policy. In all probability the Premier has not yet seen the report.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— I have the greatest sympathy for what the hon. member has just stated. I have read the report tabled. I have read the report from Dr. Rendell and the two Nurses. I only read them yesterday, and handed them back to the Colonial Secretary to table. I read every word, but I would like the hon. member to remember how the matter stands, to ask him to believe that the Government fully appreciates the seriousness of this question all over the Island. Indeed the Government would be most anxious to do anything that can be done in the way of making more effective the combat against the Great White Plague. We are most anxious to make it as general as possible. I have discussed this matter on many occasions with the Colonial Secretary in connection with Dr. Rendell and his work, to see in what way we could facilitate him. We must assume that Dr. Rendell is doing everything that is possible to advance the work of this campaign. What are the facts? Previous to 1909, with the exception of what was done voluntarily, there was nothing officially done. I do not mean to create a mis-impression by this remark. What I mean is this: that in 1909 this Legislature voted $4,000 to help the Tuberculosis campaign, and the Government appointed a Commission to deal with this question. Previous to this, the Hon. John Harvey and the Association over which he presided, did most valuable work. The Commission appointed by this administration in 1909 had as its President, Mr. Harvey. They asked nothing for their services, but we gave them four thousand dollars a year in addition to any voluntary sums they might receive. After working for four years, the Commission recommended that the Government make a Department of it. It had reached a point where it could no longer be done by voluntary work. In other words, the Commission and Mr. Harvey and others who were engaged in this work, their lives were so full with other business, and this subject was so important that it was felt it should be made a Government Department. That was the recommendation of the Commission. Accordingly we brought in a vote of $20,000, and just at that time, as you will all remember, the Reid Newfoundland Co. offered to build eighteen sanatoriums, and the Government selected Dr. Rendell, who had experience and was energetic and well known in this community,and a man who it was thought would take special interest in the subject, and the Government sent him away so that he might get the last word to be obtained in the British Isles and Canada and the United States. He went over there and was given carte blanche. He was told to go over and get the very last word on treatment in connection with the Great White plague. He went over and spent some months and came back and went to the United States, and did the same there. His whole purpose in going to these centres was to learn the most up to date treatment. Now he came back here, and pending the construction of these sanitaria he has been doing what he can here in St. John's by segregating patients, taking infected patients out of their homes and placing them into camps; and in addition to that, as this Report shows, he has done a lot of work in connection with the outports in the way of education. He began by having two nurses in the outports, and as the Report indicates, he hopes to have nurses in every district That is following out the idea suggested by the hon. member, and what better can you do? If you take it out of his hands to-morrow and appoint another Doctor and an-

other Board or Commission, the only thing you can do is to proceed along the same lines. Why, he cannot get nurses. He is trying to educate and make Tuberculosis Nurses. Now a Tuberculosis Nurse does not require the same amount of training as an ordinary Hospital Nurse, because it is more a question of food and surroundings and education. It is largely a question of food and isolation with some simple precautions as regards expectoration and other matters, and I think that after a while he will be able to show good results. Now these sanitaria have not been built, and I suppose the reason is that there has been a tightness all around which has been felt by every person in trade or business, and I suppose the Reid Newfoundland Company like other people have felt the effects of the war, and I suppose they could not easily make that lavish expenditure that they were prepared to previous to the war. You will remember that a few days before the war broke out, about a week before the declaration of war, the Governor General of Canada laid the corner stone of the sanitarium in St. John's; and in addition to that there were to be sanitaria in each district. In addition to his other work, Dr. Rendell has done a lot of what might be called ambulatory work in connection with patients. Hundreds of people here from the outports go to his surgery and there receive instructions That is a very important class of treatment in connection with this tuberculosis campaign.

MR. COAKER—Is that generally known, that he has a dispensary.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think so. That is one of the principal means of dealing with this tuberculosis. You cannot take everyone out ot their home and put them in a sanitarium; nor do they need it; but they can come to a dispensary; and we hope as we proceed further in this matter, to have a dispensary or several dispensaries in every district. I think when that is done a great deal will have been accomplished. Now if the hon. member will look at the accounts, he will see what was spent last year in connection with tuberculosis. Twenty-four thousand dollars has been voted each year in connection with this matter, and each year there has bene a dropped balance. It is not but that we could spend double that amount if we had it, but the difficulty Dr. Rendell has had has been to get the proper machinery in force and get proper nurses for the work. I hope that that explanation will be satisfactory.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I would like to say a word in this matter. There is a class of people suffering from tuberculosis that has not been spoken about here in the House at all. Now pretty nearly all the people in the outports are interested in this matter. I believe what the Prime Minister has said that Dr. Rendell has been doing his best, and that he has had a shortage of nurses, and has not been able to supply the outports as well as he would like. I know, and members of this House know that a great many of the people in this Island who are suffering from tuberculosis are people who are unable to help themselves. In other words, they are not able to get a Doctor. I know myself that nurses have gone to their houses where they found two or three people suffering from tuberculosis, and the nurses have told them what to do. Now the Prime Minister has told us that food is one of the principal things as regards persons suffering from this disease. What is the good of nurses going over to Bay Roberts and entering one of those places and finding nothing in the home, scarcely a covering over those who are suffering and telling them they should keep the windows

open? The windows are open and there is any amount of fresh air blowing through the house. But that is not going to keep any of them alive, if they do not get some nourishment. Now, I know for a fact that in my district today are many who are suffering from tuberculosis, and they are also suffering from the want of something to give them strength to fight against that disease, and they should get it. They may go, perhaps, to the Poor Commissioner, and he will tell them that he cannot give it to them. He might give them some common food, but what is the good of that to these poor people who are suffering frm this disease. I was astonished to find that we have been dropping balances in connection with this vote. When I have asked myself that some of this money be sent to the Magistrates in my district to buy food for some people suffering from tuberculosis, I could not get it. There are three doctors in Bay Roberts, and each one of the three would be only quite satisfied to take this matter up, but what is the good for a doctor going to see a person if that person cannot get what the doctor prescribes. I think myself it is about time we should wake up, and if there are any dropped balances they should go to that class of people. There are some of them who would come on to St. John's and go into that Camp if they could, but there is no room for them. There are others who will not leave their homes. They have the idea going through them that they have little hope of getting well, and should they die they want to die at home if they can. We should try to spend all of that money. Give it to the doctors, or place it in the hands of the Magistrates, so that if the doctor goes into that home and prescribes nourishment such as milk and eggs and fresh meat it may be sent to that person. There is no good of nurses or of anybody else going around the country without they have the means at their disposal of giving people what they know they really want. I have known these circumstances myself and have helped these people, but I cannot see why any member of this Government or any other Government should dig down in his pockets even to help these poor creatures when year after year there has been a dropped balance These poor people should be helped out. I do not care whether they belong to St. John's or the outports, because a poor man is a poor man in any case. I am of opinion that that money can be spent so that we will get more benefit from it than we are getting to-day; and if you have never done anything else while you live, if you can only make arrangements to spend that $24,000 right. then you will have a monument of good thought erected after you are gone. I can see them suffering in my district to-day,and the poor creatures want not doctors and nurses, but food. All the doctors and nurses cannot help them without somebody pays for the milk and eggs and nourishing food. Now I think that this matter should be given due consideration by every member of the House, whether on this side or the other. While we are waiting for these sanitaria a great many of our people are passing away on account of this disease. While we have this $24,000 at our disposal we should do all we can with it, and let these sanitaria be built when the people see that they are able to give us the money; but do not let us have any more suffering if we can relieve it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— I would like Mr. Chairman, to make a few remarks in relation to this matter and to set right a few statements that have been made by hon. members. I have prepared a statement here from Dr. Rendell's Report in

relation to the number of patients treated in the Camp at St. John's. It says that the total number of patients treated in 1915 was 510. The number of outport patients treated in St. John's was 49, and in the outports 245; in all 294 out of 510, leaving 216 people from St. John's. I make that statement because it might be believed that this work was entirely devoted to St. John's, whereas, as a matter of fact, more than one-half were outport patients who were treated this year.

Now with regard to the remark of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I cannot understand or appreciate the condition of things which he describes, as the nurses and doctors are authorized to provide any nourishment necessary for the patients with whom they come in contact, and if the nurse went to Bay Roberts and did nothing more than tell the people to keep the windows up, I am surprised, because I know the two young ladies who are doing this work, and I am able to say that in every case that I know of the work they did was done thoroughly and efficiently according to the means at their disposal.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES— That's what I said.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— They have the power to provide necessaries such as milk and eggs for the patients they are looking after. Of course, I am not in a position to take issue with the hon. member but it strikes me there is something else to be explained in relation to this matter. I take this upon myself to say, however, that they have a very small staff for the work they have to perform, as there are only two nurses and a doctor and only four probationers. For the past year they spent nearly four months in the outports. They spent three full months and part of another month in the outports. It is true, as the Premier has pointed out, that it is very difficult to get nurses —girls who will undertake the work. The work is not attractive; in fact, it is most uninteresting, and it is of such a character that it is monotonous and with little variation. That is the reason nurses will not take up tuberculosis work, because there is no variety, and the same amount of experience they get in ordinary hospital nursing.

In connection with Dr. Rendell, I think there has been much misunderstanding about the work performed by him. I consider that his work was done in such a manner that even, if up to the present there have not appeared much results from it, this year, however, we have an illustration of the work that has been carried out the past two or three years by the fact that there was only one case of infection located this year in a house that had been visited by these nurses and the doctor. The trouble they have had to contend with in the past was that in houses where infection existed, the inmates being in direct contact with the patients, and often using the same vessels, and that kind of thing, likewise became infected, and to say that in all the houses where infection had been, there was only one new case developed is the highest testimonial that the staff can have as to the efficiency of the work done and the rules laid down for the prevention of this terrible scourge. The Report is worth reading, and will give members an insight as to what has been accomplished within the past year. Dr. Rendell and his staff have been working continuously and getting remarkable results with the means at their disposal, and I would not like to see this work in any way curtailed. Every dollar spent in that campaign has been justified, and I make bold to say that no money spent in the public service has been expended with better effect than the money

spent in this Tuberculosis campaign. It is true that the whole amount has not been expended. They do not spend money because it is available, but they merely use the money as it is required for their work; but if you curtail the amount you may curtail the usefulness of the service in the near future. I hope to see the day that we will have such a campaign against Tuberculosis that the present organization will grow to such an extent as will reach every portion of the Island and every district will receive the required amount of attention—that Carbonear, Brigus, Trinity, Bonavista, Placentia, Burgeo and all the other districts should be receiving the same attention that we are getting here in St. John's, and if at that time the vote that we are now providing for that Tuberculosis campaign should not be sufficient for the work, I have no doubt that this House will have no hesitancy in increasing that grant to carry on the work successfully. I therefore would like to express my protest against the curtailment of this grant, because it is one that I consider of vital necessity.

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 motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 5th, 1916.

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

PETITION.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of King's Cove, in the District of Bonavista. This petition refers to the same matter as those presented a few days ago by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, namely, arrangements required by the merchants and planters to carry on the Labrador fisheries. I ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

REPLIES TABLED.

Minister of Public Works tabled certain statements.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled reply to Mr. Abbott's question, No. 3, Order Paper April 4.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled reply to Mr. Abbott's question, No. 4, Order Paper April 4.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled report of Postmaster General on work performed by Mr. J. W. Mercer; and also Mr. Mercer's report.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled reply to Mr. Halfyard's question, No. 3, Order Paper April 3.

The Minister of Finance and Customs tabled statement of duties asked for by Mr. Clift.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister tabled detailed statement re agriculture asked for by Mr. Coaker.

QUESTIONS.

MR. LLOYD—In reference to statement furnished me by the Hon. Minister of Finance: May I ask whether the war loan appears in the exchequer account?

HON. MIN. FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is to be found in separate statement.

MR. LLOYD—Is it in the Bank of Montreal?

HON. MIN. FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes. We keep that money separate. That money is to be used

for war purposes only. We have no objection to giving you a statement covering it. It is not part of the exchequer account. A portion of the war loan is held over in England and a portion of it is here.

MR. LLOYD—You can let me have that statement to-morrow?

HON. MIN. FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes. I can let you have it now.

Mr. Lloyd gave notice of question.

Mr. Targett gave notice of question.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled, "An Act respecting the Administration of Local Affairs."

SUPPLY.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the 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—Since we met yesterday afternoon, I have had an opportunity of reading Dr. Rendell's report on tuberculosis I think the report shows that excellent work has been done; but unfortunately the work has very largely been confined to the city —in fact more than half the cases treated were city cases; but that condition of affairs may be due largely to the fact that the movement is comparatively a new movement. Dr. Rendell states that the work was really undertaken for the first time last summer; and for the future he will have a chance of carrying on the work more largely in the outports. There is no doubt from the statement of the nurses who are in the outports, so far as they went last Autumn and Summer, that there is an abundance of work; and to my mind the report is conclusive in one direction, namely, the necessity for the extension of the present work; and the results emphasize very strongly the position taken by Sir Robert Bond some years ago and bear testimony to its wisdom. It would be well if it were possible to induce those generous gentlemen who offered to build sanatoria throughout the Island, to divert the money they intend to give towards the cost of a large and substantially-built camp, on the same lines as the ones in use now, and to devote any surplus funds to the actual working of them and not merely to capital account; and as far as the outports are concerned it might be well instead of establishing the usual sanatoria to establish camps on the same lines as those now in use, but of a more permanent nature. I was struck with the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, particularly the references to the report of Nurse Godden, as regards Bay Roberts and Hr. Grace. I remember 14 or 15 years ago having a chat with the incumbent of Bay Roberts, the Rev. Mr. Shears, and he told me of the state of affairs then, and the state of affairs then in regard to consumption was not as alarming as this report depicts. He told me of what experience he had in one or two cases, where he had known of two whole families being wiped completely out from their house owing to the condition of the house. He had advised those who lived there to tear it down and burn it, otherwise he feared that those who lived there would die, and he told me that the warning had been in vain. I take it from this report and from other sources of information that there cannot be any doubt that the true method of combat against this scourge is along the lines pursued at present, particularly in the way of extending these camps and sending nurses around, and by giving instruc-

tions in the schools through the teachers and in the homes through these itinerant nurses. So far as my views are concerned, I would like to emphasize that this report shows the need for the expenditure of large sums of money to combat this great scourge and I hope that when we meet again next year the work in the outports, instead of forming less than half of the work done in this regard, will form the major portion of it, and that the Minister of Finance will not have any balance of this appropriation left. There is ample need for the use of all of it.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: In discussing the question of Tuberculosis the members of the Government side of the House say that they are desirous that this appropriation should be made larger than it is, but that they cannot see a way to find the money to make the increase. A few days ago the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister made a statement that no constructive policy has ever been suggested by members on this side of the House. His actual words as I took them down were, "No one expects any constructive policy from any one on the other side of the House." We have suggested from this side of the House, not only at this session, but at past sessions, many good proposals, some of which were accepted and placed upon the Statute Book. Now we make another suggestion by which the Government could economize and thus make an increased expenditure for such a worthy object as the tuberculosis campaign. The one suggested by the Leader of the Opposition and ably supported by Mr. Coaker was the introduction of some method of purchasing supplies for the various institutions so as to ensure lower prices. I have looked over some of the accounts that have been furnished by the different Departments, and I find that the need is very great and that the patronage system is condemned as one of the worst systems that could be in vogue, if you want economy practised or supplies furnished at lowest prices. The Finance Minister stated that all supplies were put out for public tender, but his statement is not borne out to the fullest extent on examination. A portion of the supplies are put out to tender, but not all of them. There are many instances to prove the contrary. Take the question of potatoes. I do not know, nor have I seen any tender made public asking for supplies of potatoes, and looking over the accounts we find a great variation in prices. In one instance 300 barrels were supplied at $2.00; some at $2.20 and some at $3.00. These were all supplied in the same month of the same year. If potatoes can be supplied for $2.00, why pay $2.20 and $3.00? Must you be kind to your friends at the expense of the people, who must lose $1.00 a barrel to enrich a political supporter. The Government could save on that purchase alone the sum of $150.00. In the purchase of cabbage, here again there is a big variation in prices. I find on one bill a charge of $1.20 per dozen; on another $1.50 per dozen, and on another $1.80 per dozen, covering a period from September to October in the same year. There is not the slightest doubt in the mind of any reasonable person that put out to tender or purchased with due regard to the interests of the country, at least $60.00 could have been saved here. Then take the purchase of turnips. The account which I have here does not give the total amount supplies, and only applies to two or three months, but of the 100 barrels supplied the prices varied from $1.60, $1.80 and $2.00 per barrel. It is well known that turnips could have been purchased at $1.60 a barrel right through. On

that 100 barrels alone the Government lost $30.00. Here is another item that shows the evils of the patronage system. Of course the Government has not been any worse in this respect than any other Government, but all these things show the need of reform, a reform that can be easily brought about if the same initiative were shown as was shown in the year the Government first took office, building branch railways and enriching the Reids. There is 3300 lbs. of fresh fish supplied at 3c., at the same time at another institution there was a quantity supplied at 4c. per pound. On this purchase the Government lost $33.00.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think the hon. member will find that this fish was supplied to the Lunatic Asylum, and that the additional cent was for cartage in to the Asylum.

MR. GRIMES—That may be, but had it been put out to tender there is no doubt that you would have had the whole lot supplied to the Lunatic Asylum for 3c. right through, including cartage. There are a lot of eggs supplied to the Institutions. I made a total of 600 dozen supplied to the Lunatic Asylum and the General Hospital, supplied in October and November, and the price varies from 35c. to 50c. a dozen, and these prices within two months. One lot at 35c., another at 40c., and another at 45c., and 50c., all within two months in the same year. I could understand 50c. being charged for good fresh eggs in the winter, but seeing where some of these came from I have grave doubts as to whether they were fresh at all, and in any case at that time of year they could have been bought at 40c. On that 600 dozen eggs, taking an average of 40c. a dozen, the Government could have saved $60.00. Then there is the purchase of sugar. Quite a lot of sugar is supplied to the various institutions. I see no reason why the Government should go to a Water Street retail firm and pay 7½c. for sugar when it could be bought for 6¾c. from any agent of American sugar refineries. In some case the Government purchases through agents. The Minister of Public Works imported paints from Canada from a manufacturer, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries purchased his oil through the representative of the American Oil Company. If that is done on these articles, why not do it on all the supplies? It could be done with sugar just as well as with oil and paints. On the item of sugar alone, of 18,240 lbs. furnished the Lunatic Asylum, you could have saved $186.00.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—If the hon. member would permit me to say, that sugar at 7½c. was being supplied at a loss. At one time of the year it might be bought for 6½c., and at another for 8½c., but when a man is making a contract he has to strike an average.

MR. GRIMES—What I want to point out is that that might be supplied by an agent of a refinery at 6¾c. It stands to reason that a middle man must have his profit, and that you can save that profit by buying from an agent, and in this instance you could have saved 1½c. a pound making a difference of $186.00. Then the purchase of butter. You go to a middle man and buy butter from him for an institution of 6770 lbs., and you pay 24c. You could go to the butterine factory and make terms with them whereby they would supply you the same at 10 per cent. discount.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—They would not sell it to us.

MR. GRIMES—You could make them come to terms.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—But they would not sell, except to the Trade.

MR. LLOYD—Well, the remedy is

in your hands. This is an institution to which you have given advantages, and if they will not reciprocate to you you can easily bring them to terms by legislation.

MR. GRIMES—If the Government give factories special advantages, they should be ready to reciprocate. Now, then, take the question of groceries. A man goes down and personally applies to the Head of the Department to give him an order on his store for certain supplies, and here is an item in which big overcharges are shown. Lemon and citron peel charged at 28c. per pound when at the same time of year the different stores in the city were advertising the same at 22c. per pound retail. This is a difference of 6c. a pound on this item. This bill which I have in my hand covers $121.00, and had the bill been tendered for, $25.00 could have been saved to the Government. I have said that the Government deals directly with some concerns, and here is an article that could be supplied in that way and on good terms. There is a supply of readymade clothing for the inmates of a certain institution, which they could be supplied from the factories here or from tailors for that is being done with khaki suits made for the soldiers bought direct from the factory. Instead the order goes to a political supporter for 70 pairs of $6.00 each, which if put out to the factory or to tender they could have saved 20 per cent. or $84 in the purchase of this one item alone.

Then there is an item of Men's Underwear for same institution. You have an underwear factory here in the city with whom you can deal directly. Instead you go to a little retail concern in the city to get these suits at a cost to the Government of $6.00 a dozen, whereas they could be supplied by the factory at $5.50, in other words on that lot of 24 dozen suits you would have saved $40.00. On another bill here there is an item of ounce duck, 8 ounce at 18c., and 10 ounce stuff at 22c. The 8 ounce duck could have been bought for 15c. and the 10 ounce stuff for 18c. a difference of 3c. and 4c. on this material. If the Government had bought at wholesale prices they could have saved 3 or 4 cents a yard on that supply, or made a saving of $33.80.

Then there is a supply of Men's Socks, supplied at $5.40 a dozen. The Government could have gone to the Factory here and bought these for $4.50 a dozen, and saved 90c. a dozen on the six dozen bought, or $5.40 altogether.

There is a bill for "Flash," at $1.20 per dozen. "Flash" is used for cleaning hands and other uses are made of it. It could have been bought for $1.00 a dozen, and on this 16 dozen you could have saved $3.20.

In the case of Dry Goods there is nothing in which the Government could be more easily deceived. You have such an item as Safety Pins at $6.00 a gross. The very best article on the market could be bought at $1.00 a gross and in fact the ordinary ones used by people are 50c. and 60c. a gross, and here you are charged $6.00. On another bill I find cuptowelling at 40c. a yard. Now you can buy a splendid article at 20c., the best article on the market, and here the Government pays the exorbitant price of 40c. a yard. Bought right you could have saved $51.00 quite easily. If the Government is really serious about increasing the vote for Tuberculosis they should appoint a man to look after the purchase of supplies. You could get a live experienced man for $2,000.00 a year and he would save the Government $40,000.00 in the purchase of supplies.

Another item which shows more exorbitant charges on the part of

some person is Sewing Cotton, on one bill at $6.00 a gross. That is the correct price, but on another bill it is down at $7.00 and on another at $8.40. On this item the Government could have saved $25.00. What about coal? You go to some coal merchants in the city and order our coal. Why not deal directly with the Coal Company at North Sydney or the United States? You cannot expect that the coal merchant in this city is going to supply coal without making some profit; they will make at least 50c. per ton, and on the 4,000 tons of coal which we buy for our public buildings and Light Houses you could save the Colony $2,000. On coal alone you could make enough to pay your man to look after the purchase of supplies. The total amount of these bills which I have cited is $37,432.00. At a conservative estimate I have calculated that the Government could have saved $3,331.00. The Government must spend at least $300,000. At an average saving of 10% anyway, you make $30,000. You would save more than that. I have pointed out cases in which the Government has been charged twenty, forty and even fifty per cent. higher prices than have been charged over the counter in our retail stores in St. John's. Now here is an opportunity for the Government to accept a suggestion from the opposition side of the House. Here is something of a constructive nature that would have the effect of reducing public expenditure, and if the House would take the trouble to go into this matter and deal with it as it deserves, it would effect a very necessary reform advantageous to the country and with credit to itself. At least $30,000 could then be voted to the Tuberculosis work, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would doubtless find himself in a position to help out those people in his district who are not able to guard against tuberculosis because they cannot afford to follow the instructions given. Everybody will agree that it is no good to give lectures to people unless they can follow out the instructions with regard to good food which is always recommended, and which their scanty means will often not allow. Here is an opportunity for the Government to increase the tuberculosis vote and grant to those people, who are not in a position to help themselves, assistance in getting the right food to fight this dread disease. If this is a constructive Government, as it boasts it is, and if the members are sincere in what they have said in the matter of increasing this grant, here is an opportunity to save money enough to supply the necessary food to those in need and save hundreds of them from dying preventable deaths.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman. I rise for the purpose of supporting the motion of the Hon. leader of the Opposition in reference to the increase of the vote in reference to the Tuberculosis Campaign. At the same time, Sir,I must beg leave to say a few words in reply to my friend Mr. Grimes. Mr. Grimes is a very pleasant speaker, and I think he has been very lenient in his contentions so far. I think it is only necessary to give a little explanation as to why some of these articles appear to be charged at a higher rate than others. Now, Sir, with reference to potatoes. You find that these are bought at different prices, $2, $2.50, $3.00. You can surely see that the price of potatoes varies in accordance with the different seasons. You take August for instance. A man digs potatoes, I dig them myself, and won't sell them for less than $5 per barrel, or $4 according to the quality. That is the price you can get in the city and that is what must be paid. The first price is always the highest price. It is the same everywhere. Fresh fish

is at the highest price charged for fish. Some fresh fish costs as much as 20, 30 or 40 cents. There is no price by the pound. The price complained of here is 4 cents in one place and 3½ in another. These fish were purchased in different places and at different times. The fish for which 4 cents was paid was the fish for the Lunatic Asylum; and cartage of course was included in that price. Tenders are not asked for, but prices always are, and the lowest gets the contract. There are so many small purchases in the course of a year that it is nearly impossible to ask tenders all the time. They then vary in price month by month. Eggs for example. We get eggs from Bay Roberts from June to September at the rate of 25 cents per dozen. That is the regular price, but after that you have to pay more. You have to pay 40 cents or 45 cents. To-day we are paying 50 cents. To-day we are paying $2.50 for potatoes which I think Knowling and the other retail merchants on Water St. are selling at $3.75. We pay less as a rule than the retail price on Water Street, of which fact this is an instance.

Now I think it would be unwise and unfair to institute the policy outlined by my friend the last speaker, and to give all our work out in contracts after tender, because if that course was followed, a very few people would monopolize the whole business. These people would do all the contracting or all the supplying for the Board, with the result that all the money and profits would pass to them to be distributed amongst their friends. The same thing would happen in the seal fishery. You notice it when steel ships are allowed to sail. If they had gone out this year, there would be no doubt but that they would have captured good trips, and probably some of the others got nothing. You in this way give certain monopolists the contracts. You ignore the middle man, and don't give him an opportunity to earn a single dollar. I do not think the hon. gentleman and his party would support any such contention as this long, because the people would soon turn against him. It would in my opinion be very poor policy indeed. You wouldn't save anything by it. You would be continually patronizing the same few, and would do nothing to help out the middle man. Personally I try to help every man who comes to my office looking for work like this. If I cannot help him I send him away with a smile, and tell him so. With reference to the coke and coal supply, I may say that we always ask for the prices, and accept the lowest.

With regard to the few small items enumerated by my friend, Mr. Grimes, I may say they are minor matters. A few cases must arise, but I think, to say what is right of the Board of Works, that it is an honest and capable Board, and very careful in that respect.

Vegetables, it is understood, must vary in price, according to the season of the year.

I have nothing to find fault with in the speech of my friend, Mr. Grimes, and as I have said, I think he was very lenient in his remarks.

Now, Sir, with reference to the remarks of the honourable gentleman with reference to the Tuberculosis Campaign, I think this ought certainly to be an educational one. In the first place you must have trained nurses, properly trained; not a lot of young ladies such as Mr. Jennings told us about yesterday. They should be thoroughly conversant with their work, and should have the necessary authority to provide the food they need to supply to those unfortunates who may be troubled with this dis-

ease. In conversation last evening with a medical man, just after the debate in this House, I was told that everything depended on the food supply. Lots of milk and eggs are necessary, and it would be necessary for the nurses to have a fund voted for supplying these necessities. It would not be an annual vote, for there would be less need for it every year. In this way you would not be making paupers of those you had to help in this respect as you do now, for at the present time every person who receives, be it one or ten dollars, is reckoned as a pauper.

MR. LLOYD—I do not think that there can be anything more generous than the criticism offered by Mr. Grimes upon this grant. The Minister of Public Works has however declined to extend his support to the policy of saving money and he told us so in the frankest terms. He further told us that he believed that the coal purchased by the Government was obtained at the lowest rate possible in the city. I accept that statement for what it is worth and it is worth very little. But I believe that it is absolutely true. I believe that the government cannot get contracts at a lower rate in the city and for the very good reason that there is an understanding here that will prevent anyone from getting coal at a lower rate. The remedy had been suggested by the member for Port de Grave. The Government imports coal largely and the only way that it can get coal at a less price is by dealing directly with colliers in countries from which coal is exported.

MR. LLOYD—Before we proceed this afternoon I would like to ask if the Colonial Secretary can make a statement on the Postal Telegraph Office trouble to which I made reference here yesterday afternoon. There are two matters that have been referred to. In reference to this latter the Colonial Secretary promised to make a statement. This statement has however not yet been made.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I may say that I already have pointed out that this matter has been referred to the Commissioner since his return from abroad. Last night he was interviewed by a member of the Government and gave his opinion that he would not be able to report on that question for some little time. As yet he has nothing like the necessary evidence for a full report. When the suggestion that an interim report should be made the Commissioner stated that he considered that more than useless. and most unfair for the reason that it would cover only one side of the question. I have had no opportunity of proffering any suggestions but I shall be pleased to take a note of any remarks that may be made to facilitate matters. As soon as the Government have taken any further steps with regard to this I shall be most pleased to inform the hon. member.

MR. LLOYD—The Colonial Secretary has made no reference to the other matter to which I made reference; to the recent trouble that occurred in the Postal Telegraph Office.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Perhaps I did not make myself well understood. When that matter occurred, the report which occurred in the "Mail and Advocate" was referred to the Postmaster General from whom I got particulars. I went to Mr. Knight who was sick at the time, gave him the papers and asked him if he would institute an enquiry so that I should be able to lay upon the table of this House the information which they have asked. Next day I found that he was too ill to attend to the matter for some time. Outside of that nothing has been done officially. The official

who assaulted another of the clerks apologised to him and to the department, and his apology was accepted. Mr. Knight was prevented from continuing his work in connection with the matter further by reason of illness. I shall be glad to consider any suggestions that may be made to this House that will in any way clear up this matter.

MR. LLOYD—I consider that the Colonial Secretary has now thrown considerable light upon this matter as certain information is now given for the first time. The Colonial Secretary stated some time ago that he intended to lay the matter immediately before the Government.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I said, if you will pardon me for a moment, that I would lay before the Government the decision of the Commissioner as soon as he had finished his task of collecting the evidence. That is what I intended to convey.

MR. LLOYD—We ought however to have some assurance that we will not have to wait until next year to get that whole report. It is unfortunate that the report cannot be brought before the House this season. I do not blame the government or the Colonial Secretary in anyway, all I ask is, a distinct promise that as soon as the report it ready, and reasonable time has been allowed for its consideration it shall be available for publication.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I certainly think this is a public matter, and there is no possible objection to having it published if the government is satisfied. As soon as it is received from Mr. Knight's hands and has been considered by the government it will be published. I think that is satisfactory. It is most regrettable that we cannot have this matter discussed before the House, because very strong steps will have to be taken. It is difficult to find out exactly where the sore point is. One day one party is blamed and the next day another. I think Mr. Knight will perform his work in a most thorough manner; a more competent man could not be selected. It is most unfortunate that he was taken ill again on his return. He is not in a position now to make any report, as all the evidence he has collected is from one side, and when he is in a position to do so he will get this report placed before us. As far as the publication of anything in the nature of an interim report I certainly would recommend it.

MR. LLOYD—I shall be satisfied if the Government will say without any conditions through the Premier or Colonial Secretary that it will make a statement that the government will place in our hands this report as soon as possible. I realize that a reasonable time should be taken by the government to consider the action to be taken. The matter is sufficiently grave, and the statements of the Colonial Secretary made to-day in this House show clearly enough that the Postal Telegraph system is thoroughly disorganized and drastic steps will have to be taken by the Government. I agree with Mr. Knight that it would not be fair to make any interim report of the present evidence. I have seen some of the evidence, not through Mr. Knight, I may say, and I can assure you that it would be highly improper to publish it, as some of it consists of charges on hearsay.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—As soon as the government receive this report it will be placed in the hands of the leader of the Opposition to make whatever use thereof he may think proper.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. I presume the Hon. Colonial Secretary has made a distinct promise on behalf of the government that as soon as a reasonable time for consideration

has elapsed, this report will be published, (Postal Telegraph enquiry). I do not know why the Government has not been more active unless it simply means to continue what has been going on in that department. You admit a man was assaulted and various other circumstances of a shocking nature, and are you going to permit that sort of thing to go on? He apologized to the man he had assaulted. The apology was accepted. You have proof of this man being intoxicated. The offender admits his guilt and yet in the face of all these facts, you did nothing to establish any sort of a discipline in that department, but rather by your acceptance of his admission of guilt and apology you have acquiesced with his guilt. These things have been going on year after year for the past ten years. Information has been lodged in the Colonial Secretary's Department here and you have all the proof you require and yet you do not take any action to establish discipline. You should consider the public. Can the people of the country place any faith in an institution whose Chief Clerk was intoxicated. Private messages have been copied, private business messages have been sent over the wire, no charge having been made. All these facts are known, and what can the public think. However, I am content to abide by the arrangements you have made, and I hope you will get the report down as soon as possible. The government ought to do what they can to make that Department first-class, and you are not going to do this until you get to the bottom of the entire trouble.

I am very thankful to the Honourable the Premier for the kindness in taking up the petitions that I have presented in relation to shipbuilding and owners. I understand that a Bill will be brought in here soon to deal with these matters. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries evinced deep interest when I first mentioned the matter in this Assembly, and the Premier responded with great promptitude to the appeal made from this side of the House, and we are going to have a satisfactory Bill passed. This bill will be a resurrection in this country of this industry, and will have an immense and far-reaching effect upon the fishermen and other people of this colony. I would also like to make reference to the statement of the Marine and Fisheries Department with regard to the petition presented here with regard to the Tug. I hope the government has not lost sight of this matter. We want a tug in the Port of St. John's that will be available when called upon to search the ocean for vessels that have been cast away by storms etc. It is very important that we should have a very satisfactory reply.

But it would show the bona fides of the government in this matter if we had a vote that might be spent for the building of such a boat as soon as the markets become normal again. I don't think the order ought to be placed now, because conditions at the present time are such that it would cost fifty per cent. more to build a boat now than it would under ordinary circumstances; but if, in the meantime we had an assurance that something would be done we would be satisfied.

I may say that so far as the fishery votes are concerned this year, we have no very great objections to make. I went through the report of the Department, and there is not very much to grumble about. The lobster policy is still being carried on, and will be, I suppose, in spite of anything that we may say, but that is the only thing I disagree with. Some splendid re-

commendations have been made with regard to the inspection of herring. I would suggest that the reports of the Inspectors might be published, so that people might know exactly what their opinions are. I would like to see, as I know I will, if the suggestions of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are carried out, something done in connection with that inspection.

The one thing that I would like to see done in connection with the lobster fishery would be the closing down of the fishery in the north for two or three years. There were only a small number of cases—perhaps 150 packages—put up last year in all the Northern districts; but in the meantime there is a certain amount of uneasiness amongst the people; some are prepared and some are not; but if it were decided to close down the whole thing, all those who are interested in the fishery would be satisfied and would get some other employment. There would be no harm done, because the number packed, so far as the northern districts are concerned, doesn't amount to anything. I think if there were a close season for a few years, there would be a great improvement in this fishery. Now, if we could get an assurance in connection with the matters that I have dealt with, in relation to the improvement in the Fisheries Board and the tug matter,we would have no further objection to the Estimates. As regards barrels, I visited some factories the past winter and strongly approve of the barrels I saw. I may mention that several factories will be built solely for this purpose in a few years, and I am sure that it is a plan which every large herring exporter will have to adopt. The barrels must be made of the best wood. Anyone going into this business will simply have to have these factories to make those barrerls. For it is only those who are equipped with these facilities and can secure cheap barrels can maintain a market in the face of so much competition. These people can make a barrel at sixty cents in their own factory that cannot be bought for less than ninety cents if made by hand, and that is a considerable difference. The F.P.U. took up the matter in relation to the common barrel and made certain recommendations.

After four or five hours consideration with the best packers from the north at our convention, we arrived at this conclusion, and I think the Fishery Board will take a serious step if they depart from these suggestions. The barrels we get here in St. John's that come from the North are often unsuitable to contain pickle; that, of course, is a very serious matter, because if a barrel of herring is put in the sun for two days it will be found that the herring is ruined. Thousands of barrels go out of the country in this condition, and consequently, their market value is very small, and the people tell us that their experiences with our herring prompt them to say that they do not want any more. The name of Newfoundland Herring is repugnant to dealers in America. They do not want our herring if Scotch pack, from across, are to be had. Of course, I am talking about the herring that the merchants buy in the Spring and often sell in the fall. Inferior herring should not be allowed to go out of the country. There is no inspection of barrels, and there is no way to guarantee the quality of the fish.There is one fact we may be sure about if the herring are good, we will always get a market and to make the herring sufficiently good quality to send away you must have barrels and contents inspected. We must not mind the complaints; that will be heard, as

some will grumble. The barrel that Mr. Jennings described was in every respect a good one. As regards turbot I might mention that the F.P.U. also sent a recommendation to the Board of Fisheries.

These are the conditions we must create if we desire to bring this pack up to a first-class condition. All the turbot available will be sold fresh in a year or two. The Member for Placentia referred to placing agents abroad. I do not know whether he knows that in 1909 the F.P.U. approached the Government asking them to appoint agents upon the identical lines he suggested here in this House this afternoon. It is not a position to be occupied by any commission merchant or needy friend of the Government. He must be a man specially trained and qualified for that position, for the American people are as shrewd as will be found. Mr. Devereaux says it is a question of courage. I say it is a question of knowing how. It is not done by having discussions here in this House. You must get eight or ten men who know the business, give them power to do what they consider right. As the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said you will have to form your Board on the lines of the Scottish Board, if you desire to accomplish anything. I have every faith in the future of this industry, for there is a chance of large markets, but we will have to deal with this matter in a competent and capable manner. The right men must be placed in charge, for everything depends upon his expert knowledge of the business. There will be no need to go to South America then for our herring markets. We will find markets in Canada and the United States. The unsuccessful politician is not the man for this job. You want a business man. I myself suggested a year or two ago, two or three men that would be satisfactory. The first thing, however, that you need is a system of cold storage. Success depends upon being able to place in cold storage fish we have here waiting to be sent abroad. We cannot bring fish from the North and let them rot on our wharves all summer, as we have been doing in the past. We depend upon the Government for support in this matter, and won't be satisfied until the matter is properly dealt with. If we were here in St. John's with cold storage depots of our own, we would limit the amount going to the markets from week to week or from month to month, and we need never stog the market. And no money that you spend could be employed in any better way, so far as the interests of the Colony are concerned. You may build railways, construct public works, or do anything else you like, but no money that you can spend will give better returns than that spent in connection with the improvement of the fishing industries. This country has had three hundred years experience in the business, and if we have any brains at all we ought to be able to make a success of it now. We must take the question entirely out of politics. We must make it a national question, get our brainy men interested in it; and if we do that we will very shortly find that the value of this industry to Newfoundland will be three times what it is to-day.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman: I might say that I have outlined a policy in connection with the inspection of herring and other pickled fish, and forwarded it to the Government for consideration; and the Prime Minister has already assured me that the matter would be attended to at the next Executive meeting. I might say in reference to the tug that I feel the time has come when we should have something of this sort, and I have expressed this opinion to the Govern-

ment. It is pretty hard to buy a vessel of the kind we need now, because tonnage has gone up double what it would be in normal times. However, I am looking forward to seeing the shipbuilding policy which is now before the Government carried out, and I think that the first order that should be given to the first company formed in this connection should be to build this tug. Of course, if this policy is not put into operation, we shall have to go outside and get it done. Now, I don't think there is a member on either side of the House but will give this matter his strongest support. We see the necessity of it every year. This is not the first year that we have been called upon to assist vessels in distress. Every year, since the beginning of the fisheries in this country, it has been the same old story, and no effort has been made by any Government to have a boat at their own disposal. It is quite true that we have got the Fiona, but the Fiona cannot do everything. She is only fitted for the work which she is performing. This boat that I propose would be one that would be fitted for any service that the Government wished to put her in. At the present time we very often have to get subsidized boats to do certain work, and we have to pay them money which, if we had that boat, could go to the credit of her expense account. I believe myself that the Government will give this matter their very best consideration, and try and lay aside a certain amount of money for the purpose of the construction of this boat. Personally, I would like to see the boat bought now. That may not be possible, but I want to say that while I am on this side of the House, or in the House, I shall not lose sight of the necessity of having a boat controlled by the Government; and I feel certain that after two or three years she would pay for herself. When next the Executive meets, I think all those matters that we have talked about will be dealt with, and we will be able to say definitely as to what the intentions are regarding shipbuilding and regarding the inspection of Scotch herring packed in Newfoundland. This inspection is necessary. If we want to protect this industry we must protect the people against themselves.

With respect to barrels, I consider what we want in this country is a barrel-making factory. At the present time the coopers of this country are not able to produce the number of barrels that are required. Last year I made enquiries in relation to this matter from Norway, and received some catalogues of barrel-making machinery, and I find that we can put up a factory, at a cost of eight or ten thousand dollars, that would turn out from two hundred to three hundred and forty barrels a day. That is what Scotland has done, and that is the reason why they are able to supply the market. At the present time we are not able to produce enough barrels to meet our own demands, and those that we do produce are not up to the required standard. They are all right to ship around the coast, but they are not able to stand the rough usage which is necessarily associated with shipment abroad. Now, I believe the Government would be prepared to admit the machinery for a factory of that sort free of duty, if only some person had the nerve to to go into the matter. I have not got those catalogues just now, because I sent them to Halifax, to a person who wanted to look them over with the intention of starting a fectory in Nova Scotia, but he telegraphed me a few days ago that he was returning them. When I receive it back I will, of course, be only too glad to let any person

who may be interested have the use of it. I will guarantee my friend on the other side of the House that so far as I am concerned I will do all in my power to carry out the ideas that I have talked about. I might say, regarding the lobster fishery, that we already have 300 applications for licenses this year, most from St. Barbe and Bay St George. I do not know that we have many from the North. As far as the North is concerned, the people there have got other employment that is turning them in more money than lobster packing would, and I have no doubt that very few lobsters will be packed down there again this year. The case is different with the people of St. Barbe, who go into this business rather largely. I have received forty or fifty letters from people down there in relation to the good work done by Mr. Badcock. The people down there take a very great interest in the business, and every lobster fisherman is practically a warden in himself. That applies to St. George's District also.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman: In looking through the Fishery Report today in regard to herring, I notice that reference is made to an old statute which provides that the inspectors should be paid by the firms who employ them. I think that the Government should take up this matter, and appoint inspectors. I believe that they should be independent of both the buyer and the seller. To my mind, if the buyer of the herring has to pay the inspector, it simply means so much off the price that he will pay the seller, and the producer stands to lose. I think the inspectors, if appointed, should be paid from the revenue of the country, and so be independent of all parties.

I listened carefully to the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with regard to the production of barrels and the introduction of a barrel-making factory. Well, I don't think that would be altogether a blessing, that is, if it meant that the making of packages would be altogether confined to that factory. I know a great many poor men, who have no opportunity of earning anything in any other way, especially down North, who spend their winter months making barrels; and they make good barrels, too, as good, I think, as any barrel factory could make. But those barrels could be improved by the introduction of a wide iron hoop on the chime. I think that that is a thing that should become law—that all barrels should have a wide iron hoop on them; it would improve the barrel in every way. The herring industry is an important one, and every measure should be taken to make the article marketable and to see that it is well packed. There are a few people engaged in this business who don't take the trouble that they should, and who do their work badly, and it is those men that we almost always hear of. We hear very little about the people who do their work well, but if a man does it badly, it is advertised all over the place. Now, I don't stand here to defend the man who does his work badly. I think that inspection ought to be introduced, and the men who put up the bad article should not be allowed to sell it. Probably the introduction of inspectors would meet that requirement. But something should be done immediately. If you intend that there should be an improvement in the future, you will have to disturb the present.

There is one other little matter—not exactly connected with the vote that we are discussing today—that I would like to say a word about, and that is in connection with the Old Age Pension scheme; and it is a matter which I would suggest the Government take up. I understand that the Old Age Pension office has no par-

ticular means of finding out when a pensioner dies. Now, those pensioners are all very old men, and I think it is very important that some arrangement should be made in this respect.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The Relieving Officer is supposed to make it known.

MR JENNINGS—That may be, but in many cases the Relieving Officer may live twenty or thirty or forty miles from the place where the death occurs. A case came under my notice during the past year. An envelope was brought to me containing an old age pension cheque. The man to whom that letter was addressed had been dead six months; which, to my mind, shows that somebody did not do the square thing. Now, my suggestion is this: The Local Affairs Act, I think, included the possibility of the placing of matters of this kind in the hands of the Road Board. Why not arrange to have this matter looked after by the Chairmen of the different Road Boards? They would not expect to be paid for it. It would merely be a matter of reporting to the Department when a death occurred; and I believe you could go further than that and let the Board recommend a person to fill the vacancy.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the pension is sent by cheque, payable to order, which has to be endorsed by the pensioner. In some cases, where deaths have occurred, we have not been notified for several months, but the cheques came back alright. The cheques are not made payable to bearer, and if anybody who has no right to do so assumes the responsibility of endorsing that cheque, he lays himself open to the possibility of being up against criminal proceedings.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: When I mentioned about the barrel factory, I did not mean to rob any of our people of the work which they are now doing, but I can tell the hon. member that there cannot today be produced in Newfoundland sufficient barrels to supply this country's needs. Some three years ago, the Gorton Pew agent at Bay of Islands came here, and asked me if I would introduce him to the different coopers here. He wanted to give an order for about 3,000 barrels.

I might tell the hon. gentleman that there cannot today be handled barrels enough to supply the country's needs. The coopers here got constant work making barrels for the firms around town; and the consequence was they would not take any contract at all to supply that number of barrels to any person. They had pretty nearly all the work they could do. Down on the West Coast it is just the same in this respect as it is North—they cannot make enough barrels for their own use, and it is impossible for really uniform barrels to be made (such as are used in Scotland or Holland or Norway) when so many people are making these articles. One of the things which we will have to remedy in the American and Canadian markets is the great evil resulting from the inferior pack in evidence in our herring exports put up according to the Scotch method. The old law relative to this matter says that the barrels had to be of certain size, the staves of certain thickness, and the head of certain thickness, and so on; but that law is scarcely ever carried out. The people here make the barrels according to the means at their disposal, and it is pretty hard to enforce the law. One of the hon. members on the other side stated that curtailing or enforcing the laws relative to the present barrel making industry would be a hardship on his constituents. If we are going to do anything with the

herring fishery we ought to forego all that, put aside personal considerations and take it up as a national question. We have to assume that it is going to be fostered by the Government, and that they are going to do everything to encourage it. To-day war is on, and the Scotch fishermen are not able to send herring to the United States, neither are the Dutch, Norwegians, nor Danes able to sell all the herring they get to Germany, though a lot must go in there; but even if they can sell a large quantity of herring in Europe, there are 110,000,000 people in the United States craving for herring; and the herring that is packed and put up in a good package finds a ready market and big prices; but the one that is not packed rightly, of course, gives a black eye to the good ones; and if you had been with me this winter down on the East side of New York looking at our herring, and saw the condition they arrived in, you would have shivered to think they were packed down here, and you would have required a lot of sand to keep up to the fact that you were a Newfoundlander when you heard these Jews criticise. We have had Scotch experts here, and their reports say that we have a better fish today than they are putting up in Scotland, and are getting such prices for, and we have greater quantities, and the expenses of packing the catch are not so great in Newfoundland as in Scotland. It is true our catch has increased during the past two or three years, but there are millions of herring today swimming around our shores, and why should we not embrace the opportunity that presents itself by entering enthusiastically into this enterprise, putting our catch up properly, and exporting it in as attractive a manner as possible, but then we must have a solid package, and both our pack and cure as near the Scotch method as possible; and there is only one way of doing that and that is if every man gets interested and gives his best brains to the project. This is not a political question, it must be looked at in a much broader manner. I may never sit in this House again; but while I am here I am going to use my best endeavours to further the interests of the country. In this case I want our herring to go to the United States and drive all other herring out. Now is the time for us to pull together. We have a glorious country, Newfoundland; and I always have been proud of it. We are a country of fishermen as good as any the world over. The Atlantic ocean that rolls past our shores should be to us a wheat field, from which our annual harvest should come. But we have been kept back by old ways and methods. We should inaugurate new ideas and take our place to-day as the leading fish country in the world. There is one way of doing things and that is doing them properly. As regards this barrel making question: a man may say: "if you introduce that kind of a thing into the country what am I going to do?—I am a cooper." But I say that man will not be injured. We want more barrels and better barrels. Having more barrels will mean that we will be enabled to export more herrings. Better barrels will mean that for the herrings we export we will get better prices. We will have to get a better barrel; but we cannot get them at present. The Gorton Pew Co. and other firms tell me they cannot get barrels. Mr. Flett was in to see me to-day about it. Herring well-packed are good advertisements; the names of the manufacturers are on each package, and good herring in good packages will mean a good advertisement for Newfoundland. This is our opportunity; we should not let it slip away from us. We should give it our very best thought and consideration, and if we do that, in a few years' time our

herring fishery will exceed in value our cod fishery. We have herring and we have people to engage in the industry; good and up-to-date methods must be put into force; the people must be taught to use them; if they do not use them, they must be protected against themselves. There is never anything accomplished without beginning; so let us begin on this now.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything said by the hon. member, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I have been in New York, Boston and other Cities where our herrings are sold, and have seen Newfoundland, Scotch, Norwegian and other herrings offered for sale, and on the opening of the packages the Newfoundland article was usually considered as slop, although it looked just as well in a way as that known as the Scotch cure. The package for our herring is not near as good as that used by the Scotch, and the fish are not packed as well. In a great many cases, the barrels were not well filled which would be obvious as soon as the heads of the barrels would be removed. I know this to be the case as I was present on more than one occasion at the place and time of sale when the Scotch cured herring were offered side by side with our own. A buyer on one occasion said in my hearing, "If this barrel was packed in the same manner as the Scotch herring, I would give four dollars extra for them per barrel." This certainly means that our herrings were superior in quality to the Scotch article. That is the great trouble I have seen in connection with our herring industry in the various markets, and the same thing applies to our salmon and turbot exports. The past year I have seen a great deal of Newfoundland fish of all kinds offered for sale abroad. Our turbot is fast becoming a favorite fish in the Province of Quebec, and several thousand barrels were sent to that province the past year, and consumed by its people. I saw however, a number of barrels condemned by reason of the indifferent method of packing, such as slackness in filling the barrel and in many instances the fish were not properly cleaned. This, of course, would mean a reduction in price. On the other hand the well filled and carefully packed barrel of nice, clean and attractive fish would always command a good and remunerative price, and no drawback was demanded by the buyer. The demand for turbot is increasing every year. The reason why the demand for our turbot in the States is small, is, that up to the present a very small quantity has been introduced in that country. I think that it would be a move in the right direction if steps were taken to introduce our turbot there, and have a few barrels distributed amongst the people especially those of foreign extraction. I have no hesitation in saying that if we can create a demand for our turbot in the United States it would be seen that in a very few years we would not be able to supply the demand. The demand would very soon be just as great for that fish in the American market as now prevails in the Province of Quebec.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman, It is encouraging to find that we have such a discussion as that brought out here this afternoon in relation to what will one day be the co-equal of our staple industry. The Newfoundland herring fishery of the future will, I have no doubt, reach the same proportions as the Scotch industry boasts of to-day. Read the history of that Scotch industry and ponder over the number of years it took before the realization of its value dawned on the people and the benefits of improved methods of handling and ex-

porting became evident. The Scotch fishermen spent many, many years in acquiring the knowledge that the Dutch had profited so much by. But once that knowledge was acquired and its value recognized there was an upheaval of opinion in the old country and a Fishery Board was established there and came into operation in 1834; but since that time and up to the present through the rigorous inspection that was inaugurated, through the minds of these Scotch fishermen, the position has been reached where Scotland is to-day proud of an industry that has assumed such proportions. But they had troubles in Scotland too in bringing about the reform of the herring fishery—we have had similar troubles here; no doubt the divergence in the type of barrel supplied from the local people, (like Newfoundland, with one style of barrel made in Trinity and another made in Green Bay), handicapped the export quite a lot; for a time there was no systematization—hence the value of the fishery did not rise; and the consequence was that the trade in that commodity was irregular. Now, a poor pack in one section of a country affects the pack in another. I believe it is almost impossible to find a number 1 pack in Newfoundland. And why? Because you have no system of inspection. I do not mean you to inspect the herrings as they go into the barrel only, but an inspection that will cover the whole operation of putting up this commodity.

You have got to get a man with a knowledge of hoops and timber,a man who knows whether the wood is green or seasoned, and that everything is regular. There must be a Government Brand. I have gone into this matter fully, and feel safe in saying that if the Government established a brand, and agencies as I have outlined, in five years the herring fishery would be rivalling our cod fishery. We have an industry worth millions of dollars which we have never touched; which we have never tried to export. Our herring has never been put on the market, and I have Mr. Duff's authority for stating that our herring could be made much superior to that caught in the North Sea. It is not only superior in fatty substances but more suitable for transport than the Scotch herring. Surely in view of this it ought not to be impossible to place this on a foreign market as against the Scotch. Instead of a fishery worth $100,000 it ought to be worth three millions of dollars if we could place it in Boston, New York and other towns dealing in herring to-day. What do we see to-day in the "Fishing Gazette" and other papers in America? We find one paper after another saying the Newfoundland turbot is not reliable, but that it can be first class. Now Sir, why is this? Only because we have no proper system of exportation. We have no brand, no system. We have Sir, in this House to-day a man who knows all about the herring fishery and more probably than any man who has ever been here, Mr. Duff perhaps excluded. I refer to Mr. Jennings, the hon. member for Twillingate, but we need more than men trained in the herring fishery . We want men trained in putting them up in packages. We ought to have agencies established in North and South America just as we have agencies established in Gloucester. We have entirely neglected the Southern continent. If we had agencies there,—now I do not mean office clerks, but a man and men who know all about the country, the market, and the fish industry in particular. He ought to know the laws of the country, and the gentlemen of influence in his locality. What you want is six, eight or ten men like that who will look after the

industry. But you must also keep good quality herring. Men cannot advertise unless the quality is the best. I believe with such men appointed as agents and posted throughout the marketable regions of South America we could induce South America to take every herring we would catch for the next fifty years. We must educate the country to send this fish. I was just thinking of one little portion of South America, the Argentine. They could take all our fish and our vessels could get a back freight. They could take skins to New York and sugar from New York to here. All we want to accomplish this is an agent thoroughly in touch with the commercial men, and it would be a surprise to find what would be done.

What have we had to do? A company comes here and we guarantee them 5%. We have but one or two of them. We ought to have more, and if these markets could be opened up we would have more. We might have markets in Argentine and other South American Countries just as we have them to-day in the Mediterranean. It is only a matter of earnestness. It is only a question of courage. We have the intelligence, but we have lacked the courage to initiate and start as a policy what ought to be our principal ideal. I feel earnestly on this question, and I feel now is the opportune time. Now is the time when the markets are open, and while we are not able as yet to produce an article equal to the Number 1 Scotch article, we will be able to before these markets will be in a position to compete against us.

We should not leave this matter in the hands of one or two companies which may want to deal in it. What we want is a general and systematic prosecution of this industry. The people up till now did not take any part in this because they were led to believe it was a very difficult undertaking. This was the idea they got from Mr. C. F. Bennett who was one time Prime Minister of this Colony. They were not told how to do it, and they were consequently afraid to attempt it. It was hidden from them. Now it is up to this Legislature to change this situation. Why? Our herring to-day brings us in only about $4. If it were in Boston, New York or some other of the American fish consuming cities it would, if cured like the Scotch Cure, bring in from twelve to fifteen dollars. If it were in the Argentine it would probably bring in from twenty-two to twenty-seven dollars. It would be a very easy and paying matter to ship it to the South American States. You could ship about one thousand barrels, and the ship could take a return freight of ten thousand hides. These could be brought to New York or to Liverpool or other European ports. Return cargoes to Newfoundland could then be taken. From Spain we might get a load of salt; from England general merchandize and from New York sugar and other produce. If we had intelligent men at some of these leading markets, good all round men such for example as Dr. Lloyd. the learned leader of the Opposition, acting for us, there could not be much doubt about the satisfaction that would result. The agent would be in touch with the whole country and municipality, and would perforce encourage this industry. It would most certainly be worth while, because I have no hesitation in saying that I feel that in a short time this fishery would be worth to us at least three million dollars per year.

Another important feature is the introduction of devices for the better catching of this fish. No one ever seems to take the interest to go abroad and see how they are conducting this fishery. The introduction of seines

alone would have a marvelous effect, and I feel quite sure that in the next two years this fishery would be twenty-five times its present size, if the Government had the courage to grapple with the question. Yet nothing is done. Never a word is said.

Before I take my seat, I may state for the information of some members of the committee that there is at present a Company known here as the Newfoundland-American Packing Co., which is financed by The Thomas Hubbard Company of New York. The President of this great firm is Mr. William Shillaber who is connected with some of the most prominent families of Boston; while Mr. E. F. Searles is also a man of great wealth —in fact both are multi-millionaires. The late General Hubbard, who died last year, was in conjunction with Maurice K. Jessop, President of the New York Chamber of Commerce—financial backers of the Admiral Peary-Bartlett expedition to the North Pole. The firm of Hubbard and Co. are the financiers and organizers of some of the largest railroad and banking institutions in the United States. Mr. Shillaber has had control of the Firm since General Hubbard's death; he is very progressive; well known in Wall Street, and accustomed to success, and will no doubt be also successful in the new venture of the Firm here in Newfoundland. The Company also operates in South America and have their Agents there, men of the very highest standing and experience, boosting their business. This great Firm also operates the International Bank, having branches in London, Washington, San Francisco, Shanghai and Hong Kong. This Company is erecting a large plant at Bay Bulls, and will in time, have similar plants in several places in the Colony. They are large packers of herring; will maintain a large Cold Storage plant, Fertilizer and Drying plants. they have their own herring inspectors in Placentia, Fortune, St. Mary's, Green Bay, and other localities, and I hope in a few years this Company with others firmly established here, will by their example and prosperity enable us to follow in their footsteps in such a manner as to give the Government who has the courage and keenness to inaugurate a policy such as I have endeavoured to describe, a lasting place in the history of Britain's Oldest Colony. Let courage be our slogan with lots of energy, application, intelligence and sympathetic interest. Our people, so easily trained in all departments of trade pertaining to the country, will do all that is needed to carry on this great industry until it reaches that period when we shall be able to say through our Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the Newfoundland herring fishery is equal to any in the world.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman: I wish to thank the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's for the compliment he paid me with regard to my experience in the herring fishery. I think I can claim to have some knowledge of that industry, having been engaged in it more or less for thirty year. To get down to the practical point, this industry resolves itself into two systems, first, what is generally termed the Newfoundland cure, and secondly, the Scotch pack. We hear a great deal about the bad pack, and the bad packages, but there are other matters which are not dealt with at all. I contend that a large percentage of the barrels made on the south side of Notre Dame Bay are as good as any Scotch barrels made from soft wood, with the exception of the iron chime hoop, which we suggested last fall to the Fisheries Board it would be well to introduce, only giving reasonable time for the importation and introduction of the same. We also suggested an in-

spection of the barrels, which we believe would bring the small percentage not properly made up to the required standard. But I assert here today that no matter how well herring may be packed, if they are allowed to lie around wharves in the hot summer sun for five or six months, as a large quantity did the past summer, when they reach the market they will be only fit for manure, and then the poor packer gets the blame.

I hear that several parties in Twillingate are starting this spring to put up herring according to the Scotch method. I am very much afraid that it is not going to be a success. They salt, under that method, two barrels for the same quantity of salt we use on our barrel, Newfoundland cure. They leave the gut and spawn in the fish, and the belly is not ripped. We clean it all out. Now, in my opinion, if these herring lie around for some months before they are shipped to market, we shall have the same old cry repeated over again: Newfoundland herring unfit for human food. There was an attempt made some years ago by a Scotch firm, who located at Twillingate, to pack and market our herring after the Scotch plan; the venture proved a failure. There was a rumour they were paid to fail; for that I cannot vouch, but I know they handled our spring and summer herring, and that might have easily contributed to the failure. I have been told that the herring caught in Notre Dame Bay this fall, although cured according to the Scotch plan, did not fetch near the price the herring coming from Scotland did. What is the reason for this? Our fall herring should be as good as is caught in any part of the world. It looks rather suspicious to me; is there some little secret that we have not yet learned and which the Scotch people intend to keep to themselves, fearing future competition in the American markets? I heard of one cargo of herring taken to Lewisporte late this fall. Packages were not procurable at the time. I believe those herring lay in that vessel's hold for a month and were thus taken out in a frozen condition when salt would have no effect upon them, packed and shipped to an American market. Who gets the blame if this is another black mark against Newfoundland herring?

Again as to our Newfoundland cure. I had the opportunity of speaking to the Halifax agent who first came to inspect a quantity of herring Messrs. D. P. & L. Osmond were shipping to Halifax. I found that he was well satisfied with both the barrel and the cure of the herring, and with all due deference to the hon. member for Burgeo, Mr. Moulton, he told me he could buy herring much cheaper on the West Coast than he could get them at Moreton's Harbour, but they were no good. The barrels, he said, had no wood in them, and sometimes would burst abroad in the vessel's hold. The firm of D. P. & L. Osmond must have shipped nigh on ten thousand barrels to Halifax and other ports this year, and they told me themselves that they did not have a complaint of one bad barrel in the whole shipment. This goes to prove that with a little painstaking and carefulness we can both make the barrel and cure its contents fit for the requirements of the market. However, I believe the introduction of an inspection will meet all the conditions required and hasten the time when our herring shipped from Newfoundland will reach the markets in a first class condition, and that prices will be realized second to no other country in the world.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Chairman: I would like to say that the proper barrels to be used in the packing of herring are made of hard wood and galvanized iron. In this country soft

wood barrels are chiefly used, and one cannot expect to turn out such good packages. Soft wood packages are more easily broken in the handling. Sometimes again, the herring are very poorly packed, and, of course, this means that they very soon are spoiled and quickly deteriorate. The question is whether we are going on in the old way, getting from three dollars to five dollars per barrel, or whether we are going to adopt the more advantageous Scotch cure.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: Do I understand that the whole Estimates are going through now?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—We will be in Supply every day. We will have additional Estimates—Supplemental Supply.

MR. HALFYARD—Because before the Estimates go through, I wish to ask the Colonial Secretary for an answer to a question which I asked concerning the wages that are paid the mail clerks on the "Fogota" and the "Earl of Devon." The salary paid the mail clerk on the "Fogota" is $32.50; the salary paid the mail clerk on the "Earl of Devon" is $37,-50. I don't know whether there is any explanation for this difference.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—It may be that one official is longer in the service than the other.

MR. HALFYARD—I think the man on the "Earl of Devon" is practically new to the service.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Well, one man may have more duties to perform than another. However, I will get the information for the hon. member.

MR. HALFYARD—I may say, this matter was brought to my attention, and that is the reason why I ask the question. Perhaps the matter may be considered, and if there is no reason for the difference, it may be adjusted. The mail clerks are just like any other class of civil servants. They know when a man who is doing exactly the same work is getting more money, and there is dissatisfaction.

The other matter that I want to draw the attention of the Minister to is this: Last year there was an outbreak of typhoid at Change Islands. When the matter was brought to the attention of the Government, they acted with commendable promptness. Dr. Brehm was sent down, and also Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer. The Doctor gave a very gloomy report on the conditions which prevailed there. I have a copy of the report. It is too long to read, but this is an extract: "After careful enquiry I came to the conclusion that the spread of the disease was chiefly due to the infection of the water supply, &c."

Mr. Hall went into the matter very carefully, and made certain recommendations to the Government. He pointed out that to give the people of Change Islands a good water supply, six wells would have to be sunk there; and he went to the trouble of drawing a map of Change Islands and pointing out the location of these wells. Now, I don't think it is necessary for me to detain the House on this matter. The outbreak last year cost the Government $590.18, and if nothing is done to give the people a better water supply, there may the same expense next year or the year after. Mr. Hall stated that the sum of $1,-400 would, in his estimation, be required to dig these wells. The matter was brought to the attention of the Colonial Secretary, and all that could be done last fall was to spend about $112 to fix up the well that was there. He said in his letter to the Secretary of the Department of Public Works: "The larger scheme will have to stand over until next year. It is necessary that provision should be made by the Legislature for the expenditure if the work is to go on."

Therefore, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance and Customs to this matter, so that when he is bringing in Supplemental Supply, he may make provision for this amount.

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 asked leave to sit again.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

EDUCATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill: 'An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to Education."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: It will be remembered that at the last sitting this Bill was passed, with the exception of one or two points that I undertook to see the the Inspectors in relation to. The first one is section 5, sub-section (b.) A slight amendment was proposed there, namely, that the word "men" be stricken out, so that a lady might be eligible. That has been agreed to. It was also proposed to strike out the words "shall be eligible for reappointment." That has been changed to "shall be eligible after one year." That is, you don't penalize the returning member for ever. He can come back. It now reads: "One member of the Board shall retire annually, but shall be eligible after one year for reappointment."

The next is section 70, sub-section (f.) There was a question raised there as to whether under that section a teacher, who was considered to be no longer able to perform his duties efficiently, though he had not quite reached the age of 60, would be entitled to his pension. It is now proposed to make the section read: "Be permitted to retire previous to attaining the age of 60 years, and receive his full pension." These are the only amendments.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, There is a point I would like to bring up. In one of the old Acts there is a provision that where a teacher has paid so many premiums, although he retires from the profession he may keep his premiums up, and on attaining the required age he shall be eligible for his pension. Now, I would suggest that the same condition be put in here. I am not suggesting an alteration. I think you will find this in the old Act. The idea is this: A teacher may have put in his thirty years service before attaining the age of 60 years and may have retired; then, on his attaining the age of 60 years, he is entitled to his pension. To explain: Say a teacher has put in his thirty years service at the age of 53 or 55, and wishes to leave the profession. I want to allow him to continue paying his premiums until he reaches the age of 60, although he is not teaching, and then get his pension. I think that was provided for in the Act of 1913.

MR. CLIFT—In that section you say he is entitled to receive his pension Would it not be better to say: This shall not, however, affect any rights he may have under the section.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That was only inserted to make the matter absolutely clear, because Df. Lloyd raised the point the other day as to whether that was sufficiently clear to make it certain that the pension would be received.

MR. LLOYD—I agree with that, but the point I am now raising is another matter.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I see your point. I will have it looked up and at the next meeting of the House will deal with it.

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 motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

TRAWL FISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act for the protection of Persons engaged in Trawl Fishing," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

INFLAMMABLE OILS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend and Consolidate the Law in relation to Inflammable Oils" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

CARBONEAR REBUILDING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend Cap. 4 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Second Series) entitled "Of the Rebuilding of Carbonear" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

TRADING WITH ENEMY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Trading with the Enemy," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 5 George V. Cap. 4. entitled "An Act respecting a Volunteer Force in this Colony" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Colonial Secretary the Bill entitled "Weights and Measures Act, 1916," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 6, 1916.

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

Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled replies to question asked by Mr. Coaker on April 4th.

PETITIONS.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from New Chelsea in the district of Trinity, signed by Israel Palmer and a number of other residents of that place, asking that the Branch Railway be extended to the end of the district.

I also ask leave to present another petition from Catalina on the subject of mail steamers on the Labrador, relative to fishery matters.

I hope the Government will give these petitions the consideration they deserve, and ask the House to refer them to the Department to which they relate.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Horwood, Fogo District, and also a sim-

ilar petition from Jackson's Cove, asking that large steamers be prohibited from prosecuting the seal fishery; that greater encouragement be given those who engage in shipbuilding; that a dividend on capital invested in shipbuilding yards be guaranteed by the Government; that a tug suitable for rescuing life and property be provided for the port of St. John's. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of these petitions, and trust the Government will give same the consideration their importance demands.

MR. JENNINGS—I beg leave to present a petition from Herring Neck on various public matters, on a line with some others presented in this House recently. I ask that the petition be received and considered with others already presented on the same subjects.

MR. TARGETT—I beg to present a petition from New Perlican on mail service.

MR. CLAPP—I beg leave to present a petition from Baie Verte and Coachman's Cove, asking that Mr. E. Butler, J.P., be appointed a tidewaiter at Baie Verte, in place of Mr. M. J. Hilliard, of Conception Hr., C.B. You have gone outside the district itself when you could have easily got a man capable of filling the position in the district. Mr. Butler has been teaching school for some 36 years, and the people are anxious that he should be given the position. He taught school at South West Pacquet for some time. The fact of his being a Justice of the Peace as well as his having been a school teacher, ought to recommend him for the position. The position should be filled by one living in the district. I don't want to quote instances of how positions are filled by outsiders, because members of the House know perfectly well that this thing is going on all the time, and should be stopped. I would be glad if the Minister of Finance would have this matter brought before the proper authorities and accede to the request of the people of Coachman's Cove and Baie Verte.

Mr. Stone gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the annual report of the Newfoundland Savings Bank for the year ending December 31st, 1915.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law relating to Local Affairs" was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. Speaker announced that the Chairman of the Committee on Supplies had certain votes to propose. It was moved and seconded that these votes be now read a first time,—Public Charities, $47,224.00; Agriculture and Mines, $19,900.00; Marine and Fisheries, $111,080.00; Postal Telegraph Department, $717,120.00. It was moved and seconded that these votes be read a second time and concurred in.

QUESTIONS.

MR. LLOYD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to table a comparative statement of Imports and Exports for the following periods: July 1st, 1913, to March 31st, 1914; July 1st, 1914, to March 31st, 1915; July 1st, 1915, to March 31st, 1916.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND TOMS—Mr. Speaker, an answer is being prepared.

MR. LLOYD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to table a statement showing the Revenue received from (1) Customs; (2) all other sources between July 1st, 1915,

and March 31st, 1916; and also a statement of local expenditure on current account during the same period.

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

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if the S.S. Hawk was employed by the Government in the mail service during the year 1915; if so, state her route and the amounts paid by the Government for the service.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—There was no employment of the Hawk on the mail service last year.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of the returns of all local and main line grants sent to Little Catalina during the years 1914 and 1915.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—I hope to have that answer ready in a few days.

EDUCATION BILL.

Committee of the Whole on bill entitled; "An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to Education.

On motion of Rt. Hon Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on this bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman. When in Committee on this bill yesterday it was suggested by the Hon. leader of the Opposition that we might make an improvement on this bill in relation to the Pension scheme. If you will look at section 8 of the Act you will find that the Teachers' Pension fund is fully provided for. Sub-section F deals with the matter principally, and it reads as follows—"In consideration of the regular payment of the annual premium hereinbefore provided for, each teacher who shall have reached the age of sixty years, and shall have completed thirty years of service as a teacher, shall be entitled to receive, during the remainder of the life of such teacher, a pension equal to two-thirds of the annual average salary, exclusive of perquisites of any kind, which has been received by such teacher during the ten years immediately preceding the date when such teacher shall become so entitled; and no such pension shall be less than that paid under the pension scheme of 1903; provided that if any teacher after thirty years of service, and after attaining the age of fifty-five years, is unable to render further efficient service, he may, upon the approval of the proper Superintendent, be permitted to retire previous to attaining the age of sixty years, and receive his full pension."

Then in sub-section J it is provided that—

"Any teacher who shall have reached the age of sixty years, provided he has served for at least fifteen years shall be considered incapacitated, and shall receive a pension in proportion to his years of service as provided in sub-section (i) above, unless he can produce a certificate from the proper Superintendent of his complete fitness to continue his work as a teacher which certificate must be renewed annually."

Another section which deals with the matter is sub-section L which reads as follows:—

"Any contributor to this fund who shall cease to follow the occupation of a teacher after five full years' service as such, and payment of five annual premiums, shall be permitted to withdraw from the Fund all his contributions with compound interest at three per cent."

A case not dealt with under the

Act has been suggested and that is the case of a teacher who after teaching for 30 years, retires and continues to pay in the regular payment until he reaches the age of 60 years. He should be entitled to receive a full pension. I would move an amendment therefore to that effect. It seems to be a further improvement in the Bill; although there may not be many cases arising under it, still it will make the bill more perfect. As a rule after teaching 30 years they would probably go on for the next 10 years in order to receive the full salary as teachers. Amendment will go in after sub-section F.

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 passed the same with some amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted; and it was ordered that this bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

STATUTES CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the whole on the bill entitled "An Act to amend and consolidate the Public General Statutes of the colony.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman I beg to move that the following section be added.

9. The consolidation so arranged shall not have the force of law until it still have received the sanction of this legislature in the usual way.

The section was adopted.

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 had passed the same with some amendment. On motion its report was received and adopted and ordered that the bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

UNION ELECTRIC CO. BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Lloyd the House resolved itself into Committee of the whole on the bill entitled "An Act to incorporate the Union Electric Light and Power Co."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. LLOYD—The bill now before the committee is in one respect not unlike other bills which have been brought into this house in connection with the establishment of electric light and power companies, asking for certain concessions from the government and also asking for the incorporation of the Company. In some respects it differs from the usual line. It takes a line which I think should commend itself; as it is particularly a Company in which a large number of fishermen are interested. It is not a company which seeks to benefit large capitalists or even capitalists of moderate investments. The idea is to induce fishermen to invest their savings and take up the development of certain water powers on the north side of Trinity Bay. I think this feature ought to commend itself to this House. There is in this country a very large sum of savings invested in the banks. The Finance Minister has from year to year called attention to the large amounts of deposits in Savings Banks, and it would be only fair for us to do all we can to induce the fishermen who have this money to invest it in the industries and the debentures of this country. Indeed it is my opinion that if sufficient confidence could be secured, the saving fishermen would invest in the industries and government debentures of the col-

ony, and we would by this measure get rid of a large part of our financial difficulties; as this bill offers inducement to the fishermen to go into this enterprise I think it deserves the attention and good will of this House. It is proposed under this bill that the company shall be incorporated with a capital of $200,000. Those who have read the bill will note that in the printed copy the sum named is $100,000 I will move to make that amount $200,000.

The object of the Company is to develop certain water powers which arise from the falling waters of Trinity Pond, Rattling Pond, North West Brook flowing into North West Arm, also certain water in Champneys and from Diamond's Pond flowing into Catalina. That power is to be used for the purpose of lighting the towns of Trinity, Catalina, Bonavista and other neighbouring towns, and if it is possible to use it for other purposes. One of the objects for the use of the power is a fishing establishment at Catalina.

This proposition differs also in other respects from others that have been presented. The term asked for is twenty years, a short period,shorter than usual. It contains also a clause that at any time after twelve months notice either the government or any local government body wishing to take them over for local purposes shall be empowered to appropriate it for a consideration settled by agreement or arbitration. Under the bill to incorporate the Northern Electric Light and Power Company, the term was fifty years, but with the right of expropriation by the government or other local companies after a period of thirty years with a twelve months notice. I do not know any other features of the bill out of the ordinary but if there are any I will explain them in passing. As regards this section 14 I must say that there is a slight amendment to be added which reads as follows, "and Trinity Pond, Rattling Pond and its lakes and tributaries and the oulet to the North West Arm of Trinity and the waters also of North West Brook to its outlet on the North West Arm of Trinity" This covers a few small streams that the other phraseology does not comprehend.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that the Committee had considered the bill to them referred and had passed the same with some amendments. On motion this report was received and adopted.

It was ordered that the bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

PASSENGER ACCOMMODATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the bill entitled "An Act to amend Consolidated Statutes (Second Series) Cap. 115, entitled "Of Passenger Accommodation on Steamers and Sailing of Vessels."

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 bill to them referred and had passed the same without amendment. On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

BANK FISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House reolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend the Law Relating to the Bank Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: It is hardly necessary for me to make any remarks about this amendment to the Bank Fisheries Act. When considering the matter, we saw that there could be an amendment made to the Act 6, George V., and also to the Act that was passed some years ago; and we have embodied it all in the Bill now before the Committee. Last year, the Committee will remember, we brought a Bill in here to provide for the safeguarding of lives at the Bank Fishery. Those who drew that Bill forgot that there was an Act already on the Statute Book called the Insurance Act, and they found out when it was too late that this Act interfered with the old Act. The old Act had defined the Banks as being forty miles from the land, and the owners of schooners and outfitters were not long in seeing that a mistake had been made and in taking advantage of it, pointing out that as they were not going forty miles from land it was not necessary for them to have life-belts and buoys on board their vessels, although there is just as much danger to a fisherman or seaman two miles from land, or one mile, as there is at 150 miles. That is the reason why I am here again this year asking for this amendment. This new Act embodies the old one in reference to insurance. Each member has had a copy of this Act laid before him, and I am sure he has gone over it very carefully. It is not necessary, therefore, for me to comment on it, but as we go along if there is any information that is required I will be glad to furnish it.

MR. COAKER—Will that definition of trawler in the first section (hon. member reads the section) interfere with the present law in relation to trawlers? We have a law prohibiting these trawlers from fishing in our waters, have we not?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Not outside the three-mile limit. There is a law in relation to Labrador.

MR. COAKER—But I thought that eome years ago so e legislation was passed in relation to this matter. Of course you know that there is a very strong feeling against these trawlers fishing on our coasts.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—This doesn't interfere with any law. We won't clear trawlers out of this country. Of course, if a French trawler comes in here to be refitted or repaired, we will give them a clearance; but it is not the intention of our Government to allow steam-trawlers to prosecute the fishery inside the three-mile limit.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—If the Minister will permit me, there is no law in reference to this matter. The Government some years ago took the matter up with the British Government, and the Governments of Canada and the United States, with a view to having an international arrangement made; but the French Government would not be a party to any arrangement. Since then, I understand, some Canadian and some United States bankers have fitted out steam trawlers. The only way in which you can deal with the Bank fishery is by international agreement. Of course, you can prevent your own people, but I do not see any point in doing that if there is no restraint on others. The only law that I know of —I am speaking now entirely from memory—in connection with the prohibition of steam in our fisheries, is in relation to the Labrador. There is nothing that we can do to prevent a man from fitting out a steam-trawler, any more than you can hinder Capt.

Lewis, who goes out in a motor trawler.

MR. COAKER—Then this does not clash with any law?

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES—No. One thing is certain, in my opinion, and that is that in the future Newfoundland will be forced into steam-trawling as well as Canada and the United States.

MR. COAKER—Unless you legislate against them.

MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES—The Canadians tried that and could not do it. While St. Pierre is where it is, and under its present Government, there is nothing you can do, because France is never going to be a party to doing away with it. The people of Gloucester protested against it, and sent delegations to Washington, but there was nothing that could be done; they could only be stopped from fishing within the three-mile limit. The consequence is that out of Gloucester to-day there are only about seven salt fishermen. They cannot get crews, and they are selling their salt fishing vessels to Newfoundland and building steam-trawlers. Last year or the year before Mr. John B. Patten went over to England and was going to buy two or three trawlers, to be operated from Grand Bank. While he was there the war broke out and he could not get the trawlers to buy, because they were wanted for mine-sweeping and patrol work in the North Sea, and he had to return without them. When the war is finished, no doubt, this business will be carried on more than ever; Frenchmen will be coming out and trawling from one end of the Grand Bank to the other; and if you want to compete with these people you will want to use the same means that they are using. To-day there are trawlers operating out of Great Britain and going as far as Iceland, and I have no doubt that when the war is over, they will also operate on the Grand Bank. They are fast boats, and will find no difficulty in making the trip.

MR. COAKER—With regard to this trawling business, when the war is over I presume some arrangement will be made by the British Government to secure the Island of St. Pierre from France for Newfoundland, as an appreciation of the part that we have taken in the war. When I was in Canada I discussed this question with some public men there, and I think we might get the Canadian Government to support such a proposal to the British Government. They feel that St. Pierre ought to belong to Newfoundland. If St. Pierre remains as it is, it is going to cause a wonderful amount of annoyance to us in as far as fishery matters are concerned. As the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries have pointed out, it will be impossible to do anything in the way of legislation in view of prohibiting trawlers from engaging in the fisheries off our coast, because the French authorities will not be a party to such prohibition while that nation operates the fishery from St. Pierre.

The whole thing depends on this. Can we secure the Island of St. Pierre from the French Government? We should give them certain rights, but if we can secure that Island we will then find a means of settling this whole question. I mention this in order that it may not be lost sight of by our Government when peace terms are being considered.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: In section I notice the expression 'respectable medical practitioner.' Should we not delete the word "respectable" as unnecessary?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That expression was in the old Act; and talking with the Solicitor of the House, Mr. Conroy, he informed me that as it was in the old Act he did not think he should alter

it without the sanction of the House. If the Committee thinks well, that expression will be changed.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Should not the fund referred to in section 10 be The Customs Trust Fund?

MR. LLOYD—Is there a Customs Trust Fund?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yes.

MR. LLOYD—Does it relate to this matter?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes; the money referred to in section 10 has to be paid into that fund.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—The section will be amended so as to read: "shall be paid into the credit of the Customs Trust Fund for the purposes of the insurance fund."

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the bil to them referred, and had passed the same with some amendments. On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that this bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

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 to amend Chapter 44 of the Consolidated Statutes (Second Series), entitled: 'Of the Rebuilding of Carbonear.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

CARBONEAR REBUILDING BILL.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: The necessity for the alteration in the Act was found when the definition of the line for new buildings to replace those recently destroyed by fire was required. It was then discovered that the line for this particular section of street was not described at all in the Act.

On going into the whole matter of the street line on a plan from a survey made two years ago, it was further found, that, in several parts, the description in the Act did not agree with the existing lines of street. This could only be discovered when a general plan of the street was made which did not exist up to this time.

As a description of the portion of the street omitted from the original Act had to be authorized, and also the correction of the description of those portions of the existing street line which does not agree with the description in the Act, had to be made, it was thought advisable by the Department to describe the line of street in its whole length continuously, so as to avoid confusion in future, inserting a clause in the Act making the plan accompanying the Act evidence as to the lines described therein. This inclusion of the plan as part of the Act is continuing the practice followed in the case of the "St. John's Rebuilding Act, 1892, Section 12."

In the original Act, numbers 2 and 9 describe the street line. The difference in the new section (a) is that the street terminates at the junction of the Road to Burnt Head instead of continuing on to Crocker's Cove, shortening the street by one half-mile, as from Burnt Head down to Crocker's Cove, the street is practically out of the town limits altogether.

Section (d) simply embodies what was provided in Section 2 of the old Act with reference to those portions of street for which the lines were not specifically defined, leaving the line to be defined from time to time as required by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. This will refer in the present Act to that portion between Taylor's Beach round the pond to the property of Herbert Pike.

MR. LLOYD—What is the intention as far as the cost is concerned.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That remains as it is by the present Act. As a result of the recent fire, it was considered desirable that some slight widenings should take place; in other words, these houses and others had been projecting, and an examination of the plan showed that it had been imperfectly drawn. The Department accordingly went over and made a complete survey of the principal streets referred to. This Act provides for the addition of the results of this survey to the former Act, although it is understood that there will be no necessity of expending any money in connection therewith.

MR. LLOYD—I understand it so far. The bill is in one or two small clauses. There was an Act for the rebuilding of Carbonear in the Consolidated Statutes. That Act gave a street line. It is now proposed to alter that street line without rebuilding the houses along the street. I understand there is no expenditure authorized.

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 without amendment. On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

TRADING WITH ENEMY 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 Trading with the Enemy."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: This Bill, entitled "An Act Respecting Trading with the Enemy," is introduced at the request of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, who drew our attention to the Act recently passed by the Imperial Parliament, entitled "Trading with the Enemy (Extension of Powers) Act, 1915," and we now propose to apply the Imperial Acts in this connection to Newfoundland. I am quite sure that no great inconvenience will come to the Trade by our placing this Act on the Statute Book, for the reason that parties against whom we are likely to bring it into operation are all hostile and unfriendly and enemies. All the countries in Europe with which Newfoundland trades, such as Italy, Greece, Spain, Portugal, Russia and France are all friendly or our Allies, and the traders who will constitute the list which will be hereafter adopted will be found to be amongst our enemies. Section 1 of the Act vests in the Governor in Council authority by proclamation to prohibit persons or bodies from trading with any other persons or bodies, whenever it appears expedient so to do. Any person acting in contravention of such proclamation shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, triable and punishable in like manner as the offense of trading with the enemy. Section 2 provides that the list of persons or bodies with whom such trading is prohibited may be varied or added to by further proclamation at any time. Here, of course, power is given to remedy any difficulties that might arise, and to make any alterations deemed necessary. By virtue of these two sections the Governor in Council could publish a list of firms doing business in any neutral country with whom Newfoundland business men would be prohibited to deal, and if they did deal with them, they would be treated as if they had dealt with alien enemies. Sections 3 and 4 of the Act are unusual in character, and under normal conditions would be objectionable in principle; but, to make this Act of

any value they are essential under present circumstances. These sections provide that certain Imperial Acts named in the Sections, and all other Imperial Acts relating to trading with the enemy enacted prior to the passing of this Act, shall be deemed to be in force in this Colony, so far as the same can be applied thereto; and that all subsequent similar enactments of the Imperial Parliament passed before the next session of this Legislature, shall come into force in this Colony on such date as shall be fixed by proclamation by the Governor in Council, so far as such enactments can apply to Newfoundland. At the present time the Imperial Parliament legislates directly for Newfoundland as a portion of the Empire in large Imperial matters, such as the Merchant Shipping Acts, and we have adopted the important Imperial Statutes, such as the Bills of Exchange Act and the Sale of Goods Act, and incorporated them into our own statute law. Imperial Statutes which come under the head of Criminal Law, become law in Newfoundland under Chapter 63 of the Consolidated Statutes, one year from their passing in England. Thus it will be seen that the sections of the measures now introduced are not in conflict with the practice which has been followed in other matters, nor are they in conflict with the practice continuously followed in criminal matters. They are objectionable only in that their effect is to have the Imperial Parliament legislating directly for Newfoundland and empowering the Governor in Council, during the year between now and the next session of the Legislature, to put into force certain Imperial legislation by proclamation. But we must bear in mind that we live in an exceptional and extraordinary and unusual time, and that at any moment the Legislature can repeal the Act, and we are only passing it now in the interests of ourselves and the Empire that is fighting for its very existence. Having regard, however, to the fact that this power of applying Imperial legislation to Newfoundland by proclamation is extended only until the next session of the Newfoundland Legislature, and having regard particularly to the circumstance that this is a large Imperial matter arising out of the War and affecting only trading with the enemy subjects, or those who, though neutral by International Law, are for all practical purposes to be regarded as enemy subjects, I feel that the provisions of these sections are the most suitable and reasonable that can be suggested.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that they had considered the bill to them referred and had passed the same without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

The remaining matters on the Order of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the Houses rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, the seventh day of April, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 7th, 1916.

The House met at three 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 Crabbe's and one from the inhabitants of Sandy Point dealing with the question of motor boats, and asking that regulations be made in regard to them. I would ask that the petition be received and

be referred to the Department to which it relates, and I would ask the Government to give the matter the consideration which it deserves.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Knight's Cove and Stock Cove in the District of Bonavista, asking that telephone communication be established to connect Knight's Cove and Stock Cove with King's Cove.

I understand, Sir, that it would cost a very small amount to connect these two Coves with King's Cove. It would be only a matter of what the wire would cost. It doesn't require any poles, because the telegraph poles leading from King's Cove to Trinity would answer for the two purposes. I think about two and a half miles of wire would fit the whole thing up, and it would be a great benefit for the people residing at these places. I hope the Government will give the matter their early consideration, and that they will be able to grant the prayer of the petition. I now ask that the petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Hillview asking that the sum of $400 be granted for the construction of a bridge. I understand that this bridge connects both parts of the Harbour, and that it is completely worn out. I hope the Government will give every consideration to the matter, and I would ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Freshwater, Bay de Verde District. They are all fishermen operating on the Labrador, and they ask that Triangle be made a port of call for the mail steamer. I beg to support the petition, and ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled: "An Act to amend and consolidate the Law Relating to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's."

Mr. Lloyd gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled: "An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to Patents."

Mr. Stone gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Lloyd gave Notice of Question.

QUESTIONS.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing all amounts allocated from his Department in Trinity District during the years 1911, 1912, 1913, for which no returns have been received; the purpose and amount of each allocation, and the names of persons to whom the allocations were made.

In the absence of the Minister this question was ordered to stand.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the amount of money allocated by his Department to Ernest Hayley, of Villa Verte, in the District of Trinity, during the years 1911, 1912 and 1913.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker: The answer to that is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a copy of the names of all persons who are receiving Old Age Pensions in the District of Trinity, together with the names of the localities to which they belong.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker: That statement is being prepared.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Min-

ister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a copy of the returns of all local and special grants sent to Collier's, Harbour Main District, for the years 1913, 1914, 1915, and to March 31st, 1916; also, a statement showing if any money has been sent on these accounts and no returns received for same.

In the absence of the Minister this question was ordered to stand.

MARRIAGE FACILITY BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill "An Act to Facilitate the Marriage between British subjects residing in Newfoundland and British subjects residing in the United Kingdom" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

EDUCATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to Education" 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.

STATUTES CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act to Revise and Consolidate the General Public Statute Laws of the Colony and for publication of same," 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.

UNION ELECTRIC CO. BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Lloyd, the Bill entitled: "An Act to Incorporate the Union Electric Light and Power 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.

PASSENGER ACCOMMODATION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend Chapter 115 of the Consolidated Statutes (Second Series) entitled: 'Of Passenger Accommodation on Steamers and Sailing Vessels'" 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.

TRAWL FISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act for the Protection of Persons Engaged in Trawl Fishing" 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.

CARBONEAR REBUILDING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled: "An Act to amend Cap. 4 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Second Series), entitled: 'Of the Rebuilding of Carbonear,'" 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.

TRADING WITH ENEMY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting Trading with the Enemy" 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.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend and Continue in force for a further period the Act 5, Geo. V., Session 1, Cap. 4, entitled: 'An Act respecting a Volunteer Force in this Colony.'"

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: I would ask that this order stand deferred until Monday. I propose to suggest an amendment in reference to the Volunteers who are under shipping articles. Some difficulty has arisen in connection with the matter, and there is no distinct Law on the subject. A similar difficulty has arisen in England, and the Army Act has dealt with it.

It was ordered that this order stand deferred until Monday.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill, "Weights and Measures Act, 1916."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Whilst in Committee on this bill, one or two sections were allowed to stand over for some further consideration or alteration. The first matter that was considered was in relation to the point raised by my hon. friend from Twillingate, Mr. Coaker, in reference to the inspection of certain articles which might be imported here and which might be of doubtful weight, and that some provision should be made wherein some competent authority might be available to carry out such inspection. Upon consideration of this matter I desire to lay before the Committee the following suggestions. After Section 30, in which provision is made for marking the net weight on barrels of pork, beef and jowls, add this sub-section. (Hon. gentleman here read the section and sub-section.)

Now, that Mr. Chairman, I submit, will cover the necessity of having some person available to inspect any articles which are enumerated in the preceding sections. In St. John's, of course there will be no additional charge for traveling expenses. The Inspector will be in reach of all; therefore there need be no charge for travelling. But such will not be the case in the outports, where the Inspector may live eight or ten miles from the place where he may be wanted. In this case, provision should be made for the additional cost of travelling long distances to carry out such inspection. It is considered if the Inspector has to go three miles, the fee of $1 together with the 25 cents additional for each package would be sufficient. If the distance is over 3 miles, 25 cents for each additional mile will be charged. This fee for travelling, however, will not be charged if the distance travelled is less in amount than the value in fees for the work which may be required.

In Section 39 which deals with the duties of the surveyor of lumber the point was raised as to the meaning of the term merchantable. It would appear from the old section that there were only two kinds of lumber in the bill. It was a bit incongruous, and to make the point sure it is provided in this amendment for four grades of lumber, grade 1, grade 2, grade 3, and Refuse. We have consequently added to the section words to that effect. (Hon. gentleman here read addition.)

Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, that

will make the meaning of that section very much clearer.

In sub-section 4, re spring balances, this has been altered to the term of Computing and Dial balances. Exception has been taken to the charge of fifty cents for the inspection of small spring balances. These are cheap articles,and a payment of fifty cents was considered excessive. Upon investigation, and after an interview with the Inspector, I am still of the opinion that the use and sale of these instruments should be discouraged in every possible way. It is obvious, I think, that a spring balance manufactured at the figure of twenty-five cents cannot be reliable, and therefore if not reliable they should not be used at all. I understand that those cheap balances were manufactured in Germany, and as there must be a scarcity now in the market, and as it will be most desirable to have them replaced for many reasons by more reliable instruments, the Inspector will in future exercise his authority and confiscate any he may find that shows a deficiency. There is a standard balance sold from fifty cents to $1.00; I think it is the 'Salter.' This balance is made in England, and is a most reliable one. The price certainly is not high for a good scales, and it will be seen by the section that the fee for inspection is 20 cents. In the past, vendors have not been subject to rules and regulations of this sort. They have never been called upon to pay a fee, and these scales were put out only when the Inspector happened to run across them and tested their accuracy. The result of his test was in nearly every case the balances were condemned. In future very much more attention will be paid to this matter. We have no desire to be unduly hard on the vendors, but one vendor with a pair of these cheap, unreliable balances may wrong a large number of people quite unintentionally. It is therefore desirable that these cheap balances be put out of the market entirely. The other portion of the section refers to the Dial balance. for the section refers to "Computing and Dial balances." These are now used almost universally in butcher and grocery shops and take the place of the old scales and weights, and the fees imposed are just and equitable.

One other matter there is which has not been changed, for my attention has just been called to it this afternoon. This is in reference to the length of shingles. (Reads.) Now, I understand that very few shingles of more than 16 inches length are sold on the market, and it has consequently been suggested to me that 16 should be the standard size. I have not had time to look into this matter closely, but this can be considered when we come to that portion of the bill. I would therefore suggest that we now take up the various amendments.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I think from what the hon. mover of this bill has said that he and his Department have gone to a lot of trouble to meet the demands of this side of the House. We thank him for it, and will give him our support in these changes.

(Section on measurement of barrels.)

MR. DEVEREAUX — Supposing there were 75 barrels of herring came in here from an outport. Has the vendor to pay 75 cents for every barrel of the 75 barrels? If they are to be inspected at such a high rate as that it will be very difficult to get the vendors to have such inspection. It is certainly a poor way of encouraging inspection of herring. I would like an explanation of this section.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—This section only refers to articles enumerated in the previous section. In that section it is provided that the

net weight shall be marked on a barrel of beef or jowls and that the weight shall be 200 lbs. This provides the machinery for ascertaining that these barrels contain the net weight. Suppose a man imports one hundred barrels of beef or jowls. He may take a barrel out of that and have the contents weighed, and he can have this done for a dollar. For 25 cents each he can have the same thing done with the rest of the consignment. It only applies to importations.

MR. COAKER—There is no penalty on the person who sends a barrel containing short weight. I wonder if you could not insert something here so that the person getting the short weight barrel should notify the Board of Trade or make it public in some way or other. I think a man would not be likely to send short weight barrels here if he knew that it was going to be made public all over the country.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—This section provides for a certificate from the inspector which will be given to the purchaser. He can use it for his own protection and if he sends it to the exporter it will no doubt be sufficient to show him that he is not likely to deal any further with him.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I do not rise for the purpose of delaying this measure, but before it finally passes I would like to hear some expression of opinion in relation to the measurement of oil. There is an almost universal complaint in relation to the manner in which this is done at the present time, and my object in rising is merely to accentuate the fact that this dissatisfaction exists, and to ask the Committee to consider whether it is not possible to introduce a measure that would relieve this dissatisfaction. In my own district especially there has been bitter complaint in regard to the unsatisfactory way in which the fishermen have been treated in relation to the measurement of oil. This is a commodity which is bought and sold in all parts of the country, and it is part and parcel of our staple industry, and I would like to hear some expression of opinion as to how this matter of measurement might be treated in the future.

MR. COAKER—I think the other day I expressed an opinion with regard to this matter. I stated that we had given the matter a lot of consideration at our Union meetings, but found no way in which the system could be improved so as to be of benefit to the fishermen. There is not the slightest doubt but that a cask of oil contains two or three gallons more than it is gauged for, but if you adopt any other system it would mean a loss of labor and time, and the value of oil will be reduced by an amount per tun equal to the value of the increased measure. That is, allowing oil to be $135 or $140 a tun, that would be a reduction of about $10 a tun. At the present time no one gets the benefit from buying oil by gauge except the largest exporters. This year we have gone into the oil business very largely, but we have not sold a tun of oil by weight, all gauge; but I think that the large shippers, like Jobs, and others who deal largely in oil, sell by weight. There is dissatisfaction, as has been stated by the hon. member, but I do not see, as I have said, any way in which the system can be changed so as to benefit the fishermen; all we can do is to endeavour to force the price per tun up so as to make allowance for the loss, and that is what is being done. The small fisherman who sells loose oil by the gallon does not lose; it is the shop-keeper, the peddler, the middle-man who loses considerably, because he buys by the gallon and sells by the cask, and he loses about three gallons on a cask. If

we do away with the gauge, the only way to get the exact measure will be to weigh the oil, and that would mean a lot of trouble, and in the end it would not be any advantage, because the price of oil would go down $4 or $5 or $6 a tun, because the merchant knows that by buying by the gauge he gets more than he ought to get, and consequently he is prepared to pay a higher price than he would be prepared to pay if he only got his exact measure. Of course, the price of oil is regulated by what the foreign markets are paying. It is quite true that we were paying in St. John's last fall $15 or $20 more a tun for oil than the markets abroad warranted, but that was a pure matter of speculation on the part of the Trading Co. We knew that the price must advance later on, and we wanted the fishermen to get the benefit at the time. But, as I have said, under the present system the merchant pays more than he would pay if the measurement was exact. I don't know how it was in the old days, but now there are no great profits made on oil. There may be $5 a ton, but that is as much as there is, while they might have got as high as $25 or $30 a tun in former years. If the hon. member for Placentia had anything to suggest, we would be glad to consider it. As I have pointed out, it would not really make much difference to the fishermen so far as results are concerned, because it would practically work out the same way. The trouble is to introduce a system that will be satisfactory all round—that would be of advantage to the fishermen, and still would not give too much trouble or be an annoyance to the buyer.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Chairman: I would like to say a few words on this matter. I have had a lot of experience in this business,and I have found that casks of over 40 gallons, that is an ordinary kerosene oil cask, will measure about three gallons over its gauge; so that what I think would be a fair rule would be to say that every cask containing over 40 gallons would be sold at three gallons more than what it would gauge. That would not cause any trouble, and it would be a fair way of dealing with the matter, because the person selling would be getting his rights. With regard to the fishermen, as a rule the small fisherman does not lose anything, because he sells by the gallon; the planter sells his oil generally by the cask; but the small trader is the man who loses. He buys his oil by the gallon, and then sells it to the merchant by the cask, and he loses three gallons on every cask that he sells. I think that what I have suggested would be a fair and easy way of getting out of the trouble: a rule or law to the effect that on every cask of over 40 gallons an allowance of 3 gallons be given.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman: In reply to the hon. member for Twillingate, I am somewhat surprised at the manner in which he dealt with this subject. He emphasized the necessity of dealing with this matter, because he has undoubtedly made it known to the Committee that it is impossible under the present system to have an accurate measure; and that shows pretty clearly, I think, that there ought be a section incorporated into the present bill to deal with the measuring of oil. Now, the hon. member for Burgeo, a man who has been in the trade for almost half a century, has told the Committee that on every forty gallons the fisherman loses three, and knowing that it is easy to compute what he loses on the tun—almost $12.00, and if you multiply 12 by the average number of tons of oil that are sold each year, you can easily find what the fishermen lose because of the irregular manner in which oil is measured. It is

time, surely, that a commodity so large and worth so much money should be standardized as regards measure. A man sells a barrel of oil today containing 43 gallons, and the measure that we use gives him credit for only 40 gallons. That is obviously unfair. And yet the hon. member for Twillingate tells us there is nothing very wrong about that, because ultimately the exporter, the capitalist, will not lose any money. We know that the capitalists are not losing anything, it is the fishermen that are losing in this matter.

We all know that the middleman is the bone and sinew of the state; and it ought not to be permitted that the middleman should lose. A middleman is he who keeps the balance of trade and regulates the trade to a certain extent in this country as well as in other countries. Where the middlemen do not number largely the community is not rich. If the fishermen of this country are allowed to lose $12 per tun on oil because of inadequate measurement, and if they know that they are losing it, it is only reasonable to suppose they are satisfied; but in my opening remarks, I told the House that there is an universal complaint around the country that this oil question is not as it ought to be. This is a matter which has caused dissatisfaction for a great many years past; and complaints have been heard about it for more than a quarter of a century. As the years go on the dissatisfaction grows, and the complaints become more bitter as time goes on; and such is the general disquietude over this condition of affairs, that I tell the House now that this matter shall be and must be taken up without any undue delay—if it cannot be handled this year it must then be dealt with in the very near future because by not coping with it you are hindering trade. If a man buys oil today he does not know what he is buying; when he sells to another man, and that man puts a gauge in the oil, the result shows a vast difference between the quantity purchased and the quantity sold—a difference of ten or twelve gallons per tun. Surely a matter of such great importance as that ought to be regulated. I again express my disappointment and regret that a subject of such weight as this should not have been given more consideration.

MR. COAKER—I have listened to all that the hon. member for Placentia, Mr. Devereaux, has said. He has been loud in his denunciation of the present system, but his utterances have been devoid of anything in the nature of a suggestion to remedy the evil he sees. If he would suggest something the House would be enabled to consider it. It is useless for him to get up and criticise a condition of affairs and not make any recommendation towards its betterment. Let him suggest some definite proposal or remedy.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I have given you a definite statement; I have said that on every barrel of oil sold, the seller loses three gallons.

MR. COAKER—All you have to do is to adopt the suggestion made by Mr. Moulton; it is practicable and sound; but by applying it you reduce the value of the oil immediately.

MR. DEVEREAUX—That is nonsense.

MR. COAKER—We must remember that the gauge used is a standard gauge; but the trouble is that the kerosene oil cask—so largely used for this purpose—is a peculiar make, and when the contents are gauged every man who sells a cask of oil loses two or three gallons. Now adopt the suggestion made by Mr. Moulton and say that for the purposes of sale every cask shall be considered to hold three gallons more than indicated by the gauge, and you get over the dif-

ficulty as to gauge, but reduce the value of the oil per tun. It is well known that all casks do not gauge alike. Some casks on gauging show a difference of three gallons and more not more than one gallon.

MR. MOULTON—Some run as high as four gallons.

MR. COAKER—Every man in the North who sells a cask of oil knows he loses on each cask two or three gallons. I do not agree with the idea of selling by weight; it means increased trouble and labour with no consequent increase in value. Very few of the firms sell by weight. You take firms like Smith and Company. These people buy oil and sell it as they buy it; they do not buy oil by gauge and sell it by weight—and take that much profit from the fishermen. The man who sells oil by weight is the large exporter—like Job Bros. and Co., or Bowring Bros. These people buy oil from the smaller people and sell it by weight. The smaller merchants sell to the large exporters; but it is only in sales by the latter that the method of selling by weight is used. We do not believe in the system at present in force; but the question is how are you going to do anything better? The hon. member for Placentia has been strong in his criticism of this system, but he has said nothing that would indicate a way out of the difficulty. If he has anything to suggest, let us hear it; and if it is reasonable, why we will adopt it.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I suggest that sales be by weight.

MR. COAKER—The trouble with the weight system is that you have increased labour and inconvenience; the oil will have to be taken out of the barrel to get the weight of the cask. The best suggestion I have heard is that put forward by Mr. Moulton, and that is that every person who sells oil in kerosene oil casks be allowed two or three gallons on every cask over and above the gauge. But a difficulty presents itself when we consider even this suggestion. It is well known that all casks do not gauge alike; the question is how are you going to arrive at a standard number of gallons to allow on every cask? I say strike an average, and allow, say, two gallons, but that won't increase the value of the oil to the fishermen; it will mean a cut in price equal to the value of the twelve or fourteen gallons you compel the buyer to pay for.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman: I think the system against which so many complaints have been and are being made, could be remedied without difficulty. Because the problem is not to be solved without difficulty, is no reason why we should despair about it. It has been the history of the world that nothing great has been done without great difficulty of attainment. Can you not have the oil weighed into the casks under the supervision of an official, and when the cask has been filled let the weight of its contents be stamped on the cask and verified by his brand? Then when the oil would come to St. John's the brand would be there to show exactly how much oil was being sold. That suggestion of mine may be crude, or may have been put in a crude way; but I have no doubt that if a Committee of this House discussed this matter—and I say that it is important enough to be so discussed—something would be done that would place this matter in a position satisfactory to all. We have heard this afternoon a man get up and defend obsolete methods. The hon. member for Twillingate has informed us that there are only one or two large buyers of oil in the Colony; that ultimately all the oil in the country reaches one or two firms. But they, surely, have not the possession of all the knowledge in relation

to the oil question, because Mr. Coaker has already told us that he knows all about it. But when he deals with the large exporters—like Job Bros.—does he not place the position clearly before them—does he not say to them "you will have to weigh in 12 gallons more per cask, because under the gauge system three gallons are lost to the fishermen on every barrel?"

Under the present conditions the fisherman is helpless—and because he is so the matter has been dealt with in the way it has been for the past thirty years or so. I do not say there is any dishonesty about it; but the fishermen are to-day seeing that this thing is wrong and not fair to themselves; and I say that in the interests of trade and commerce something should be done. I have no desire to be contentious, nor have I any wish to bring acrimony into this debate; but I have been with fishermen all my life, and as long as I can remember, I have heard them complaining about this matter; and I consider it my duty to make some comments thereon. I consider it my duty as the representative of fishermen, to say to the House that the time has arrived when something ought to be done in relation to this oil question; and surely there could be a Committee of both sides of the House discuss the matter—a measure as important as this? Give the fishermen a chance of being satisfied. I think that if this matter could be taken in earnest and given due and intelligent consideration by such a Committee, and its report brought back to this House in a fortnight the result would show a measure intelligent and agreeable to the people who are more interested than any in this House at the present time.

MR. COAKER—Just one remark in reply. The hon. member, Mr. Devereaux, has spoken about dealing with large exporters; let me say that all the oil that is sold in the trade is sold by gauge. The merchant, that is, the buyer, sends a gauger to the sale, and the seller has a man there to gauge for him too. The oil is sold by gauge and not by weight. Therefore the seller gets only what is gauged out. If forty barrels are gauged into the cask, forty barrels are gauged out. Considering the whole matter, I have again to say that the only suggestion made that in my opinion, deserves to be followed, is the one put forward by Mr. Moulton; and that will result in having prices reduced.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Chairman: As a representative of one of the most important fishing districts in the country. I feel it my duty to express my opinion on this most important subject, for whatever may be said on either side, the fact remains that $50,000 has been lost to the fishermen of this country as the result of the present system. This is a fact, and I can prove it. There were 1,200,000 qtls. of fish caught last year, that is speaking roughly, or to be more exact, there were 1,246,000 quintals. It is generally admitted that one quintal of fish can give one gallon of oil. We have therefore 1,200,000 gallons of oil, or 28,120 casks of oil. The three gallons from each of these casks represent $50,000, and as I said at the beginning, this full amount has been lost to the fishermen of this country by the present system, and I am surprised to find the hon. member from Twillingate get up and defend that system. The fishermen have lost this year $50,000 and this has been going on for years, and yet a change is considered undesirable. I know of what I am talking. For years I purchased oil in the district I now have the honour to represent, and I know enough to know that it is not the middle man who loses. In a great many cases it is the poor man, the producer. Most

of the purchasers buy oil in small quantities, and sell it to Messrs. Bowring, Job or Coaker. This is where the loss occurs, and I think this is a very opportune time to deal with this question. I think it is a pity to let this bill go through without doing something to remedy it. I would favour it if it saved the fishermen $10,000 or even $1,000, but still more when I believe it is $50,000. I am entirely in favour of defining a standard gauge, and think this House should do something at once.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion which has been taking place here this evening. No doubt great feeling exists in this connection. Insinuations have been thrown across this House unworthy of the members who made them. They are absolutely unjustified in making such charges as have been made here this afternoon. The expressions used on this side of the House did not justify such statements. This system has not been defended by any members on this side of the House. The hon. member for Placentia misinterpreted the remarks of the member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker. While speaking on this question, Mr. Coaker said very plainly that this was a matter which the fishermen of the F. P. U. had considered several times at their Conventions, but as yet they had not been successful in arriving at any conclusions. The member has interpreted this as meaning that they were defending the present system.

Something has been said by the hon. member for Burgeo and LaPoile in this connection that appears to offer a solution to this trouble. The trouble appears to be in that there is no standard measurement for oil of this sort. It appears that casks apparently the same size, do not hold the same quantity. The two members from Placentia Bay have spoken enthusiastically in this connection without offering any solution to the problem. Now, Sir, I intend to bring this matter to a head, and move that this matter be referred to a Select Committee, and I challenge the members on the other side of the House to accept it.

MR. DEVEREAUX—The hon. Leader of the Opposition has, of course, shown a little smartness in the position he has taken this evening. He would refer it to a Select Committee, and I am quite agreeable if the House is; and I even go further and say that I feel glad that this discussion was brought on here today. I am just as serious in my remarks as he. It has been stated here this afternoon that the F. P. U. Convention found themselves unable to do anything in relation to this matter in their councils some years ago, but I see no reason why this House should not adopt some measure. Here with the help of the President of the F. P. U., and some members of the Union, as well as others of us who represent fishing districts, we ought to be able to suggest some suitable arrangement to be made in this connection. I am only too glad to show myself sincere in my remarks in this connection, and will support any motion calculated to benefit the fishermen of the country in this respect. I support the member from Twillingate in this, as I believe that he has a sincere desire to help the fishermen of this country with which he has become associated. The whole trouble is that there is no measurement in relation to this commodity, which is one of the principal products of the country. I am quite prepared to second, Sir, the proposition that a Select Committee be appointed to consider whether or not it is advisable to attend to this matter.

MR. LLOYD—Now, Sir, I move that this bill be referred to a Select

Committee to take up this matter. There was really no need of my motion being seconded, but this makes no difference.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman: I am prepared to support the motion. I think it is my duty to tell the House what I know in this connection. I know a little about cod-oil. The statements made by Messrs. Walsh and Devereaux, the members for Placentia, in my mind, are correct in every particular. Mr. Walsh stated here this evening in repiy to the member for Twillingate that the quantity of fish caught last year was one and one-quarter million quintals. Every fisherman is prepared to own that one gallon of oil on an average is obtained from every quintal of fish, which means that we get 1,250,000 gallons of oil last year. Every fisherman knows that oil put in kerosene barrels drops from two to three or four gallons each. Now if the amount contained is forty gallons, and each cask loses from 3 to 4 gallons, large losses result. We have 1,250,000 gallons of oil, which means 31,250 casks of oil. Take from each of these 3 or 4 gallons, (we will take 3 gallons, as this is the average), and we find that we are losing 93,000 gallons. Take the price of oil as 50 cents per gallon, (some get more), and this shows a loss of $46,865 to the fishermen of the country. If it is refined oil that gets lost in this way, the loss is $2 per gallon. This is a matter which I think we should look into, and see what would be the best thing to do. I have been a large purchaser of oil for the past 30 years, and I may say that I have got more satisfaction from fir barrels. They are not made in St. John's, but outside, and are made to carry what they hold and hold what they are made to carry. For these and various other reasons. Mr. Chairman, I beg to support the motion of the Leader of the Opposition. That is all that one can do now. We can all see the unsuitability of the present system. How would it be to have the oil sold by weight?

MR. COAKER—I have no objection except this. If every man sells oil by weight, he will have to have the oil taken out in order to find the weight of the barrel. I do not mean in any way to defend the present system, but I must confess that I do not see a way out of the difficulty. The only thing that can be done is to have the matter referred to a Select Committee and then perhaps something can be done that will ameliorate matters.

It was moved and seconded and resolved that this matter ought to be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and recommended that further consideration be referred to a Select Committee.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. Speaker appointed the following Select Committee: Hon. J. R. Bennett Hon. M. P. Cashin, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Devereaux, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Walsh.

The Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of the Municipal Board, together with the Act to amend and consolidate the Laws in relation to Municipal Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

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 enable the Governor in Council during the Existence of a State of War to take Possession of Articles of Commerce unreasonably withheld" without amendment.

MR. MORINE RESIGNS.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker: I

have decided to resign my seat in this House, as from the close of this session, and I wish to say adieu—"until we meet again"—to you and the members.

Thirty years have passed since my first election. I sat here continuously for twentyyears. This is the second session since my re-election. A flood of recollections make "good-bye" a sad word for me.

Only one member of this House—the Premier—was here when, in the session of 1887, I first sat here. Of the 36 members of the Assembly in 1887, only 13 are now living.

The Colony has undergone a revolution in my time. In 1886 its exports were less than five million dollars in value, its imports six millions—the total trade eleven millions. In 1913-14 the exports were valued at fifteen millions, the imports the same, and the total trade was over 30 millions.

In 1886 only householders voted—a small proportion of the people; to-day, manhood suffrage prevails. Then open voting was the law; to-day the secret ballot prevails. Power has passed from the classes to the masses. Some there are who honestly deplore this, but they blame popular government with faults not fairly chargeable to it. It has at least brought into this House an element really representative of the outports. I refer especially to the Union members beside me—and has thereby helped tc bring the voter into more direct contact with the problems of government. The evolution has but begun, and it is too early to arrive at a verdict.

Only the railway to Harbour Grace was in operation in 1886, the Placentia branch not being commenced until that year. In 1890 the railway to Exploits was commenced, and in 1893 the road to Port aux Basques. In 1898 the system was consolidated, and the operation under Reid commenced.

Who shall say that upon the whole improvements in the condition of the people have not resulted? They are better fed, better clothed, better housed, better educated, and, I believe, better fitted to do their bit as citizens of this vast Empire.

I would not have it thought that in resigning from the Assembly, I am cutting for ever the tie which binds me to the Colony. Wherever my lot may call me, a large measure of my affection will go out to the country in which my adult life has chiefly been lived, in which my children were born, and in which there are so many constant, faithful personal friends and supporters. I shall come back if and when I am needed. The lure of the Island's purple hills and rock-bound shores is in my blood.

My years in the Assembly have been years of service. I hope "good service" will be said by all. While youthful vigor prevailed, I was a hard hitter, and took hard blows, the centre of many a blood-stirring struggle. I am afraid that in the face of provocation, the old Adam in me is not yet entirely subdued. But, my blows have never been given in malice, nor have I harbored resentment when made the object of attack. If in the heat of debate, I have hurt the feelings of any person, I deeply regret it, and hope I shall be forgiven, as I freely forgive those who have assailed me. I can truly say that to all the members of this House I entertain the most friendly feelings.

I thank you, Sir, and the members for patiently hearing me, and I say adieu with the sincere wish for the prosperity of this Colony, and its people.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It would be ungenerous on my part and I do not think I would be doing what I feel is the desire of my friends on this side of the House, if I were not to express the feelings of regret

which we all entertain in hearing from Mr. Morine this afternoon that he is about to sever his connection, not alone with the Legislature, but with Newfoundland, and is on the eve of taking up his permanent residence in Canada. In the valedictory address he has just made, he reminds us that he first came into this House thirty years ago, and that of all the members who were then here I am the only one now remaining. In that he is quite correct. I am the only member in the Legislature, in either branch, that had a seat in '87 when the hon. member first came here as a representative of the District of Bonavista. It is just 31 years ago since I was elected to this House myself, and during that period I have been a member of three Administrations, sitting on this side of the House for nearly a quarter of a century, twenty years of which period Mr. Morine has been on the other side in Opposition, and I have had rare and continual opportunities of estimating the fine service given by him in these years in the public interests.

A member in Opposition has very much better facilities to develop as a debater and critic than when sitting on the Government side. When a man is in the Government he is narrowed and circumscribed by the responsibilities of office. Although to a great deal of the policy advocated during these years by Mr. Morine and the party with which he was identified I do not subscribe, nevertheless I never failed to express my admiration for his industry and attention as well as his brilliant work, never once excelled by any man in my time who sat in this House. Of course, my friend made enemies. We all make enemies when in public life. No man who is worth his salt does but makes enemies. Dullness and mediocrity may go unmolested and unattacked, but people never tire of finding spots on those whose superiority brings out in bold relief their own shortcomings. No man can make history without making enemies, and our friend in the thirty years he has been in the public life of the Colony, if he has made some bitter enemies,has also left an indellible mark in Newfoundland's history. If he had been a mere time-server, if he had chosen the path of least resistance he would probably have been more popular and would have made fewer political enemies; but he is of the class of those who are fearless and brave and say what they think, with the result that they tread on the corns of many and in that way make up opposition. It is regrettable to notice the departure, day after day, of the chiefs of the old Liberal Party. Two years ago Sir Robert Bond made his bow and the curtain was rung down for him, not for good I hope. We have hardly ceased our regrets at the recent departure of our friend, Mr. Kent, when now we are called upon to mourn the departure of Mr. Morine, whom I hope I am not misdescribing when I class him with the Liberal chiefs, he having been a member of that party since he last came into the House. Still it is pleasant for me to note, historically, if not politically, that the junior members of that party are buckling on their armour, ready at a moment's call to take the place of their departed chiefs, jumping into the trenches of political warfare in a patriotic effort, and vieing with each other in a valiant and praiseworthy effort to save the country. All farewells are sad,and the valedictory of our friend has, I am sure, awakened no emotions other than those of mutual regret. Misunderstandings and wordy war are inseparable from heated, earnest political life, and we would be less than human if sometimes we did not overstep the confines of Parliamentary usage and etiquette. We

often say in the heat of debate, sometimes under provocation, that for which we are afterwards bitterly sorry. I know I always feel so myself. On such occasions as this we wish we had never uttered the offending word, and in this spirit, personally, as well as for my colleagues on this side of the House, I bid adieu to our friend, and express the hope that in his new sphere of labour he will find all the happiness that can be desired. He will be missed in the halls of the Legislature as well as at the Bar, where for many years he held a high and honourable place; but the regret which he must entertain for his severance from his adopted country will be assuaged somewhat by the feeling that he takes with him the kindliest wishes not alone for himself and his wife, but for the young Newfoundlanders whom I have no doubt he is proud to call the other members of his family.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: I regard it as a duty that the position I occupy imposes on me to join in the sentiments expressed by the Leader of the House. As far as any bitterness of the past may be concerned, it would be a good thing for all of us to let "the dead past bury its dead." Mr. Morine has been a notable and dominant personality in this branch of the Legislature. I remember that when I first came to the country some 25 years ago, and first entered these portals and to sit outside the Bar, the first person who attracted my attention occupied the seat I am occupying to-day, and that person is my friend who sits behind me, and who has given us his valedictory to-day. I hope that I may derive a measure of benefit from what I saw then, for I admired him from the first. He was fearless in debate, and was extremely industrious, and his personality shone out on every occasion. I watched his career for years —for from the first day I came to the country I took an interest in public questions and public men. When the time came, he took office in the Government, and he did things which I strongly disapproved, and I never hesitated to express my disapproval; but these things it would not be becoming for me to deal with to-day. There were some features that I strongly admired in Mr. Morine. When he became the head of a Department, he was the Head of the Department. That personality which had shown itself in this House was felt through the length and breadth of that Department, and Mr. Morine was the Director of the Department. In connection with that work the country owes to Mr. Morine one of the most important and effective Acts that have ever passed the Legislature. I refer now to the Audit Act. There was nothing to my mind that ever passed the Legislature that is a greater safeguard in the common interests of the people than the Audit Act, and the appointment of the Auditor General to control the expenditures of Governments. If for nothing else, Mr. Morine will be regarded for his strong personality as the Leader of Opposition, and when he was in the Government ranks, for the benefit he conferred on the country, by having the pluck to face the odium of fighting the patronage system by introducing the Audit Act in this House, putting it through of the Legislature, and making it Law. I join, Sir, in the sentiments of the Leader of the House in extending my best wishes to Mr Morine for his future prosperity in the new home he is to make to the West of us. I know that he will take out from this country the full sympathy and best wishes of the Legislature in his future work in Canada. We of his profession wish him the best of luck and the best of fortune, and when in due time he is called to the highest realm of the Law

we will then again be able to express our felicitations.

HON. MR. EMERSON—I would like, to add one or two words as an expression of regret at the departure from the country and particularly from the Legislature of the hon. member for Bonavista, Mr. Morine. During the course of his valedictory remarks, he stated that the Premier was the only member now present who had occupied a seat in the House in 1887 when he, Mr. Morine, was first honoured by being elected as a representative. I can claim it almost as a special right to say something on this occasion, for I was appointed to an official position here the year after Mr. Morine first made his appearance in this House. Since that time I have had many opportunities of watching his career as a politician, and though not always successful in making the country see eye to eye with him, he was at all times an object of admiration for his skill in debate, and for the energy and hard work which he had displayed on all occasions. I do not think that I am far wrong when I state that Mr. Morine has never had a superior in the House as a debater, and it is not too much to say, that during his thirty years of political life, the opponent who had crossed swords with him, had found that Mr. Morine was a foeman worthy of his steel. The district of Bonavista never failed him in its appreciation of his admirable qualities as a representative. I do not wish to indulge in any fulsome praise at present, but I would probably speak in more flattering terms if Mr. Morine was not present. I feel confident that he takes with him the best wishes of the community and of the Legislature, for a happy and prosperous career, both for himself and his family in his western home where he has decided to take up his new abode.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker. I wish to express the regret of the members on the back benches on this side of the House to the fact that Mr. Morine has seen fit to make arrangements to leave our country and take up his residence in his native land Canada. For several years he has been connected with us as our Solicitor and during that time we have worked very harmoniously together. I do not know any man in the Colony that has more sympathy with the ideas that I possess than Mr. Morine. There is no man in public life that I have ever discussed public matters with that is as much in sympathy with the aims and objects of the Fishermen's Union as outlined in the Bonavista platform as my hon. friend Mr. Morine. On several occasions he has discussed matters of public concern with me and the only thing I regret is that circumstances have not permitted him to come into this House with us and go on the other side of the House in order to carry those objects and aims into effect. He is purely democratic.

I remember some years ago occupying a seat outside the Bar of the House and listening to its debates. The great opponents of that day were Sir Robert Bond and Mr. Morine. and I remember remaining in this house until 4 o'clock in the morning to hear the end of the discussion. I did not agree with the politics of Mr. Morine in those days, as I was then a strong Liberal, but I admired Mr. Morine very much for his pluck in fighting hour after hour in defence of the principles which he advocated. Again when the Reid deal was before the House, I had the pleasure of occupying a seat outside the Bar and listening to that four hour speech of his, and the brilliancy of that magnificent address is another thing which has left a lasting impression on my memory. He is going now, and I suppose we

shall never have the pleasure of seeing him take a seat in this House again; but he is going with our fullest approval. He has not acted without consulting me in connection with the arrangements which he proposed to make and he is leaving the country with the goodwill of the Fishermen's Union and of those with whom he has been associated on this side of the House I know that his constituents of Bonavista Bay will regret very much the severence of the tie of so many years, and that their good wishes will accompany him in his new home in Canada.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this occasion. I suppose there is no man in this House who has been more closely associated with Mr. Morine in the past than I have been. I sat on the other side of the House beside him for many years, and during that time I became a great admirer of the man. Of late years we have become separated for some reason—adverse winds or some other cause—and he is still on the Opposition side while I am over here. However, he was a great fighter, in fact, when I was on the other side I had nothing to do but to sit down and listen, he was able to do all the opposition. There is really nothing for me to add to what has been said by the previous speakers. I only wish to say that I regret very much to see him leaving the country, and as an old friend and admirer, I wish him every good luck and success in his new home.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word. I am a young politician, but Mr. Morine is no stranger to me. I have known him for quite a number of years, and I have always admired the stand which he took in politics. I am just thinking, however, of all the nice things that will be said of Mr. Morine, now that he is leaving the country. When a man dies, no matter how bad he has been, there is always somebody who will say something nice about him. Now, this country can ill afford to lose good men, and I am sorry that Mr. Morine is leaving; but I hope that if in days to come we should assemble again in a House to the West, Mr. Morine will be there to receive us.

MR. MORINE—Mr. Speaker, just one word before we close. It is to thank the members for the generous and altogether unexpected way in which they have referred to me. I am afraid that it does savor somewhat of a funeral oration, as the hon. member for Harbor Grace has remarked, but at least I have a gratification which is not given to many dead men, namely, that of listening to what is being said about me. As a matter of fact, during the days of this session I have felt somewhat like a ghost wandering around the halls of his past activities, because having made up my mind to go I could take very little interest in what was going on. If the opportunity is mine, at any future time, of doing anything for the Colony or for any of the members who have spoken so kindly of me to-day, I shall be glad to avail of it. Some of these gentlemen I brought into political life; I think I may say that of my friend, Mr. Moulton; the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, too, is a political protege, if an opponent, of my own. I thank the hon gentlemen who have spoken so kindly, because it gives me the assurance that no matter what has happened in the past I take away with me the goodwill of the House.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 10th.

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

NOTICES OF MOTION.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and the providing of a bounty in relation to the same.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the Establishment of a Newfoundland Herring Inspection Board.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the Extension of the Privileges of the Railway Marine Docks Act of 1913 to other companies formed for a similar purpose.

PETITIONS.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Current Island, Forrester's Point and St. Barbe, District St Barbe asking for Postal telegraph facilities at Current Island. There is no telegraph office between Flower's Cove and Brig Bay. To reach either of these offices a land journey either around St. Barbe Bay to Flower's Cove, or around Manuel's Bay to Brig Bay is necessary, a walk of ten miles. However the importance of this section of the coast together with the increase in demand for communication makes it apparent to all fair minded men that the time is certainly ripe when an office be placed at Current Island. It is very inconvenient for that part of the coast to be without a telegraph and post office, as it may mean a great loss to the fishermen during the fishing season. The petition has my full support.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from Twillingate, Herring Neck, Morton's Harbour and Fogo in the absence of Mr. Halfyard, on a public question which concerns, I might say, the entire North East Coast from St. John's to Cape Bauld. For the further information of this Hon. House I beg leave to read the petition, which very properly sets forth the conditions and requirements of the petitioners. (Hon. member reads petition.)

There can be only one opinion among seafaring men and those acquainted with the dangers encountered on that part of the coast with regard to the need set forth in those petitions. Cabot Island and the Penguins are situated on one of the most dangerous parts of the North East coast, and a fog alarm at these stations is more needed if possible than the light, as in foggy or thick weather the light cannot be seen, and in a time when the mariner is very anxious to know his position. I notice by the Public Accounts that quite a large sum has been expended on the West Coast this past year in repairing lighthouses, etc., and there is no doubt that those repairs were needed, but I think that it should be the turn of the North East coast this year, and trust that the Government will be able to allocate a sum for this purpose and grant the prayer of the petitioners. I ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. CLIFT—I beg to support the prayer of the petition just presented by Mr. Jennings, and sincerely hope the matter will receive the consideration of the Government. I remember presenting a petition here a few years ago upon the subject. At the time the matter was strongly endorsed by the

Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and we were led to suppose that something would be done in the way of granting the prayer of the petition. I trust that the matter will receive early attention, and that the Government will see fit to comply with the request of the petitions.

MR. HALFYARD— I also have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition. The coast upon which the petitioners live is a very dangerous one, and the matters they refer to demand the earnest consideration of the Government. I hope that they will see their way clear to grant the prayer of the petition.

MR. STONE—I beg leave to present a petition on the subject of a road, largely and influentially signed by the inhabitants of New Melbourne. I also wish to present another petition from Clarenville, also largely signed, relating to a wharf. The petitioners are asking for the sum of $240, which if granted will be a benefit not only to the people living at Clarenville, but it will be of great service to those living in nearby settlements. I ask leave to refer this petition to the department to which it relates.

MR. TARGETT—I beg leave to present a petition from Hant's Harbour asking for an extension of the railway all along the shore. There have been a great many petitions sent in regarding this matter, but nothing has yet been done. I also beg leave to present another petition from George's Brook asking for the sum of two hundred dollars to repair or rebuild a bridge at that place. The bridge is about sixty feet long and is in a state of disrepair. The people of George's Brook are very much inconvenienced by the fact that this bridge is in such a condition. In fact it may have to be rebuilt. I hope the Government will give the matter their closest attention, and beg leave to refer it to the department to which it relates.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

PATENTS BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Mr. Lloyd, the Bill entitled: "An Act to Amend Consolidated Statutes, Chapter 109, relating to Patents," was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. Abbott gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Targett gave notice of question.

Mr. Jennings gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

MR. STONE asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister if there is a bonus of any kind paid by the Government for putting up Scotch Cure Herring; if so, what amount was paid in 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914-15, and to whom paid.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— Yes, there is a bonus. I beg leave to table papers relating thereto.

MR. LLOYD asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to table a copy of the Report of the Committee of six Citizens of St. John's who had charge of the distribution of coal from January 12th until the arrival of the S. S. Alconda; also, to ask him to table all correspondence relating to the sale prices, etc., of coal after the arrival of the S. S. Alconda, Florizel and Portia.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— I beg to table desired information.

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. MIN. FINANCE & CUSTOMS

The total amount asked for under Supplemental Supply 1915-1916 is $124,-415.94, made up as follows: Under head II., Civil Government, the sum of $21,283.94, viz:

Colonial Secretary's Office $10,133.94.

Completing Census, Printing, Compiling & Binding ...	$5,420.94
Consolidation of Laws	4,400.00
Sealing Commission	13.00
Births, Marriages & Deaths	300.00

The latter vote, $300, is required to pay extra bonus to Outport Registrars for prompt returns. This was formerly paid from the Tuberculosis Vote,but for the past two years it has been paid through the Colonial Secretary's Department.

Public Works, $7,850.00, viz.,

Contingencies	$ 500.00
Fuel & Light, Departmental Buildings, Outports	250.00
Insurance & Keeper, Buildings, Channel	100.00
Repairs to Public Buildings .	7,000.00
	$7,850.00

The amount asked for contingencies, is required to cover different services. Vote for fuel and light, $250, is necessary for Public Buildings at Grand Falls, Bay Roberts and Spaniard's Bay. The actual expenditure last year was $1250.00, and the amount voted was $1,000.00, leaving this short vote of $250.00. Insurance and Keeper, Buildings, Channel. The vote $100 is as salary of the keeper of public buildings at Channel. Repairs to public buildings, $7,000.00, this amount is required for repairs to the various public buildings, and was short voted last year; it is now absolutely necessary for repairs to various public institutions.

Marine and Fisheries, $1,800.00, viz.,

Charwoman, 6 months at $16 per month	$ 96.00
Telegrams, Departmental, 8 months	240.00
Sealing messages, January, February and ten days in March, from Bell Isle and other places	120.00
Foreign Quotations	200.00
Annual Report, Fisheries Department	400.00
Outstanding bills to date and office expenses 6 months	744.00
	$1,800.00

Premier's Office.

Contingencies	$1,500.00

This vote is required for Telegraph Messages, Reference Books, Telephone Rent and Stationery.

Under head IV., Administration of Justice, Colonial Secretary's Office,is asked the sum of $7,880.00, as follows

Police annuities	$ 100.00
Registration of Jurors	300.00
Civil and Criminal Prosecutions	3,000.00
	$3,400.00

The first vote Police Annuities, $100 is to cover the Pension paid to the late Wm. Collins, Inspector of Police, who was pensioned just two months before he died.

The amount of $300.00 for Registration of Jurors is required to cover cost of Registration this year, the regular vote being inadequate.

Under the head of Civil and Criminal Prosecutions, the amount required will be $3,000.00, as the sum voted for this purpose is insufficient, owing to increase in Civil and Criminal Prosecutions, and the increased ex-

pense incurred in dealing with them.

Public Works.

Supreme Court	$1,180.00
Fuel and Light, Constabulary Fire Department	300.00
Maintenance Penitentiary ..	300.00
Forage	300.00

Finance Department.

Magistrates Contingencies ..	1,500.00
Supreme Court Contingencies	750.00
Deeds and Companies	150.00
	$7,880.00

The actual expenditure in connection with the Supreme Court last year was $6,100.00. The amount voted was $4,920.00, leaving this short voted $1,180.

The vote of $300 for Fuel and Light, Constabulary Fire Department, is owing to increased cost of coal, and the vote of $300.00 for Forage is required on account of increased cost of feed.

The vote of $300.00 for Maintenance Penitentiary is called to meet the increased cost of supplies and provisions.

Finance Department.

Magistrates Contingencies ...	$1,500.00
Supreme Court Contingencies...	750.00
Deeds and Companies	150.00

The vote for those purposes being inadequate, this increased amount is found necessary to meet the requirements.

Under head V., Legislation, the sum of $7,950.00 is required.

Finance Department.

Legislative Council	$1,204.00
House of Assen.bly	4,801.00
General Legislation	1,645.00

Public Works.

Fuel and Light	300.00
	$7,950.00

The vote last year under those heads was insufficient to meet expenses.

Under Head VII., Public Charities, $26,402.00 is asked for as follows—

Public Works.

Maintenance Lunatic Asylum	$6,225.00
Laundry Work, Lunatic Asylum	1,600.00
Fuel & Light, Lunatic Asylum	1,000.00
Maintenance, General Hospital	435.00
Salaries, General Hospital..	552.00
Maintenance Poor Asylum..	1,020.00
Salaries, Poor Asylum	70.00
Maintenance Fever Hospital	500.00
	$11,402.00

The votes for Maintenance in connection with those institutions are called for owing to increased cost of provisions and other supplies.

Fuel and Light, $1,000.00, required owing to increase in prices of coal.

Under same head for Public Charities—

Casual and Permanent Poor	$7,000.00
Public Health, Outports	1,000.00
And E.R.C., No. 2	7,000.00
	$15,000.00

The vote for those purposes being insufficient, the Commissioner of Public Charities has asked for the increased amount to cover the expenditure under the various headings as named.

Under Head VIII., Light Houses, we require the sum of $5,650.00—

Finance Department.

For Contingencies ... .$	500.00

Marine and Fisheries.

For Maintenance	$5,000.00
For Fog and Noon Gun ...	150.00
	$5,650.00

The vote of $500.00 is required on account of additional notice to Mariners.

The Maintenance Vote, $5,000.00,is short, and this additional amount is required to maintain the efficiency of the various services under this head; and the amount of $150 for Fog and Noon Gun is required by a new gun replacing the old, and in the extra cost for powder, etc.

Under Head IX. Agriculture and Mines, I ask for $1,210.00, namely for

Timber Inspection ... ...$	510.00
Forest Fires	700.00

The vote of $510.00 for Timber Inspection, is to cover the salary of the Inspector appointed under the Logging Act; the payment of whose salary and expenses out of the vote of Timber Inspection was authorized by Minute of Council.

The Forest Fire vote, $700.00 has already been expended, the cause of the expenditure being the necessity of keeping the Fire Wardens longer than last season.

Under Head X. Marine and Fisheries, $26,040.00 is required for

S.S. "Fiona" ... ...$	16,000.00
Enforcement of Bait Laws	4,000.00
Harbor Master and Boatman	40.00
Dredging	4,000.00
Propagation of Lobsters ...	2,000.00

The vote of $16,000.00 on account of S.S. "Fiona" is needed, part for repairs effected to the vessel, and part to cover short vote; there being a Minute of Council for this expenditure.

The amount of $4,000.00 for enforcement of Bait Laws is asked owing to having paid $7,360.00 hire of S. S. "Cabot" while "Fiona" was under repairs, thereby reducing the $8,000.00 vote for this purpose to $640.00 for originally intended expenditure.

The amount of $40.00 under this head, Harbor Master and Boatman is an advance to Thos. Dewling, Boatman, omitted from the Estimates for this purpose.

The $2,000.00 asked for under heading of Marine and Fisheries, Propagation of Lobsters, is required to meet the increased price asked by fishermen for the spawning lobsters, the original price paid 5 cents is now increased to 10 cents, making this amount necessary.

The details of General Contingencies, $25,000.00 will be tabled. The principal amounts are: A sum paid for the Hospital Enquiry; An amount paid to the Hudson Bay Co. for relief, Labrador; an amount paid to the Reid-Newfoundland Co. for bringing sealers from Port aux Basques; an amount of $2,104 paid on account of the Royal Commission; an amount of $804 paid the Newfoundland Government Savings Bank as interest on the Harbour Grace Water Co. Stock. A copy of the Supplemental Supply to be asked for will be found on the desks of hon. members.

The final vote under the head, Customs, is needed for coal and refunds, the amount required, $3,000.00 making a total of $124,415.94 under the various Supplemental Heads.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I would suggest that this matter be let stand over until to-morrow, so that we may have an opportunity of looking over the Estimates. I would also like to have particulars of these expenditures—of the $4,400 voted for the Consolidation of Laws, and of the Census, Compiling, Printing and Binding, for instance. Then there is a vote of $3,000 for Civil and Criminal Prosecutions. I take it that that vote covers not only expenditures to be made between now and the end of the year, but also expenditures that have already been made.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The Minister of Justice asks for this $3,000 to pay the bills up to the 30th June.

MR. LLOYD—I would like to see a statement showing whether any of these votes are in credit, or how far they are in debit, so that we may find

out exactly what we have to provide to tide us over the next three months.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I have no objection to furnishing the hon. member with the information.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: You are giving details of that $25,000 for contingencies.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yes.

MR. COAKER—May I ask what was done in connection with carrying out the recommendations of the Commissioners appointed last year in regard to the Penitentiary?

MR. HAFFYARD—I would like to ask if any provisions is made in the Additional Estimates for the construction of wells at Change Islands? I brought the matter before the House some days ago, and cited some extracts from the reports of Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, and Dr. Brehm, recommending that six wells should be dug at Change Islands.

Dr. Brehm in his Report said, 'that typhoid fever was chiefly due to the contamination of the drinking water.' Nearly $600 was spent there last year as a result of that outbreak; and I do not think there is any good in sending public health officers to places where there is an outbreak of disease, receive their reports which show the cause of sickness and death, and suggest the remedy, and then for you not to make any provision to have it remedied. Several deaths were the result of the typhoid outbreak at Change Islands last year, besides the great loss and inconvenience the families afflicted sustained through it. This is too serious a matter for the House to overlook; and I was expecting that in the additional estimates or in the supplemental supply there would be special provision made to give effect to Mr. Hall's recommendations.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Money for purposes like that typhoid outbreak are generally payable out of the special grants.

MR. HALFYARD—You cannot expect us to take it out of the small grant that is allocated to Change Islands. The Hon. Minister cannot be serious when he suggests that. If you had the well-being and the health of the country at heart you would undertake remedial measures. What are you here for anyhow? You speak of patriotism. What does patriotism mean? Is it not providing for the health and well-being of the people of the country? Are you going to allow the people down there to be afflicted as they were last year? I do not believe, I cannot believe, it is the intention of the Government to allow the condition of things that obtained at Change Islands last year to continue this year after having their attention called to it by the Government officials in their reports. I would like to know what the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs intends to do in this matter, or what the Premier or the Colonial Secretary intend to do, before this Committee rises.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman: I may say that Mr. Hall the Government Engineer authorised the expenditure of a certain amount of money for this purpose last Fall; but the frosty weather came on, and the ground became so frozen that, I think, they could not proceed with the work, and they had to leave the work over until the coming spring. I think there is a certain amount of money already allocated for that purpose; and I believe it is the intention of the Government to proceed and complete the work there.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: The sum of $112 was spent last year in fixing up a well already sunk there; but the letter of the Colonial Secretary to the Secretary of the Board of Works said that an amount of about $1400 would have to be made

for that purpose at the next session of the legislature. Now we are in the next legislative session and do not see any provision made for this expenditure. If the Government would guarantee that that sum of money will be spent on the sinking of wells, that will be alright; but I have no such guarantee; the people down there have no guarantee; we cannot get the work done out of the $690 grant we get for the whole district; you cannot take something from nothing; we cannot get it from the roads and bridges grant, because the amount necessary is more than our whole grant.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr Chairman: I hope to be able to get the information necessary for the clear understanding of this matter by to-morrow, and will then submit it to the hon. gentleman.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: I may say that the points set out by the hon. member for Fogo came within my jurisdiction. It is rather a public health matter than one for the Department of Public Works. The first phase of this matter was the outbreak of typhoid fever, and Dr. Brehm the public health officer, was sent down to make an investigation as to the causes that led to this outbreak; he reported that it was due to the bad water supply, and suggested that conditions down there be remedied. Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, was sent down late in the Fall of last year; and he recommended certain wells being sunk in different parts of Change Islands for the use of the people. Of course it was too late then to undertake any comprehensive work; and he suggested that temporary repairs be made to the wells already existing there. These would cost about $100 in all, and there was $120 to the credit of the district grant; and that amount was spent in that respect. He also pointed out that a great deal of the trouble down there was due to the carelessness of the people in not keeping the wells clean, while a great deal was due to natural causes—the people were not over particular in that they dipped their buckets down in the wells and frequently took no precautions to keep them clean. That may be more or less correct. Mr. Hall emphasised the fact that some rather comprehensive work should be undertaken to make the wells safe for the future; and said that $1,400 would be required to carry out the work effectively and preclude the possibility of a similar outbreak in the future. I wrote the Secretary of the Board of Works and pointed out that as there was no money available for this work at that time, that the matter would have to stand over until the next session of the Legislature. The question should be taken under consideration and if possible before the estimates close provision should be made therefor.

MR. COAKER—We were to have a statement regarding Old Age Pensions before we finished the Additional Estimates. I suppose you have not forgotten about it?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Oh, no. I may say that at the time that discussion was on it was felt that what would be done would depend on the figures in the Finance Minister's Budget. After that we will know precisely what we are able to do, and if possible an extra amount will be voted towards Old Age Pensions and also towards Public Works. We have to see first where we will be on June 30th, 1916, and where we will be on June 30th, 1917.

MR. LLOYD—May I ask if it is proposed to take up the Additional Estimates before the Budget is brought down? These have been reported and read over but no reference appears to the matter the Colonial Secretary has promised to take up

(i.e. proposition relative to the public health conditions at Change Islends), and no reference has been made to extension of the pension scheme.

The idea is prevalent that when the Additional Estimates have been tabled by the Finance Minister it practically precludes inclusion of other votes not already appearing therein, and an appropriation not included will not be taken up again by Government.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—No; that is not so.

MR. LLOYD—That is a reasonable presumption.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I may say that we are always in Supply up to the time the House closes or until the Supply Bill is passed. Notwithstanding that Estimates are passed, that the Additional Estimates follow, that Supplemental Supply goes through, and that the Budget is brought down and disposed of, at all times up to the close of the Session we are in Supply, and any matter that is referred to may be brought in and there will be ample time to deal with it. I will arrange for that. The Finance Minister is hoping to give notice to-day or to-morrow of the bringing down of the Budget on next Thursday; we may be enabled to discuss it the end of this week or early next week; but I do not think it will be possible to deal with it really until Easter week. After that recess will be taken for three or four days, and we shall meet again after that and prorogue. I do not think it will be possible to close before Easter; it was hoped that we could, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has given notice of four important matters, and so there is not much hope of closing before Easter.

MR. COAKER—We might sit in the night time; we could sit until twelve o'clock and dispose of business so as to enable the House to close early.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I shall, if necessary, ask the House to sit during the nights so as to expedite matters.

MR. LLOYD—So long as the Additional Estimates are held over so as to allow inclusion of vote suggested by us, and this matter not forgotten, we are satisfied.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—We are still in Supply.

MR. COAKER—I am sorry to hear that the Premier does not see his way clear to getting business closed off by the 20th April because we, on this side of the House, have been making up our minds that we would be able to get back to our work before that date. If we are going to adjourn over Easter, it means another week of holidays, and it will be well up in May before we get clear. I make the suggestion that if there is any way of closing sooner it ought to be followed; if necessary we ought to sit in the nights.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Every attempt will be made to push matters. I do not know of anything that is to come before the House now except the Budget—there may be one or two other matters—and there is no reason why we should not sit every night during this week.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, there is just one matter I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary about while we are in Committee on Supply. It appears that some of our troops have been in Hospital at Malta, and among them several belonging to Catalina. As soon as they are ready to leave the hospital, the first thing they do is telegraph home for money. I have a message here received by the brother of one of these at Catalina. The brother sent the six pounds as instructed by cable, with the result that it cost him an extra $10.35. Now, Sir, this is a rid-

iculous price to charge for such a matter as this. It is the general sentiment, and one which I think is well founded, that troops who are in hospital do not receive their pay while there. I mean do not get it to use, with the result that they are obliged to telegraph to their homes asking that money be sent on to them as soon as released from the Hospital. This is bad enough, but imagine asking them to pay $10.35 in cash for cabling six pounds to a soldier just out of Hospital. Now, I don't want to complain or in any way make the position of the Government difficult, but I think it would make recruiting much easier if this matter can be remedied? Perhaps the Minister may be able to give us some information to-morrow.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I heard of a similar case on Saturday, a case in England, with the result that I desptched a cable to Captain Timewell, asking him the system under which these affairs were managed. I have not heard from him yet, but expect to hear to-morrow. The person on whose behalf I wired said that they got no money while in Hospital, but that the money was put to their credit for them to draw when they came out. Of course a full supply of money would not be needed while in hospital. I understand vendors are allowed to go into the hospitals selling one thing and another, with the result that while the other patients are able to buy things, our boys are generally without money. I have, however, as I have said, wired for full information from Capt. Timewell, as to what is the practice, and if I have the reply by to-morrow will be glad to read it to the House. As to the additional charge for telegraphing the money, I think this must be due to the fact that the money had to be cabled. In this case there would be both the cost of exchange and the cost of the message. Moneys cannot be sent this way via the Post Office. Messages and money can only be sent by the Bank of Montreal or other Banks. The system is not under the control of the Government. As I have said, I expect the increased costs are due to the cable costs and the exchange rates. I will let the House know to-morrow what report I get.

MR. LLOYD—The explanation and enquiries of the Colonial Secretary do not cover the matter. It must be a great hardship for the men to be compelled to pay the additional cost of a cable when that additional cost results from Army regulations. If they had money which it is claimed was due them they would not have had to telegraph for it. Such costs ought surely not be charged to them. If money due the soldiers is kept out of their hands while they are in hospital, any extra charges on account of this practice in the way of cablegrams, etc., should be charged to the Regiment. It is too much to expect from them. In my opinion, Sir, either one of two things should be done. The Government should do either: (1) Pay in full the amounts due to the soldiers in hospital, or (2), Pay any extra charge which may be made such as has been incurred in this case. In any case, money should be at the disposal of the men.

MR. COAKER—I do not think the Colonial Secretary ought to attempt to defend this system. I understand the charge per word is 35 cents, and as a result it has cost the friends of that boy $10.35 to send him $30. This is too much altogether. You should have made arrangements at London so that the boys could have telegraphed there. Imagine having to telegraph a brother in Catalina when there is money due him in England. The brother sent him $30, but it cost him $10.35 to do so. I think there should be some way out of this diffi-

culty, and would recommend that the Colonial Secretary when he gets the report from the officer on the other side, take this matter up with the British authorities.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not defend the system at all. I only said what I did in explanation of the fact that some of the soldiers were sometimes short of funds, and at the time have money to their credit. I cannot see what authority the Record Office has to hold over any money due the men. I have no way of knowing all the facts, and so cannot express any opinion. I have asked for information as to whether there was or was not any money belonging to the person in question to his credit in the Record Office, and expect a full explanation in due course. Most of the men make allotments. A greater part of them send a large portion of their wages home, which they keep here as a nest egg to remain here until they return, and when short they occasionally draw what they need. I know of many, many cases of this kind during the past year at Edinburgh, Ayr and Fort George, and have seen from ten to twelve messages daily from men in the Regiment who send for money, not because they have money at the Record Office they cannot get, but that they have it home and draw against same when in need of extra cash. That is the explanation in a great many cases. It would, I think, be absurdity for men to have to send here for money when they have some at the Record Office, and as I have said before, I do not think the Record Office has the power to withhold it. As soon as I get word from Captain Timewell I will report to the House.

MR. LLOYD—In that event I would like to know whether it is a fact that the sick in the hospital do not receive their money. There is an impression about that the soldiers have their pay stopped when in hospital. Do they not then receive it?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I will know that when I hear from Capt. Timewell.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman: I may say that I have made enquiries along these lines, and am informed that the pay is not stopped when sick, but it is not paid them while in hospital, and there are army regulations which forbid it. It is not the practice to pay these wages when the men are in the hospital, and I personally have no doubt but that when the Colonial Secretary hears from the Paymaster the reply wlil be very satisfactory to all who are interested in this matter. Of course, it is a great hardship that such a charge should be made for the transmission of the sum of six pounds, but no doubt it was unavoidable and made up by the cost of cable and exchange. If the young man at Malta cabled for the money he must have known how much it would cost, and I do not think that the Regiment should be called upon to defray the cost incurred when he made the mistake by not telegraphing London. If he had telegraphed the Commanding Officer, I think he might have received his wages without very great expense. At Malta, you will remember, there is a committee which has taken upon itself the duties of visiting our men at the Hospital there, and it would have been easy to ask these people for advice as to the quickest and cheapest way to get their money. However, I feel satisfied that when the facts become known, they will be satisfactory to the members of this House.

MR. LLOYD—It is to be hoped that they will be. I still maintain my position that if on account of Army Regulations our boys have been called upon to pay large expenses to get money due to them as wages, the Reg-

iment should be responsible for the extra cost so incurred.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr. Speaker: I think it is very proper that this matter should be discussed here. Who is to blame, if blame there is, I do not know. I presume many hon. members are not aware of this matter, as it was not until these applications from wounded soldiers were made to their people here for money, that the matter came before the notice of the public. There were at one time from one hundred and fifty to two hundred wounded and sick soldiers in hospitals in Gallipoli and Egypt, and I know on information received, that several soldiers had not a cent when they came out of hospital, as no money had been sent to them by the Paymaster. They were in Hospital for weeks, some for months, and when they were convalescent they had not a cent in their pockets. It is somebody's business to see that this condition of things does not recur. Whether it is Captain Timewell's business or not, I am not in a position to say. Anyway a great many of our boys were short of funds when they came out of Hospital and were forced to apply to their people here, and this entailed very considerable expense, as the cases shown by the hon. member from Twillingate have fully testified.

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 motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

INFLAMMABLE OILS BIILL

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 and Consolidate the Law in Relation to Inflammable Oils."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: As I explained on the second reading of this Bill, it is introduced for the purpose of amending and consolidating the Inflammable Oil Act. If the members of this Committee will follow my explanations I shall endeavour to point out the various changes that have been suggested. There is a new definition in Section 2 which states that Inflammable Oils shall include both Volatile Inflammable Oil and Non-Volatile Inflammable Oil. These definitions are new and have been considered necessary. I may say that I have gone over this Act very carefully with Mr. Davies, Public Analyst. Considerable attention has been given to the effect of this Bill upon trade in relation to these oils. The term Volatile Oil has been defined and inserted for the better carrying out of this Act. There is also a definition of the word "Building" as used in this Act. This will be found to be advantageous when compared with the 1897 Act. Under the old law the Governor in Council was the authority under the Inflammable Oil Acts, which is now proposed to transfer to the Municipal Council for St. John's. Section 3 is a new section, and is taken from a very strict Act in Canada, known as the Canadian Inspection Act 1906. Section 6 is new and is taken from the same Act. It is merely inserted here for public protection. Section 9 is section 1 of the Old Act of 1897 with very slight modification. In section 10 there is no change. In sub-section B calcium carbide is substituted for acetylene. This sub-section merely gives

power to the Governor in Council to extend his authority to other places if necessary. Sub-section 12 has been changed merely to obviate certain ambiguities. Sub-section 2 is merely section 12 verbatim from the Consolidated Statutes Sub-section 2 of section 13 is inserted to lessen the danger of fire in private dwelling houses.

Section 14. That is from the 1911 Act.

14.—The proper authority may, subject to such restrictions as it may deem proper in each individual case to prevent danger from fire or explosion, grant permission for the keeping in the open air, or under a properly-ventilated shelter and detached from other buildings, of not exceeding ninety gallons of gasolene or other volatile inflammable oil if contained in an approved steel barrel or of not exceeding fifty gallons of such oil, if contained in a safety can or cans of approved size and pattern.

That is for shopkeepers principally.

Section 15. That is based on suggestions from the Fire Prevention Association of New York.

15.—The proper authority may make rules and regulations:—(1) For the provision in all places where inflammable oils are kept, handled or used of adequate appliances for extinguishing fire; (b) For the prevention of the use in any such places of any artificial lighting, or for regulating the installation and use of such lighting system as may be permitted therein; (c) For regulating the manner of the storage, handling and use in such places of such inflammable oils, and the type and pattern of all appliances used in connection with such storage, handling and use; (d) For the inspection of such places and (e) For the imposition and enforcement of penalties for the breach or non-observance of any such rules and regulations.

Sections 16 and 17 are from our 1897 Act.

Section 20 is new. That is taken from the City of Montreal Fire Regulations.

20.—No person shall have in his possession or under his control, or keep any compressed Acetylene gas, unless the same is compressed in a steel cylinder of approved design and construction and to a pressure not exceeding three hundred pounds to the square inch, and then only by special permission from the proper authority.

I may say that the absence of that section—the approval part—led to several very serious accidents in this country.

Section 22 is from the 1901 Act and the Montreal Fire Regulations.

22.—No person shall have in his possession or under his control, or keep any Carbide of Calcium, except in air-tight metal receptacles, which shall be stored in a dry place inaccessible to water, children, and careless persons. Every receptacle in use shall be carefully closed immediately after the required Carbide has been taken out of it.

Section 23 is from the same Regulations, and portion from our own Act.

23.—No person shall have at any one time in any store or warehouse, or in any building where Acetylene gas is made or used, a quantity exceeding three hundred pounds of Carbide of Calcium, which shall be kept in air-tight and water-tight metal receptacles of a capacity not exceeding one hundred pounds each. All cases, barrels and other packages containing more than two pounds of Carbide of Calcium shall be marked on the outside thereof in red letters at least two inches high "Calcium Carbide. Dangerous if not kept Dry."

Section 24 is from our own Act of 1901 and also 1911.

24.—All cases, barrels, and other similar packages, containing Gun-Powder, Gun-cotton, Dynamite, or any other explosive matter, shall be marked on the outside thereof with the name of the contents in red letters of at least two inches in length; and such cans, cases, barrels and packages shall be kept in a conspicuous and convenient place in the building in which they are stored, and the position of said place notified to the chief officer of the Constabulary.

Section 25 is as follows:

25.—The Chief Officer of the Constabulary, or any member of the Constabulary Force authorized by him for the purpose, may enter and inspect at any time, and from time to time, any building where Carbide of Calcium is kept, or where Acetylene Gas is used or stored; and any person obstructing him or them in their inspection shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars, to be recovered in a summary manner before a Stipendiary Magistrate or Justice of the Peace.

Now, if members will go back to section 10: That is an important improvement there dealing with oil on board vessels.

10.—(a) Nothing in the last preceding section contained shall be held to apply to oil in the course of being landed from or shipped on board vessels, until the expiry of twenty-four hours from the commencement of such landing or shipping, nor to oil on board any schooner, steamer, or other vessel detained in any such Harbour by stress of weather or by delays or difficulties in loading or in departure.

I say, Mr Chairman, that it is hoped this Bill will be found workable and an improvement on the present law dealing with these dangerous inflammable oils.

MR. COAKER—It seems to me that this Act is very drastic, and I am of opinion it will be another Cigarette Act—it will never work out. You will never be able to carry it out. If this is the old Act I do not understand how all the people handling oil have not been taken before the Courts every second day. I understand some of it is new and some of it old.

Now, take section 4.

"Petroleum designated and known as 'high test' petroleum may be imported into and sold for use in Newfoundland for illuminating purposes, under such regulations as to specific gravity as may be established by the Governor in Council, if the flash point is not lower than two hundred and sixty degrees Fahrenheit."

Now, what does that mean? Does it mean that it may be imported if the flash point is over the danger point?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That will be found in the definition clause. I have gone over the bill very carefully and have spent several hours with the Government Analyst, Mr. Davies, who appears to be very thoroughly conversant with this matter, and he is of opinion that this is a very necessary and very wise measure for us to have. We have gone over it and made these amendments, with a view of preventing the trade or the public from being in any way hampered, but we are throwing around the public these reasonable safeguards and regulations which exist in other cities. Now, if any honourable member here has any suggestion to make that will make it easier or more convenient for the public I shall be glad to consider it. Nearly all the amendments of any importance are taken from other cities such as Montreal, where they do not usually adopt such regulations without due consideration.

MR. COAKER—This Act means if you carry it out that you will not be able to keep coal tar. You will not be able to keep more than five bar-

reis. You will not be able to have more than five gallons of kerosene at the outside, and unless certain conditions are complied with, not more than one gallon. Then, if you want to have a greater quantity you must have a special tank.

It may be alright to have these regulations in force in a city like Montreal, or even in St. John's, but you are applying them to the whole country. What you should do, I think, is to refer this whole matter to a Select Committee. There are lots of points in the Bill that could be discussed there.

MR. LLOYD—I would suggest that this matter be referred to a Select Committee, and that Mr. Davies be invited and also any others who can give any information to make clear exactly what this Act means.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I was going to suggest that myself, but after studying this Bill for several weeks and after spending several hours with Mr. Davies and with others who viewed the matter from the practical standpoint, I thought it would not be necessary. I may say I have had this Bill before the Executive on three different occasions, and the members there who are conversant with the Colony's trade and general conditions discussed it fully, and do not see any of the difficulties pointed out by my friend opposite. It is not proposed to do more in this Bill in its operation to outports than what existed heretofore. Its application to outports and the way in which the provisions are to be applied, are fully set forth.

I don't think we should wait for an explosion to happen. We waited in 1892 for a fire to happen, and $12,000,000 went up in smoke because we had no fire department. Now, we have had some explosions already, and some very precious lives were lost owing to the want of proper protection. At the same time I agree with the hon. member that we ought not to hamper trade or the citizens too much.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and recommended that its further consideration be referred to a Select Committee.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

Mr. Speaker appointed the following Select Committee: Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Dr. Lloyd, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Hickman, Minister of Finance and Customs, Mr. Parsons.

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

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 Control of Trading in Certain Commodities," without amendment.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend and Continue in Force for a further period the Act 5, George V, Section 1, Cap. 1, entitled 'An Act respecting a Volunteer Force in this Colony.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: This Bill is to amend our Volunteer Act. It is proposed to extend it for another year. That is the first section. The second section makes an amendment by substituting for the word "Colonel" the words "Lieutenant-Colonel" wherever they

appear in the Bill. That is necessitated by reason of our having a Colonel in charge of the Regiment abroad. It is proposed that an additional section be added providing for the issue of distinguishing badges to persons who have been rejected or who are exempt. That is thought desirable, as a number of persons have already volunteered, and from physical or other causes have failed to pass the medical examination, and a section of the Patriotic Committee who have charge of recruiting think that this would be a proper recognition of those who have tendered their services and have not been accepted. I understand that another amendment will be proposed by the Hon Leader of the Opposition later on, dealing with the case of those who desire to enlist but who are under agreement. I don't think that there is anything further which requires explanation.

MR. LLOYD—I don't understand why the word "exempt" is put in here. I don't know what class of persons that refers to. I could understand it in England, where there are munition workers, for instance, who are doing work which is equally important as those who have volunteered in the ranks.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There is no one legally exempt, but there are men in charge of cable offices, for instance, or in charge of work which it might be important should be carried on. That is the only meaning. The question is whether it is advisable to put it in there at all. I have no objection to leaving it out.

MR. LLOYD—You might put in there "persons who for sufficient causes have not offered their services" One can quite appreciate that there are in the cable service, for instance a number of men who are eligible for military service, but who cannot be let go however much they may wish. I know there are many who have attempted to enlist but have not been allowed. It is of quite as much importance to the Empire to keep the cables going as it is to have soldiers; otherwise it would be impossible to keep in touch with the different units of Empire and the different ships. There are persons of that class who may wish to enlist but who cannot because of some power exercised over them either through the Admiralty or some other source of authority. I certainly think it would be right to gives badges to these people and to that class of persons who wish to enlist and cannot because of some power in control exercised over them through that or some other source of authority. I certainly think it would be wise to give badges—to these people to show that as far as they are concerned they attempted to enlist but for some public reason they were not allowed.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—There are similar exceptions under the English Act.

MR. LLOYD—I can understand that a cable operator whom, in order to keep the different parts of the Empire linked up and working particularly in war times, it is so necessary to have, cannot be allowed to leave his post.

MR. COAKER—Suppose you have men applying who know they cannot be accepted, perhaps are physically unfit—consumptive for instance—can they apply to get badges when they knew before they went up that they would not be received? Apparently, everyone that applies and is turned down is to get a badge showing that at least he made an effort to join the colors; but there may be hundreds and hundreds that apply that feel sure they will not be accepted. Is any difference to be made in the case of the bona fide man?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— That will be governed by rules and regulations.

MR. COAKER—If there will be rules and regulations that will be alright. I mention this so that steps may be taken to prevent abuses.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I beg leave to move the adoption of another section with reference to fishery and other servants who are under indentures to serve at the fishery or elsewhere and are to-day liable to arrest if they enlist. As a matter of fact some of these servants have been arrested for enlisting. The purport of the section I am moving is to excerpt from the Statute the liability to arrest of such persons who leave their employ for the purpose of volunteering. I will read the amendment. (amendment read)

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Second reading of Bill respecting administration of local affairs.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—

Section 1 of the Amending Bill deals deals with Section 2 of the Act. The substance of Section 2 is re-enacted, but its form is changed, grammatical construction altered, and the Section put in clear language which would enable anybody to understand it. By referring to copy of Local Affairs Act enclosed you will see from the change made thereon that there are typographical errors and verbal complications.

Section 2 of the Amending Bill deals in a similar way with Section 3. By referring to the copy of the 1915 Act enclosed, you will see that the general grammatical construction was complicated, and there appears to have been some substantial printer's errors. In the 6th line for instance, the word "not" is printed before "provided." This is evidently a typographical error.

In Section "b" it refers to electors as being "80 per cent qualified electors." This is evidently intended to be "80 qualified electors; because in the next sub-section "'c" it is provided that the petition should be signed by not less than a majority.

The only alteration of importance in Section 3 is in sub-section "d" of the Act. In the amending section the Justice certifies not only that the signatures to the petition are genuine, but that they constitute a majority of electors within the proposed area. He has now the powers vested in him under the "Dog Act" and the "Temperance Act" to require proof of the genuineness of any doubtful signature. The language of the "Dog Act" in this connection has been followed as far as possible.

Subsection "e" of Section 3 of the Act almost defies interpretation to the minds of the layman because of its complicated construction. It starts out with the words "no protest" on the first line, and you have to go the 9th line to get the words which should follow namely "shall be presented to the Governor in Council!" This subsection is covered by language capable of being understood by anybody, under sub-section "c" of the amending bill.

Section 3 is merely a formal amendment of Section 4 of the Act necessary by the use of different words in the previous section.

Section 4 of the Amending Bill repeals section 12 of the Act. Section 12 merely provided for a first election in the year 1915. The Amending Section lays down a procedure under

which areas which neglected or unsuccessfully attempted to carry out the first election in 1915 can be dealt with, and empowers the Governor in Council to set a date in 1916, or any subsequent year for the election in any places which have not availed of the Act but desire to do so.

Section 5 of Amending Bill is intended to provide machinery in the event of contested elections. At the present time no machinery is provided to settle disputes, and it would be difficult to determine what redress defeated candidates have in the event of their feeling that they have suffered improper treatment. It would be hopelessly difficult to work out any special procedure and the simplest way appears to be to adopt Part 4 of the Election Act dealing with Illegal and Corrupt Practices as far as it can be applied to the Local Affairs Act

It is certainly better to have some regular procedure than to have an entirely barren act which provides no ventilating process by which fraud or bribery may be handled.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MARRIAGE FACILITY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Facilitate the Marriage between British Subjects residing in Newfoundland and British Subjects residing in the United Kingdom," was read a second time.

RT. HON. PRIMIE MINIISTER.— This is a bill to facilitate marriages between British subjects residing in Newfoundland and British subjects residing in the United Kingdom and is necessitated by the Act passed by the Imperial Govjustified. In the first place, this ernment in 1915. In May 1915 an Act was passed by the Imperial Parliament to facilitate marriages between British subjects residing in the United Kingdom and British subjects in other parts of His Majesty's Dominions. Under Imperial Law the publication of notice of marriage or of banns is under certain circumstances essential In many British Colonies it would appear that the publication of notice or banns is also essential under certain circumstances. In Newfoundland this is not required except where one of the intended contracting parties is a minor, in which case publication of banns or consent of parents is required.

Under the Imperial Act of 1915 publication of notice or banns in a Colony would not be accepted in the United Kingdom as authority for the celebration of a marriage in the United Kingdom, between a British subject residing in the United Kingdom and British subject residing in a Colony, nor would the publication of notice or banns in the United Kingdom be accepted as an authority for the celebration of marriage in a Colony between a British subject residing in the United Kingdom and one residing in that Colony.

The object of the Imperial Act of 1915 is to make publication of notice or banns in Great Britain's Colonies sufficient authority for the celebration of marriage in the United Kingdom and conversely it is suggested that the publication of notice or banns in the United Kingdom should be treated as sufficient authority for the celebration of marriage in British Colonies.

The object of this bill is to make valid in the United Kingdom a notice of marriage given in Newfoundland by publication in the "Royal Gazette" in two consecutive issues and a certificate of such publication issued by the Registrar General of births, marriages and deaths for the purpose of the marriage in the United Kingdom

of a resident of Newfoundland, who had published such notice and secured such certificate; and for the purpose of reciprocity the Act provides that a certificate for marriage issued by the proper authorities in England, Scotland and Ireland shall be accepted in Newfoundland in lieu of the publication of notice or banns in Newfoundland.

So far as the use of certificates in Newfoundland issued in England is concerned, it can apply only where one of the contracting parties is a minor, because in this country no publication of banns or other procedure is necessary so far as our Statute Law is concerned. In any other case, each religious denomination may have its own procedure with respect to its adherents before the ceremony would be performed by any clergyman or official of that denomination, but that is an ecclesiastical matter purely and does not affect, nor is it affected by the Statute Law of the Country.

It would appear from the correspondence sumarized on page 211 of the volume of correspondence entitled "Dominions No 4" relating to Imperial Conference herewith forwarded that Great Britain's colonies have, as a whole, concurred in the enactment of the Imperial Act of 1915 to which reference is being made, and the object and effect of this Bill is to bring Newfoundland in line therewith.

The bill was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 11th, 1916.

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

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to table the Report of the Medical Superintendent of the Asylum for the Insane for the year 1915.

Mr. Stone gave notice of question.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg to table answer to the question asked by Dr. Lloyd on the order paper for the 6th of April; also the reply to a question asked by Mr. Abbott.

PETITIONS.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Wm. Martin and other fishermen of Torbay, asking for a road to be made at that place. I would like to state that this is not an ordinary petition in which a few might be interested, but it is for a road which a very large number of men will avail themselves of. I have a personal knowledge of this matter and can say that a great many will find use for this road as most of the people prosecute the fishery. I would ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Public Works. The amount required is not a large one and will probably be found not to exceed the sum the petitioners require, which is about one hundred dollars. I beg to refer this petition to the department to which it relates, and would ask that the Road Inspector be asked to report on the matter immediately.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS presented a petition from his district.

MR. WINSOR —I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Port Blandford who ask for the sum of one hundred dollars to be allocated for the purpose of repairing the roads in that locality. I hope the Government will see its way clear to grant the prayer of this petition and beg leave to refer the matter to the department to which it relates.

MR. ABBOTT—I beg leave to pre-

sent a petition from the inhabitants of Port Blandford who ask for the sum of one hundred dollars to be allocated for the purpose of repairing the roads in that locality. I hope the Government will see its way clear to grant the prayer of this petition and beg leave to refer the matter to the

MR. CLAPP—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Savage Cove, Nameless Cove, and other places asking that Sandy Cove, better known as Sandy Bay, be made a port of call for the Reid steamer. It appears from the petition that the fishermen of that part of the coast have to travel from four to fifteen miles to get to the nearest port of call, which is Flower's Cove, and in consequence great inconvenience is experienced, especially in the matter of freight, and if the Government could see its way clear to order the steamer there the people would be greatly benefitted. There is plenty of depth of water. It would be a great advantage to the fishermen if this matter could be accomplished. The petition has my strongest support.

MR. COAKER—I beg leave to pre sent a petition from the inhabitants of Farmer's Arm, Twillingate, asking that the post office at present there should be removed and a new building erected in its stead. The old Postmaster at Farmer's Arm resigned last year, and a new appointment was made. No one representing the district was consulted. A man living at the end of the settlement was appointed. Since then there has been nothing but trouble. There have been three or four public meetings held at Twillingate Arm, about this matter; it was brought to the attention of the Postmaster General, and I presume to the attention of the Colonial Secretary also, and it has finally come to this that this petition, largely signed by the residents of Farmer's Arm, is presented to this House asking that the office be removed. I drew the attention of the Postmaster General to the matter and he thought the matter might be adjusted by opening another way office and appointing another postmaster. I suggested that to the people of Farmer's Arm, but they declined, and they now present this petition asking that the office be removed and a new building erected at a cost of $400.00. I presume something will be done now. I trust the Colonial Secretary and the Postmastr General will take up the matter and perhaps Mr. Jennings and myself will be able to see them about it and arrange something.

MR. LLOYD—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Northern Bight, and in doing so I may remark that as far as this House is concerned this petition has now become a hardy annual. It has reference to the lack of station accommodation on a section of the old line in the neighbourhood of Come By Chance. I have presented petitions on this matter every session since I have had the honour of sitting in this House during the present term of the Government; but the situation there remains unchanged. There are no such stations or no such accommodations at these places as are to be found on the new branch lines. In fact in some places there is nothing at all, in other places nothing but shacks. In some places they can be locked, in other cases they are without windows or doors and they are useless for providing shelter for those who wish to use the railway. The petition presented is from Northern Bight and the petitioners state that the freight shed there is 8 feet by 10. This is supposed to accommodate the needs of some thirteen hundred people. There is no station agent, and generally speaking, as far as freight and passenger accommodation is concerned in that vicinity they might just as

well be without any. Now the Leader of the Government has undertaken at each session to see the contractors about the matter. His labours so far have resulted in nothing so far as the accommodation of these is concerned. I do not know whether he has anything fresh to report, or whetner he can hold out any hope for the future. At all events these petitioners are bringing a legitimate grievance to the attention of the Government and I trust that something will come out of it; although I have very little hope, judging by past experience.

MR. STONE—In relation to the petition which has just been presented to the House by my colleague, Dr. Lloyd, the Leader of the Opposition, it is a well-known fact that those stations are in a dilapidated condition, and I trust that the Government will see their way clear to do something in matters of that kind. I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker. In reference to this matter; I think when this matter was brought before this House last year it was stated that the station was originally in good working order but owing to the depredations of those who visited it the place was in an unfortunate condition. Now early after the close of the session I took the matter up with the government Engineer. I instructed him to see the contractors and see if something could not be done to meet the pressing needs as represented by the members for the district. I understand he saw the contractors about it and up to this moment I was under the impression that something had been done; but I assure the honourable member that I will immediately take the matter up with the government engineer and see what he has to report. It was not ignored or neglected but was taken up with the government engineer and I am sure he will have some report to give me that will show the House that this matter has not been neglected or ignored.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr. Speaker. I may say we are in the same box in Placentia Bay as regards some of these stations. Last year I had some complaint to make about one of the stations in the Bay. One of the very worst is the one at Villa Maria. In fact it is not a station at all—it is merely a shack. I think it is unfair to the people of Fox Harbour and other settlements in the vicinity, who are very well to do and industrious that they should be subjected to this treatment. I would urge upon the government the necessity of the Government Engineer making a strong presentment to the contractors in connection with these stations so that they may be put in some kind of decent repair to fit them for the purposes for which they are intended.

MR. LLOYD—I would just like to correct a misapprehension of the Colonial Secretary. He has spoken of the station to which I referred in the petition as being a station that had been in more or less decent repair but owing to the depredations of folks resorting there it became in bad repair and nothing has been done to put it in repair. Now I wish to point out to him that there has never been anything that could be called a station at Northern Bight. There has never been anything put up for passengers. All that has been there has been a shack thirteen by ten for freight and not for passengers, and if that is compared with anything on the new line you will see at once that something to afford protection to passengers should be put there. This is not a case of passengers who had accommodat[illegible] not taking care of it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—That is true of some of the places.

MR. LLOYD—There are a number

of cases. It is not because a man is convicted of theft that you should convict him of murder.

MR. COAKER—I beg to say in relation to the station at Northern Bight that I know a little about its condition as I spent a night in it. It has always been a freight shed. The whole place is open and there is no one around there but the railway man looking after the road. There are thirteen hundred people there who use that station, and I think the least that be done would be to erect a station costing five or six hundred dollars and put the railway man in charge of it. He would probably do the work for a hundred dollars a year. For the past three sessions we have been presenting petitions and I have supported them asking for improved conditions in this matter, but after what the Colonial Secretary has just said I have no doubt that the condition will now be remedied.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I heartily endorse all that has been said in relation to these stations in the District of Trinity and in Placentia Bay. I know the station at Come-By-Chance referred to by the honourable member. It is nothing but a shack—a mere frame, and has been for four or five years. We have represented the case before, and I think Dr. Lloyd spoke representing the case once before. There are others also that need immediate attention. The one at Villa Maria, spoken of by my colleague, is merely a shack; although all the people of Long Harbour, Ship Harbour and Fox Harbour—more than a thousand people—as well as a great many people from the Bay use that station all the year round. Sometimes they arrive there at four or five in the afternoon, and have to walk four or five miles to Fox Harbour; and if owing to darkness or stormy weather it is found impossible to do that, men and women have to use that shack. There is another station at Little Harbour East in the bottom of Placentia Bay, which is only a shack. That station is an important one, because a number of people come there to take passage on the railway.

Between Little Harbour East and this station which I speak of the distance is three miles, and there is no road. The people of Placentia Bay would appreciate the courtesy if the Government would institute some means by which the railroad roads may be put in proper repair. I trust this expression of opinion from both sides of the House this afternoon will have such an effect that these roads and stations will be put in proper condition.

NOTICE OF MOTIOIN.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled: 'An Act respecting Companies Payment of Whose Capital Stock or of Interest thereon, is guaranteed by the Government."

SHIPBUILDING RESOLUTIONS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries,. the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: In introducing these resolutions for the encouragement of shipbuilding, I might say that there is already in existence in this country an Act providing for the building of ships on which the Government undertakes to pay a bounty. Several petitions have been presented to this House asking that this bounty be increased, and that the Government give

a guarantee to any company which might be formed for the purpose of carrying on the shipping business. This matter came before me some time ago. I had a conference with the Prime Minister and Mr. Coaker in connection therewith, as a result of which I drafted a letter dealing with the whole subject and forwarded it to the Government for their consideration. The Government have thought it wise to put my suggestions into force, and to give the people the privilege of forming companies under a guarantee from the Government.

I may say that there is a schedule in the present Act which provides that any person building a vessel gets from $4 to $10. You will notice the increase which is proposed here.

(The Minister here read the Resolutions.)

MR. COAKER—I spoke about hardwood planking for stems and sterns; that wood will have to be imported. Why not also include copper fastenings as well as iron-copper for fastening and composition for the bottom of vessels?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That amendment may be put in; but at the present time there would be no copper; but it is just as well to have it in the Act.

MR. LLOYD—Before this Bill passes the Committee I would like to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on his responsiveness to the suggestions from this side of the House. The courtesy shown by him, indicating a spirit of harmony obtaining in all sections of the House, is a good augury of the reception the Bill will meet when promulgated and its effectiveness in operation.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the Resolutions with some amendments, and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill: "An Act to Amend the Act 8 Edward VII., Cap. 8, entitled: 'An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding'" was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HERRING FISHERY RESOLUTIONS

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Certain Resolutions on the subject of the Herring Fishery.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: In bringing this matter before the House I consider that a long-felt want is now about to be supplied to the country. I believe the herring fishery of this Colony, if properly encouraged and taken hold of effectively by Government and people, may be brought to a stage where it equals if not surpasses our cod fishery. We have lots of herring around this Island of ours, but we have never gone into the herring business as we should have; and while we have plenty of herrings in the waters around our coast, and have men to catch them, send them abroad and market them, yet very little interest has been taken so as to encourage the fishermen of this Colony to go into the herring-packing business and bring it to the perfection achieved by Norway, Holland and Scotland. We feel proud to say that we are fishermen, but compared with Norway we are—to use a slang phrase—not in it. But we hope to be. We have just as good herring to-day around our coasts as those around the coasts of Scotland, Norway, or in the North Sea or other places; and the feeding-

grounds for herring that we possess are just as perfect; and I might say that the food that our herring eat is the same or very nearly the same as eaten by the herring around Norway. That food flows along with the Atlantic current and is brought here to our shores, and is identical with that around the coasts of Norway. Some people would like to make us believe that the flavour of the Scotch herring exceeds that of the Newfoundland article, and that the herrings used by the Scotch people are caught on the spawning grounds off the coast of Scotland. That might have been so 100 years ago, but it is not so today. the herring spawn miles and miles from the Scotch coast—out in the Atlantic—that is where the spawning ground of the herring caught by the Scotch people is found, and the spawn floats around there miles from the coast. It is not so with our herring. As is well known, the spawning grounds of the Newfoundland herring are the arms and the bays around our coasts; and we have not been required up to the present time to use drift net fishing on this coast, and will not until we drive the herring clear of their present haunts and spawning grounds. Last Summer, while on patrol duty off the Labrador coast, towards the latter part of August, when we were out ten, fifteen, thirty or forty miles from the coast, just steaming along very slowly, I noticed hundreds of schools of herring; and as the vessel would pass along and cleave the schools of herring on each bow, they would turn up; and each night the water was alive with them. It would put one in mind of the mackerel schools off the coast of the United States. I believe there are millions and millions of barrels of herring off the Labrador coast—they spawn off there as they do off the coast of Scotland. We can look back and remember when the coast of Labrador was alive with herring; the bays around there were the spawning grounds—but what happened? They were not taken in at all, and the Government of that day were not interested, and the fishermen thought there were plenty of herring, and that there would always be plenty of herring in the waters around Labrador, but the time came when the herring deserted the coast. The reason of it, I believe, they were driven from the coast by the waste of herring. The policy of throwing the old herring overboard in time polluted the water so that the herring that was at one time so plentiful throughout the shores of Labrador are now gone. Now in July and August you will find in many places signs of their returning, and I believe that in the near future that these herring that had resorted to the coast some years ago are coming back again.

Mr. Chairman: In introducing those resolutions, I introduce them because I believe that every man sitting in this House, either on this side or the other, is interested in the welfare of the country of which we all feel so proud as that of our native land, in the case of some of us, and in that of others, the country of our adoption. Both should have an equal interest in her, and I believe they have, and we are here now with resolutions before us which we must consider. Scotland was in the same position some years ago when the fishermen of that country and England got together and thought that something should be done to assist the fishermen, with the result that a Board was formed at both Aberdeen and Peterhead to encourage the fishermen to take an interest and maintain the competition with the men of Norway and Sweden and Holland. They got together and formed their Board, the first in the world. Each man had the interest of the country at heart.

Now, I believe we are on the road, the right road, in bringing in these resolutions, and the Government will inaugurate this board to look after inspection. The country has asked that there be an inspection of herring and herring barrels. Petitions have been presented in this House. I have got letters and telegrams galore asking that something be done. The Government is doing this, but if we get these resolutions through in the form of a bill, and the board formed, what we want is fishermen to take an interest in the fisheries and to help the board by doing all in their power to assist in taking up this industry, so that we will be able to place in the American market a fish the name of which will be the guarantee of its sale. We want our fish inspected, and hope in that way that when a Newfoundlander finds himself in the United States, he will be proud to know that the product sent by Newfoundland is a first class article. This Bill has been prepared with care, and I will be only too glad to receive any suggestions any of the hon. members may make, and to support any which I think would have the effect of encouraging this fishery in any way.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I notice several good suggestions in these resolutions, but are there to be any provisions to enable the Board to carry them? How are you going to insist on that?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—The Governor in Council can make rules of this kind under an act, and so enforce it.

MR. COAKER—My object is this: I do not want to see a Board appointed to deal with this question without sufficient power to do the work. The idea of starting a Board on the principle of the Scotch Herring Board is a good idea and one which has been advocated by this side of the House ever since the House opened. Anybody knowing anything about the matter must admit that something must be done, and that quickly, in the standardization of our fish into a good brand if we are going to make it as good as others. If we are going to get our fish into the American market we will have to get our fish into one class by such measures as are included in this bill. I see nothing but good in the resolutions, and hope that when we get the Board we will have on it men who are the very best to be had, and there can be nothing but good result from the measure.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Chairman: I would like to add a word to what has already been said in appreciation of the scheme involved in the Resolutions now introduced by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

We have in our herring fisheries a great natural asset, a potential source of remunerative industry incomparably greater than the majority of us are prepared to recognise.

We cannot jump into possession of this heritage in a fully developed stage, but it will be a reflection upon us as a people if we longer show that we lack the requisite enterprise to quicken and foster into full industrial fruition the budding promise of great possibilities that the past season's work has proven that we possess.

The Resolutions now introduced appear to me to be sufficiently comprehensive to warrant the hope that under the stimulating guidance of the Herring Board—the formation of which is provided for therein—an effective measure of encouragement will be extended to the industry that will have practical and satisfactory results.

I recognise that other districts than

St. George's have great latent possibilities in the herring fisheries, and to convey an idea of what is possible of attainment I may quote our own experience of the recent past. For generations we had prosecuted this fishery along the time-honoured lines, and the prices netted to fishermen were about an average of $1.50 for herring from the nets. In the past year, however, owing to the competition to procure fish to be put up as Scotch cure, the prices considerably more than doubled, and a general stimulus has been imparted that promises great development in this industry in the future.

In anticipation of this, there are to-day fish-curing premises being erected by different business firms in the Bay of Islands, to the value of about thirty thousand dollars, and the people incurring this expense are fully familiar with the qualities of our fish, and that they can command prices in the foreign markets to warrant these expenditures.

To enable us to attain, and retain, profitable markets we must see to it that only a first class product be exported as Scotch cure. To do this will call for a measure of supervision such as has worked so beneficially in our lobster fishery.

No matter what the intrinsic merits of our fish may be, unless the barrels employed and the method of curing be up to requirements, a satisfactory finished product cannot be hoped for. It will be the work of the Board to devise means to ensure requisite supervision of all these matters, and I see nothing to debar their doing this in a manner satisfactory to fishermen, and so as to ensure satisfactory results to all concerned. I congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the very comprehensive character of the Resolutions.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman: I think the Bill now before the House is a move in the right direction, and one of the important matters we should consider in connection with the herring industry is to guard against particular firm or clan obtaining special rights which would give them a monopoly of the trade, either in cooperage or pack.

The hon. member, Mr. Downey, who has just sat down, referred to the shortage in barrels last fall, particularly the size needed for Scotch cure, and he said that a large number had to be imported on that account. I believe the cause of the shortage was that our coopers had not expected a market for that kind of barrel, and therefore had not ordered from the mills the particular stock required for the work.

Since this matter came up for discussion the other afternoon, I have been approached by two or three men largely engaged in cooperage. One man asked me to go and inspect his stock. He explained to me that he could get an output of twenty thousand barrels a year and not interfere with the dry fish trade, and that another cooperage he knew could turn out some forty thousand. The trouble was that these men had never expected a call for those particular barrels and had made no former provision, and as we are all aware the Scotch barrel takes a longer stave than the local package, and the stock would have to be ordered specially from the saw mills. I have some little knowledge of what barrels should be myself, and I considered that the barrels shown me were as good as I ever saw. They certainly were as good as is possible to make out of soft wood in any part of the world. Now, I claim if our men can do this work with our own timber, they should get the benefit and preference. It is, I believe, the aim of all Governments to encourage the home industries. Let us be careful not to lose sight of this. I have

heard other statements from a gentleman largely interested in herrings in my own district, especially last fall, when he was acting as agent for an American Company. He had put up herrings and exported them to America in local barrels, and he showed me the letter he received from the firm in Chicago who bought them, and the letter states that both the barrels and their contents were perfectly satisfactory, and were, in fact, first class articles. All this goes to show that packages can be made here by our own people that will compare favourably with the first class article abroad. I make that statement here today because I feel that we ought to object against getting in people from other countries to do work that our own people can do perfectly well, and because I think we ought to be careful not to introduce anything in our laws that may operate unfavourably against them. I have had two or three letters from different parts of my district relating to this matter which I received before I left home. It appears that there was a rumour there under foot that a Scotch firm operating there was going to get a monopoly of making those barrels in that district. In consequence the men were feeling uneasy. They said that lots of them had provided themselves with steel trusses to enable them to turn out barrels as good as the Scotch people. If a monopoly were given to the Scotch people it would have a very discouraging effect upon their interests. They asked me therefore to do whatever I might find possible on their behalf. Of course, I do not know how far this has gone, it may be only a rumour. However, I have no doubt that the Government will see to this matter, and that in the Bill before the House I trust every encouragement will be given to our own people.

MR. DOWNEY—I would like to disabuse the mind of the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Jennings, of the false impression he has evidently gathered of my previous remarks .

I should deprecate as strongly as anyone any proposition tending to give a monopoly of the 'Scotch barrel' business. So far as I know, such an idea was never entertained or even broached. It would be uncalled for and absolutely unjustifiable. I do contend that we have excellent barrel making material in abundance, and our artisans have the necessary skill to utilize this material, though, so far, the special tools that facilitate manufacture and ensure the turning out of thoroughly reliable and shapely barrels are not sufficiently in evidence to enable Scotch barrels to be supplied in such quantity as the abnormal development of Scotch cure last year called for, and hence the necessity for the importations.

I am ready to admit that local barrels have carried herring to Chicago in good shape, but this was largely a railway journey, and in railway cars the ground tier of barrels are not subjected to anything like the great superimposed weight that they would be in a steamer cargo.

I think it will be the work of the new Herring Board to give such necessary supervision to every feature of this new industry as will result in having available an ample supply of all the requisites that go to ensure a reliable pack of Scotch cure herring.

MR. LLOYD.—It has always been a wonder to me why the Government ever relegated the hon. member for St. George's to the Board of Agriculture. For I do not know that I was ever more interested in anything that has ever been under discussion in this House than when the hon member rose to talk about the fishery, for it was clearly on fishery matters that he is at home. I have no doubt but

that if the Government had found a post for him on the fisheries Board he would have done excellent service for the past few years. There can be no question about his industry or vim, and I hope the Government will yet find a way to place the hon. gentleman in some position where he can be of better service to his country. I agree with those members who said this afternoon that this was a step in the right direction. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has done the right thing when he created the Board to deal with this matter specially. In the past that Department had the necessary powers, but I suppose they have been engaged in other matters to such an extent that they have been unable to devote their energies to this special work as the matter demands. Now that there is to be a Board to take up herring matters especially, there is some hope. I am not posing as knowing much of our fishery matters,but still I do not go around with my eyes closed. I have been watching the fishery statistics for a long time and I have always wondered why this side of the Atlantic has such a small show in the herring trade.

I do not think there can be any doubt that we have the herring, but up to the present we have confined our energies to the herring that comes to the shore, and as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has stated we have not gone out on the broad ocean and searched for them. The Scotch people go fifty and one hundred miles from the shore in search for herring, but at the present time I do not think that this question is of great practical import, for we are now talking of a board to make of greater value the herring that we catch. It is purely a matter of industry. A question like this must be made a national one. A national Board should be created having stringent powers in regard to classification and inspection before the herring should be allowed to go to foreign markets. In the past it has been a notorious fact that we lost markets after markets owing to the fact that inferior herring have been put on the market. We must follow the more go ahead policies of France and Scotland. The herring we send abroad must be a first class article. I have much pleasure in supporting the Resolution before the chair.

MR. COAKER.—There is one slight suggestion that I would like to make. I would suggest that you limit the number of men on that board to say ten, because I think you will find that if you have a large Board you will have the inconvenience of being unable to call out a meeting at a short notice. If you are going to have a Board composed of men taken from around St. John's you will find that a large Board will result in much valuable time being wasted.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—My reason was that I intended that we should have men on this Board representing all parts of this Island who could give the necessary information and inform us how things are going on. Men who would be intimately in touch with the conditions and prospects of the places they represented, and who could come to St. John's for that purpose.

MR. COAKER.—That is a very good reason. That will be quite alright if you have a Board created on those lines and I have no objection whatever.

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 that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

HERRING FISHERY BILL.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law relating to the Herring Fishery" was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the amounts paid by the Government toward the building of the public school at Grand Falls.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to my hon. friend I may say that the Government have no record in relation to any payments made in connection with the public school at Grand Falls. This may have been paid out of the denominational vote of some five years ago that was made for public schools; but that would be entirely a matter for the Superintendents.The government have no record of it.

MR. ABBOTT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the amounts paid for surveying Labrador schooners in Bonavista District and the names of persons receiving the amounts.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—That is tabled.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement, showing the names and amounts paid outport post offices for rents, fuel, oil, etc., for the year 1915.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I will have that to-morrow.

MR. TARGETT asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to table all reports of Shipping Inspector Bell in reference to schooners inspected last year for the Bounty of Shipbuilding.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—That is being prepared.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Rt. Hon. the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Justice to lay on the table of the House the following items: (1) A copy of the protest sent by the citizens of Twillingate against a Masquerade Ball held in the Court House there last autumn; (2) a copy of the resolution of the Methodist Quarterly Official Board protesting against the use of the Court House for such purposes; (3) copies of all the private correspondence endorsing the resolution, and in connection with the whole affair; (4) also a copy of Magistrate Scott's report in reference to the matter; (5) also to ask if any reply has been sent to the above resolutions, and if not, why not? and if a reply has been sent, that a copy of the same be laid on the table of the House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is being prepared. I will table it to-morrow.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the table of the House full returns of all moneys sent from the Public Charities Office to Hezekiah Snelgrove, of Grate's Cove, Bay de Verde District, during the years 1913, 1914 and 1915.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The Commissioner of Public Charities informs me that he will have that ready by the end of the week.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the table of the House returns of all Moneys sent to Ochre Pit Cove, Bay de Verde District, during 1915.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS.—I will have that to-morrow.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if any land near the Government Wharf in Bay de Verde has been purchased by his Department since 1912; if so give the name of the person or person from whom purchased, and the price paid.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHER-

IES.—Mr. Stone has the answer to that.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend and Continue in Force for a further period the Act 5 George V. Session 1 Cap. 4, entitled "An Act respecting a Volunteer Force in this Colony" was read a third time and passed.

MR. F. J. MORRIS.—Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is read a third time I would like to say a word or two in reference to the last section of the Bill, and in relation to a matter that appeared, by way of criticism, in one of our local papers this morning, in connection with the work of the Recruiting Committee. I refer to the section relating to the armlet or badge. Now the writer of the article endeavoured to leave the impression on the public mind that the Recruiting Committee although it was its duty to consider the matter of providing armlets, had not given it consideration. That position is not correct. The matter was considered at a meeting of the full Committee some weeks ago, when Mr. Browning brought it up, and the proposition has since been considered and decided upon by the Executive Committee. The Committee has gone so far as to have the proposed badges made. I have two sample badges here made by the Clothing Factory. Here is one design and here is another, but neither has yet been accepted. This I think, conclusively proves the matter has had the serious attention of the Executive Committee. The only reason why these badges have not been issued to the men entitled to wear them is, because it was found necessary to have a section incorporated in the Amendment to the Volunteer Act, which the Committee understood the Government intended to bring in, and which is now before the House for its third reading. This was thought necessary, and we could do nothing until we got authority from this Legislature. The Governor was advised on that point, and suggested legislation, and that is the reason these badges have not been issued. From the remarks of this paper it would appear that the Committee was not doing its duty. Well we all have heard and read of these newspaper knights, these paper soldiers who have been displaying so much activity and killing so many Germans with the pen, this is only another example. The gentlemen composing this Committee are busy men and yet they have given, and are giving, their time, both night and day, to forward the good work of recruiting, and they do not deserve adverse comment on their labours from those who are probably not contributing anything more than criticism.

Then too, the question of sending recruiting squads has had close attention ever since the Committee was formed and we have now on the way out from England some sixteen soldiers, who have been at the front, and are incapacitated from active service at the present moment They are coming out here and will associate themselves with the recruiting squad at the Armoury, who will be going around the country when the time is opportune. We are all ready to begin this campaign. There were resolutions passed at our first meeting and the members for the various districts sitting in this House received invitations, and they have all responded enthusiastically and have taken up the responsibility of arranging for this campaign, and have decided to give their best services in their respective districts. Now the Executive Committee appointed a sub-committee to meet the Hon. members of this House, and they have met on two or three

occasions; but the majority of the members representing the western portion of the Island decided that the present was not an opportune time to start any recruiting campaigns, because most of the young men west of Placentia Bay are at present engaged in the fishery; later, however, they will actively take up the matter with the recruiting squads that we have prepared. The members from the North will be ready in a few days. The members cannot leave the House at present to get to their Districts. Some of the Districts are not accessible; but every effort has been made and will continue to be made to carry out this campaign vigorously and successfully, and I think the efforts made by the gentlemen who compose the recruiting committee are worth something more than the incorrect statements that have been sent forth to the country in this morning's paper. As a matter of fact although the present Recruiting Committee has been only two months in existence, it has sent all over the country, to clergymen and school teachers, circulars and campaign literature, and also recruiting pictures and posters to every patriotic committee in every district. In every large centre in every district the work is going on, and within the last two months we have had four hundred recruits enlisted. This is a splendid showing. This number is as much as the officers can handle at the Armoury at one time. Of course we have not made any big public demonstration; but every day and every week the boys are coming in; and as regards the Naval Reserve, young men are joining the training ship every day. If any member happened to be on Water Street an hour ago he would see the splendid display of some 80 or 100 of the finest young men of the country marching up to the Dock. The Committee does not want praise, Mr. Speaker, but it is entitled to fair play.

The Bill was order to be engrossed, being entitled as above and to be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

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—Mr. Chairman: In introducing Supplemental Supply yesterday, I was asked for information by the Leader of the Opposition in reference to the vote under the head of Civil Government for Census Compiling, Printing and Binding. The particulars of that vote are as follows:—

Paid W.J.Martin, compiling..$	180.94
Paid J. W. Withers, Printing	3,690.00
Paid Dicks & Co., binding 1,000 copies at 80c. each..	800.00
Paid Dicks & Co., binding 500 copies at $1.50 each.....	750.00
	$5,420.94

The $4,400 for the Consolidation of Laws is made up as follows:—

Paid B. E. S. Dunfield, B.A...$	500.00
Paid Hon. C. H. Emerson, K.C.	500.00
Paid F. J. Morris, K.C.....	500.00
Paid Hon. M. P. Gibbs, K.C.	500.00
Paid Hon. R. A. Squires, K.C.	500.00
Paid Hon. D. Morison, K.C...	500.00
Paid Daily News, Printing...	900.00
	$4,400.00

I beg to table that information.

MR. COAKER—Is there any further claim on behalf of that Committee?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is a final payment in relation to the consolidation. It does not, of course, include the final revision.

MR. LLOYD—That is complete up to date?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The persons who will revise will, of course, have to be paid. It is not intended to appoint seven or eight to revise; that will be the work of one or two.

MR. LLOYD—The point is, that this is a payment up to date.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I understand the hon. member for Twillingate to ask whether that represented a payment on account of work which has been done, and I want to say that this is a payment in full.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—In regard to the information asked for in reference to the vote for Repairs to Public Buildings, there are no details. As is known, the work of repairing public buildings is generally done in the spring, and there is no money in hand to pay for it. The Department has asked for $7,000 to repair the Courthouses throughout the Island and other public buildings, the fence around the Barracks, Government House, etc. There are no details.

As to the vote under the head of Civil and Criminal Prosecutions—$3,000: the total vote is $6,000. This will bring it up to $9,000. Over $6,000 has already been spent. The Snowden case cost $3,200, and the King vs. Roberts and others has cost $3,500 to date. The Minister states that in the case of the King vs. Snowden the Department of Justice had to take into consideration the loss sustained by the witnesses and allow them more than the usual 75c. a day; and in the case of the King vs. Roberts, claims have been made for loss sustained by witnesses amounting to a very considerable sum. Generally witnesses are allowed 75c. a day as conduct money—the amount prescribed by law; but in the two cases mentioned, as well as in other cases, witnesses have been paid from $1 a day upwards, with board and lodging and travelling expenses.

Under Head V information has been asked in relation to the two votes: House of Assembly $4,801, and General Legislation, $1,645. I tabled the details. All the other votes were fully explained on yesterday.

ON VOTE FOR POLICE.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: Before that vote goes through I would like to enquire as to whether anything is being done in reference to the continual changes in the police force, apparently due to dissatisfaction in regard to salaries. It is a lamentable thing that it seems to be impossible, despite what has been done in the past, to keep this Force up to the standard at which it should be kept. I was under the impression, when the Pension Scheme passed through the House some time ago, that the police force would be put on good footing. I don't say that the scheme has not given satisfaction, but the general position seems to be unsatisfactory to the younger men, and it is impossible to keep the Force in good standing and this fact must have given disquietude not only to the Department, but to the Head of the Government. I rise now to enquire whether any enquiries have been made into this matter, and what is being done.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman. I wish to say in reply to the hon. member that there has been at all times a disposition to increase the salaries of the members of the police force, The subject has been brought to the attention of the government and of the Legislature during the the last three or four sessions. It was thought that the arrangement which was made in 1904 or 1905 would have been satisfactory, for the reason that prior to that time there was really nothing to induce a police-

man to remain in the Force; no matter how long he stayed there his salary was the same. The policeman had a fixed salary, the Acting Sergeant had a fixed salary, the Sergeant had a fixed salary, and so on. In 1904, when I was Attorney General at the Department of Justice, I took the whole matter up with the then Inspector General of Police,and we formulated a scheme and brought it down to the government (and it was afterwards ratified by the House) by which a policeman's salary kept on increasing until it reached I think five hundred dollars. In that way, while the juniors are only paid a small salary when they join, the salary of the man who remains in the Force is increasing every day. A man joins to-day with $300, and it is only a question of putting in years when he will find himself with a fairly good salary, having regard to what is paid other officials. Now you will find if you look at the Journal of 1903 that the ordinary policeman had a voted salary of $300 If you will look at the Estimates to-day you will find the classification. You will find that there are policemen getting as high as $500. Then he has other perquisites. I do not for a moment say that $500 a year is too much for a policeman, our men are good men as a rule, but there are numbers of men in the civil service paid less. I hope when the present financial stringency passes that the vote for the police may be considered and a deserving class of civil servants be fairly remunerated.

I can have a statement prepared for the information of the committee as to exactly what was earned last year by every member of the force, so that the House may understand exactly what the position is. The policeman who joins to-day gets $365; in addition to that he receives, of course, clothes, which probably bring his salary up to $400. That is the least salary any man receives; and then every day that he remains in the force, ipso facto his salary keeps on increasing—his salary grows all the time. In addition to that we provide a pension scheme. and generally, it was, I think—up to at least a year or two ago,—considered fairly satisfactory for the juniors;—I mean having regard to what is paid light-house keepers and many other persons in the public service. But of course the salaries are not up to what are paid in the municipalities of Canada and other places; but the difficulty here has been to find money for these services. We have a very fine body of men; they do their duty; and it would be well, of course, to consider increases in their salaries; and no doubt when the country assumes normal financial conditions again this matter will be taken up.

MR. LLOYD—I am glad to know that the Premier realizes the importance of this matter. Now the condition prevailing is undoubtedly unsatisfactory; it is unsatisfactory to the policemen and unsatisfactory to the public and is responsible for the constant changes in the force. The men leave the force because they are not satisfied. Constant changes mean a poor system of police work in the city; and one illustration of what I say may be found in the conditions recently obtaining in our midst—an organized system of burglary. Another difficulty at the present time is that old policemen who ought not to be on street duty are compelled to do service there—policemen who are too old for street work—too old to grapple with disturbers of the peace;and this is so because there are no young men to take up that duty. Such a predicament as that must necessarily call for attention. I rise this afternoon to emphasize these points, because I do not think they ought to be allowed to go without comment.

MR. COAKER—I do not think that a salary of $365 is sufficient compensation for men who perform the work of policemen, whether they are young men or not. I do not see why you should expect men to work for $365. You give them a suit of clothes each. That is alright. But what does it amount to? Why a common laborer gets $1.50 per day; and you expect to get policemen and have them at your beck and call, day and night, and be out in all weather, exposed to all conditions, and expect them to do it for $1.00 a day. They can get other employment more remunerative than that; they can join the volunteers and get $1.10 a day with clothes and food. Give them at least a decent wage. I cannot see how you can expect policemen to work, even at the beginning, for less than $1.50 per day. This is especially true about St. John's policemen. I do not advocate so much for the outport policemen—generally they are older men and well paid. But the young men are generally found in the city and must be content with $1 a day. Do not compel us to bring this matter up as it has been, year after year, but adjust the salaries. These men earn their salary just as efficiently as any in the civil service; and they are entitled to some consideration.

Another point I wish to deal with is in connection with the item: $500 paid the Herald for printing speeches. What did that include?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS — Speeches printed in pamphlet form to send throughout the Island, I suppose.

MR. COAKER—Another. item is $700 paid the Daily News for printing Hansard.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes.

MR. COAKER—When will we get last year's Hansard?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Two weeks from now.

MR. COAKER—When the House is closed. It is too bad that we should have to wait a year for the official report of the speeches delivered in this House.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, by reason of being one of the representatives of the city, I feel morally bound to say that I trust that the suggestion of the Prime Minister will bear fruit in the future and the claims of the policemen will be considered. I think we must admit that there was a considerable improvement made in this direction in 1904 when the Premier was Minister of Justice; yet, from 1904 to 1915 is a long period, during which time conditions of living have so changed that whilst the action of the Premier in 1904 meant improvement in the lot of the policemen then, yet the expenses of living and the general calls of everyday life are to-day of such a nature that the matter might again with much benefit be brought under consideration of the Government to see if—when the opportunity offers—the matter cannot be further improved. In my professional capacity I have had opportunities of being in contact with the police and can say sincerely that they are a very superior body of men; they are absolutely honest; efficient workers; and it is a remarkable fact that there never in the history of the police has been any case of acceptance of anything in the way of what is known outside as a "consideration." This is a remarkable tribute to the class of men who come from all sections and parts of the Island. It is an unheard of thing that any of our policemen have ever been "purchased." With that fine class of men, and knowing their efficient work, I trust that the day is not far distant when this matter will be considered in the spirit that the Prime Minister suggests. Unquestionably the wage is too low for these men to get; you cannot get

intelligent men at the salary paid the force now. It requires many qualifications to be a policeman. To join the force a man has to be intelligent, has to possess a discretion beyond the ordinary; it is not a mere matter of pitching anyone into the force—the very examination a man has to pass before he is admitted shows that—the man must have physique and he must have character; in a word he has all the qualities to enable him to make a living at any other calling. I think it will be found on exaamination that the scale of wages paid does not go up as high as present day conditions warrant, even as regards the older men. The perquisites they receive amount to nothing. In the run of the year, I do not believe a policeman gets more than $20 perquisites. The Prime Minister himself, from his greater knowledge of the competency of the force and of the conditions which surround every-day life now, realizes this, and he knows how times have changed since he made the improvement in police force conditions in 1904, and he is also able to appreciate better than most of us how much a further improvement is now worthy of consideration. I wish to add this little expression of appreciation of the good work of the force, in common with what has been said, and I trust that the Government will be able at an early date to give consideration to the suggestions that have been made, and which I am glad to see met with such ready response from the Prime Minister.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I wish to add my quota tc what has been said on the subject of increase in policemen's salaries. Our police, without doubt, represent one of the finest class of men we have, both physically and otherwise, and are a very superior type of man. Most of them come from the outports. I am aware of several from the district of Hr. Main who entered the force and after a short time in training became dissatisfied with the salaries and did not remain—they found better salaries and better opportunities in other directions. Now that we have the assurance of the Prime Minister, who, I feel sure, has the interest of these men at heart, I hope it will not be very long before improvement is noticeable in the salaries paid these officials. For a number of years past I have been in sympathy with these men feeling that their salaries were not adequate to enable them to live. The cost of living has gone up in leaps and bounds. Their salaries are not worth as much to-day as they were a few years ago. Both sides of the House seem in sympathy and all members desire to increase the salaries, for these men are essential to the peace and security of our city life.

MR. DWYER—As both sides of the House agree that the members of the Police Force are badly paid it is up to this House to bestow upon the matter their most earnest consideration, for there is a great deal of money spent in different ways not half as commendable as would be the raising of the salaries of the members of the Police Force in St. John's.

MR. TARGETT—It has always been a matter of great wonder to me why the salaries of these men have been so small especially when you take into consideration high cost of living at the present time. The fishermen some years get very much more money than other years, but these men receive the same small salaries from year to year, and I do not think they get as much as they ought to get. The Prime Minister ought certainly to be congratulated upon what he has done in the past, but the past is not sufficient for the present, and although improvements have been made every year no-

thing has been done as yet in this direction. We should take into consideration, as the Minister of Public Works, said, that they are a physically superior body of men and come from the outports. I do not mean to say that you cannot get good men in the city, but certainly the outport men are a splendid type. I can say this as I do not come from the Outports myself, for I was born in St. John's. I can hardly look these men in the face when I consider that I am a member of this House and how small their salaries are, and I always feel that I ought in some way to exert whatever influence I have in having the salaries of these men raised. Some of the men might, in the Outports, have their salaries raised a little in many places, and I trust the Government will take this matter into consideration, and I feel sure the Prime Minister will not let this matter drop as he has always shown the greatest interest in these things in the past.

MR. JENNINGS—I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that I have discovered in the public accounts in connection with the Penitentiary expenses, that a certain boot and shoe firm, in this City is credited with twelve pairs of boots supplied to that Institution which boots cost $209.76. May I ask what the explanation of this is? The other items are so worded that there is no chance of comparing prices, but boots at $17 per pair arrest my attention.

MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—This is a clerical error. I will furnish particulars to-morrow.

MR. LLOYD—I would like to know what was done about the recommendation made by the Select Committee taken from both sides of this House, in their report upon this Institution.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say for the information of the Hon. member that I am informed that all recommendations made by that Committee have since been carried out. I wrote the Board of Works some three weeks ago on this very same subject and asked if the report of the Select Committee of this House last year has been submitted to that Department. I was informed that the report had been received and all recommendations had been carried out.

MR. COAKER—I have made enquiry about the Penitentiary recommendations and was informed that very little had been carried out. I wish something definite from the Superintendent, Mr. Parsons, could be obtained, so that we would see what could be done. Could he not furnish some report.

I notice in the Contingencies that $275 was paid to the Superintendent for services as secretary of the Nomenclature Committee. Is that a usual charge?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE.—He put in this claim for certain work he did.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—That sum was voted by the Government to Mr. Parsons for services he performed on the Nomenclature Board for some years past. It was voted merely as a retainer. It is only a matter of $25.00 or $30.00 a year.

MR. LLOYD—I think after the statement made by the Member for Twillingate that as far as this House knows, conditions in that Institution may be in an unsatisfactory condition, and I would suggest that the Select Committee which was then in existence should be brought into existence again for the purpose of visiting the Penitentiary and finding if those recommendations have been carried out.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have not the slightest objection to that.

MR. LLOYD—I have been looking through the statements of payments in supplementary supplies and I find what to my mind are some very extraordinary items. Under the contingencies for the Legislative Council I find the Hon. Mr. Anderson's speech was printed, and a thousand copies made at a cost of $90.00. Surely this is very remotely connected with this House. Personally I know nothing about this speech, and I was not aware that it was of such national importance as to warrant its being printed to the extent of a thousand copies.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—There was a speech, I remember, but I forget exactly what it was about. I did not read it, but I remember that it was decided that a thousand copies should be distributed throughout the Island.

MR. CLIFT—What was the speech about?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—Ask Anderson.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will furnish full information next sitting.

MR. COAKER—There is one thing I would like to remark. I did not see Mr. Anderson's speech and certainly none came my way. What amuses me is the astute way the Leader of the Government acts when anything turns up, for we are always told that we only have to wait until to-morrow and we will get a full explanation. He has said this several times this session.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think you have been given every information you desired.

MR. COAKER—Oh yes, I only say this so that Members may appreciate your diplomacy more.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—You might copy a few leaves from the Premier's book.

MR. COAKER—That is certainly one of the leaves I might copy.

MR. GRIMES—I would like to ask the Premier what has been done about Dr. Rendell in reference to the sanitarium. I understand that he has asked that $10,000 be set aside for the purposes of building a Sanitarium to carry out the tuberculosis campaign.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I explained that fully the other day. You have at present in the Sanitarium a limited number of people from each of the electoral districts. At present the Government are considering the most expedient way to ameliorate the conditions prevailing in connection with tuberculosis.

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 asked leave to sit again.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BIILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 6, George V., Cap. 18, entitled: 'An Act respecting the Administration of Local Affairs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. LLOYD—We are prepared to accept one part of this, but not the whole.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The part to which my learned friend objects is the old law verbatim. (Reads.) The amendment now proposed is merely done to improve the working of the Act.

MR. COAKER—The object is to make every place operate its business under an elective board. You here leave a loop-hole by which under a

counter petition they can work under the old system.

MR. LLOYD—This is just where we join issue. We object strongly as in our opinion it would have the effect of ruining the Act.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman: I have only heard of three places in the District of Twillingate which did not avail of the Local Affairs Act and elect Boards, and considering that it was a new thing, I believe the work was done fairly well. In every case, except that of Twillingate. where the Magistrate was away at the time, the reason why the election was not held, was the indifference or defiant attitude of the Chairman of the old Board, and I think some clause should be embodied in the Act which will give these gentlemen to understand that they must carry out this law.

MR. COAKER—I strongly endorse the position of Dr. Lloyd, the Leader of the Opposition, and would recommend that if the people will not appoint a board that no road money be sent to them. We in the Northern Districts are entirely favourable, and all places without them should be made elect them at once. This has not happened in very many places, but the whole trouble is that the old Chairmen who have had the distribution of moneys for years, object to the money passing out of their hands, and I endorse what the Leader of the Opposition has said, and would recommend that no moneys be sent to any settlement until elected Boards are in operation.

MR. GRIMES—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the attention of the Government has been called to the fact that the majority of the members who have been elected as a road board have in some cases resigned. In the district to which I refer, quite a large number of people turned out to the election, and only two men remain on the board, four having resigned. The two members on the board and the people want to know how the vacancies are to be filled up. I think the Chairman of the Department of Public Works had his attention called to this matter, but I don't know if it came before the Government.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The Government has heard nothing, but I will have enquiries made and will get ful' particulars for the hon. member, and will see if any provision is necessary.

MR. JENNINGS—In the case quoted by Mr. Grimes, I should think these two would have the full power of the board just as if there were half a dozen.

MR. LLOYD—I know of one case where no board has been elected just because they wanted some person from outside to go and conduct the meeting. They would not attend if a local chairman presided. I would make them do without money until they get their board, and told them so.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Of course, those on the Select Committee will remember all these points were carefully considered last year, but it was considered that it would take some time to get the Act to work satisfactorily. It is not easy to apply all the conditions of this Act to small places. It will take some time but it will work out in time. The trouble is in the administration of repairs to roads and bridges; what can we do? We cannot let the bridges go down. There is a certain amount of responsibility to the public. These works must be continued.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: my reply to this is that the greater the number of bridges and streets to repair, the greater should be the willingness of the people to help the Board. If made responsible they will do the work satisfactorily. I think they ought

to get no money unless they are prepared to appoint and help the Board.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Why compel them?

MR LLOYD—Compel them for this reason, that if they do not manage their own affairs; if they won't manage their own affairs, it is not proper for us to manage them for them. The responsibility is theirs, and it is up to them to look after it. I am prepared to state that to every portion of the district which I represent here in this House.

MR. COAKER—In a great many cases, Boards were not elected not because the people did not want a Board, but because a meeting was not called. I had heard of no case like that quoted by the Leader of the Opposition, but even in that case it was only shown that what was wanted was fair play. All they wanted was the Magistrate to preside. I think the road moneys ought to be withheld from any district who won't elect their Boards. Set a date, and give them due notice that they must elect a Board before that time or surrender their road money.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: I would like to say one or two things in reference to this matter. In the district I have the honour to represent, the District of Harbour Grace, some settlements have not elected a road board, and as far as I can learn from my friend, Mr. Young, the reason is that they do not want any board other than the board that they have had. They are quite satisfied with the board. Now, I understand that this money is granted by the Government per capita to each district, and the general thought seems to be in some districts that the board is doing them, and robbing the moneys. This is the reason boards were asked for and received, and if the people do not think a new board is necessary why should we take the money when they are satisfied that the best use is being made of it. They are responsible for the money now just as much as the board, which I have no doubt has in many a case just as much ability as the board which might be elected. They look at this money as theirs, and say that they can spend it how they wish. I do not think it would be wise or proper to pass any such law as that which has been advocated here this afternoon. The hon. member for Twillingate said all the people wanted it. I believe they do and will ultimately accept it. I think we should be careful in this respect. We must remember the people are an independent people, and if they say "no" it is a determined "no."

MR. HALFYARD— I can appreciate the circumstances of the people. They have no money to spend, and why should they worry about spending it? What we should have in my opinion is the Local Affairs Act enforced in every place, and then there would be no trouble.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I would just like to point out that I referred in my remarks to Harbour Grace District and not to any place such as Bay Roberts. I would not have the idea spread about that I was referring in any such manner to Bay Roberts in this House.

It being now half past six, the Chairman left the Chair.

At eight o'clock the Chairman resumed the Chair.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman: I would like to say one or two things in relation to this Bill. As the House will remember, this Bill last year elicited a great deal of discussion,and rightly so, because of course, it was a beginning of something that we had not before in this country. The outports were to have the management of their own affairs like all other places. This bill, as the Prime

Minister has already said, was somewhat of an experiment for the outports, and the results have shown that these outports were not so anxious as we imagined to take unto themselves the management of local affairs. For the past fifty years we have had in the outports, and also in the city up to recent years, a board elected by the Board of Works on the recommendation of probably the best men in the districts. To appreciate what this means you have to take into consideration the educational standards in Newfoundland in that period. It was not easy even thirty years ago to get men in all the smallest settlements of the Island to take upon themselves the public position of Chairman of the Road Board. The men appointed were the best schooled men, and most intelligent, men of energy, men who thought little about themselves, and who were prepared to give their best attention to the important work for which they were responsible. Last year this Bill was first introduced. and passed, and anybody who has read the Bill will see, taking into consideration the circumstances, that it was rather drastic, as the Bill included so many things that were never contemplated by the people in the outports. It is not surprising that we find the introducer of the Bill this evening asking the House for time in order that the principles underlined in the first Bill should gradually come into operation. In my own district, and I know of other districts the same way, there are today not more than 25 per cent. of the boards elected by the people themselves. In my own district there are not 25 per cent. I can give instances in that district where the practice has been either for the Justice of the Peace or the Magistrate to call the meeting at the town hall or school house on the day appointed by the Government, but the people themselves did not act with that willingness which was anticipated. This measure, as has already been stated by the Prime Minister, will take time, and it will be unfair to the people, not in accord with the principle of the bill itself, that because this Bill becomes law, we must thrust it down into their mouths; we must thrust down into the mouths of the people that which they do not desire. You should rather talk about the legality of the Act, and must also take into consideration the conditions and the circumstances in relation to this measure and what it means.

Take the operation of the Act itself. Even though we have elected boards all over the country, you will find that another session and perhaps another House will be compelled to introduce amendments that will be no fault of the Bill itself. We give all the men of the districts the right of appointing the men who will spend their moneys, and they do so; but in connection with this we find that it is almost impossible to operate it. Take for instance, a place containing 15 to 25 public wharves The District gets $7,250 or something like that, and their portion of the allotment is $1,000. Now what is the good of this small allotment? There are wharves that will cost $3,000 and even more, and if every board that we have in any one district asks for public allocations,it will be found impossible to do anything whatsoever. Take the main road which passes through several settlements. It may be about 20 miles long. At one end there is a road board. Within eight miles there is another road board; within 3 miles there is another board, within 5 miles of that there is another. Now, under the Bill as it stands, it will be necessary for each of these sections to have some control of that road, as it goes through the settlement of each,and no doubt trouble will arise therefrom.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think

that the section objected to by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Twillingate ought not to be taken out because of the statements made by them. You will find as we go along and improve the Bill, and remove therefrom what ought not to be there, that this is quite in order. There ought to be no power given to any member in the House to deprive our people of what is called liberty; because it is just as much our duty not to give them what they do not want, as it is to keep from them what they ought to have. I think if the hon. gentlemen will study the whole question of local affairs of this country, and in connection with the Bill before the Chair, they will find that not fifty per cent. of the road boards of this country have been elected, and that not fifty per cent. of the people have taken advantage of the Bill. That being so, Sir, it would be unfair to press the question of local boards until the people have developed the question themselves. We can easily understand it in this Assembly; we fully appreciate the advantages that might accrue from such a Bill, but consider the circumstances under which this Bill must be operated. Because of this it will take probably some five or six years before we have a Bill which is not only suitable to the people of the outports, but will be equal in effectiveness to that which has been done by the local board system during the past fifty years.

Now in some localities it may be possible to carry out the provisions of the old bill. They may be able to take up their poor relief and everything in relation to public charges, but others will have to be dealt with otherwise for some years to come. I feel that if you consider the matter conscientiously, you will realize that it is too much to put into operation at the one time.

I could tell you, if I wished, the names of several Justices of the Peace, and one or two Magistrates, who could not quite understand certain sections of the Bill, so complex is it. I mention this just to show how difficult it is at first to work a measure like this, and I thnk it would be most unfair to carry out the idea put forward by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that if the people do not desire to have elections, if they do not desire to carry the responsibility, that they ought to be compelled to do so. I do not agree with that considering the circumstances. I can understand the learned speakers on the other side making the contention that the law is of such a character as to be easily understood, but I think it is most unfair to say that because they do not wish to take the advantages of that Act, that they ought to be compelled to do so.

Now, I remember some incidents that have come under my notice, which go to show that at least some of the boards are not what the hon. members on the other side would have us to believe. This was a road board election, with the Magistrate in the chair. He gave out the ordinary notice in the proper form at the proper time. The election was called for a certain day. The afternoon came, and the Magistrate was there with his clerk. Now there were about five or six hundred people in that settlement, but when the time arrived for the Magistrate to take the chair to conduct the elections, there were only two men from that town in the hall. One of these two men went on the street, he was asked to do so by the Magistrate, and called in another gentleman, and he became a member of the board. Now just think of the happy go lucky way in which that board was elected. Think of the chance that was taken. A man walking in the street, at the request of the

chairman, is made a member of the board. That is the board.

I might produce arguments galore, and other instances to show how the responsibility which was placed on the outports last year was made use of. There is one thing certain, and that is that fifty per cent of the people either did not appreciate, or did not believe the effectiveness of, the law placed in the Statute Book last session.

Now, I do not wish to be understood as talking against the Act at all, because I believe the Act of last year if it could be put in force would be a good one. I was in favour of public road board elections in principle; but am not pleased with what has taken place during the past year. We have discarded the men who have looked after these matters of money for the past half-century, who have been, as a general rule, men chosen from the best families of these settlements, and have placed their positions in jeopardy. A number of these men would not consent to nomination again, as they had already served their time on committees, and they therefore have been lost. I feel confident, however, that in the course of a few years, we will have on the Statute Book a law in this connection which will be perfectly workable.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I had no idea that the debate on this Bill would take the course it has. I did not think it was of a contentious nature. But we gather from the remarks made by the member who has just spoken from the Government side of the House, that in his opinion this Bill is not as workable as many thought it would be. It is patent to everybody that the expenditures of public moneys in the past have not been right at all times. The object of this Bill is to give the control of all ordinary grants to the elective road board which will be responsible for the right expenditure of same. I believe in that principle; I believe that the men of the different localities should take that view of the matter, and should do everything to enforce the principles of this Act. Mr. Devereaux, the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's said that the outports were not so anxious for elective boards as some had imagined. As far as the North is concerned, they were very anxious to take advantage of it, and I think at least 95 per cent. of the places North have elective road boards. In the most extern parts of Fogo District they have them, and are satisfied. I think the hon. gentleman said it was a matter of education. Well I have to congratulate Fogo District on being educated in this particular. I hope they will continue to take an interest in their own affairs as has been proven by their action on the 16th of December last, in the election of their own boards.

I am very sorry for the other sections of the country who did not take advantage of this Bill and were not public-spirited enough to elect their own boards to take charge of their own affairs. The hon. member said that they had the very best men that could be procured as members of the road boards. I do not know that anyone questions that; they may have been the very best men—in some cases the very best men for their own interests; but we know that in certain places that public moneys were not spent to the best advantage. What about grants when you had surplus revenues? If you had elective road boards then and all the surplus grants were spent in improvements —being sent to the road boards, and these boards having to give returns annually and have them posted up for public information—do you think we would be asking so many questions from this side of the House to find out how hundreds and even

thousands of dollars that were sent out and no returns made, were spent? The public did not know how it was spent or where it was sent. If the people to whom grants were sent had to give returns so that anyone in the locality would have an opportunity of looking at the posted list of expenditures, do you think you would have the condition of affairs that existed then? That was one of the principal reasons why this Local Affairs Act was put on the Statute Books, so that the people would know how the money was spent. The hon. member said: "we have discarded the people whc have protected expenditures of public moneys for the past number of years." I would inform the hon. member and this House, that we can produce returns that will show that money was not wisely spent,—that the money was not protected. Money was granted and given to people who did not do a day's work for it. In some cases the names of men were put on the returns and sent to the Auditor General, and when the men were told that their names were on those returns they wondered why their names were there. They said they received the money but did not work for it. We can give you proofs of this. Then you say this Bill is not workable. No difference what bill is brought before the House you will have some features of it which appear unworkable.

You will not have any organized family grants under this Act. This Act is for the control and management of local affairs within the limits of certain areas of this Colony, defined in manner hereinafter described—the management to be vested in elective road boards hereinafter referred to as "the boards." It is local boards I am talking about, and you do not mean to intimate that it is alright for family grants to be sent out as usual to individuals, and no returns given for the same.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I have never heard of family grants except through you.

MR. HALFYARD—I heave heard of too many. Do you not think it would be a good thing if all public moneys should be spent under supervision of publicly elected road boards, and that those boards give an account of all expenditures. It would do away with a lot of waste of money. The statements I make can be proven. It is unnecessary to cite cases wherc money has been spent and no proper return for it; the people of the place did not know that anyone had received the money. I am rather surprised, Mr. Chairman, that any member of the House would in any way defend the old system of spending moneys. If there are people in any section of the country who do not properly understand this Bill, I think they should be educated up to the point so that every feature of this Bill would be brought to their notice, and they should be encouraged, so that eventually they would have elective road boards. It is not my intention to delay the Committee, and I think, in spite of the remarks that have been offered by the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's that in his own heart he believes, and I think that he has admitted, that this Bill will be of great benefit to the Colony if once brought into working order. You cannot expect everything at one time. You should encourage the people in those sections—you say there are only fifty per cent. of the country with elective road boards,—well I think that in connection with the carrying out of your onerous duties in your going around the Districts on your official business as Commissioner of Agriculture, that you should try and educate the people in these parts, let them know the benefits they will receive by accepting the provis-

ions of this Bill, and encourage them to have elective boards.

MR. LLOYD—I rise merely to correct some wrong impressions that may have arisen from the remarks of the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's in reference to his statement that fifty per cent. of the people of Newfoundland have taken no advantage of this Act. I do not know whether his figures are correct, or on what basis they are formed, but I can assure the hon. member that his statement is not correct in reference to the Northern Districts of this Island. So far as Trinity Bay is concerned there are only one or two sections, or at any rate very few sections, and small sections at that, which have not taken advantage of the Act. I am informed also in reference to Fogo that practically all the district has taken advantage of the Bill. In Bonavista practically the whole district has done similarly. The same may be said of Twillingate. If his remarks are correct in reference to Placentia, an average for the whole Island cannot be struck from results seen there. So far as we are concerned we wish no encouragement to be given to any small section of the North to go back to the old objectionable system of nominated road boards.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman: I think the learned doctor will find that I am not very far out when I make that statement that not fifty per cent of the people of the Island have taken advantage of the Act. I am not accustomed to referring to the North or South when I make a statement like that; I have no desire to cast a reflection on one part of the Island or on another. Anyone that knows me, and takes the trouble to hear what I say in this House, or who reads my speeches, will never see any such expression as "North" and "South" used in the sense referred to. Why should there be any North or any South in such a question as this, or indeed why should there be any division of the Colony at all? I made a broad statement, which I believe, that not fifty per cent. of the people took advantage of that Bill. That is all; and now you want to accentuate it, as the honourable member for Fogo also did, that the North has not followed the example of other districts. I do not doubt your statement about the Northern districts, but where is the necessity when we are talking about a broad principle that is spread over the whole Colony, and that ought to be as effective in the North as in the South? There should not be continued reference to an expression that gives the idea of division in the country over a measure that comes up in this House. I do not challenge the learned doctor's statement when he says that the North has taken advantage of the Act, because I do not know anything to the contrary, and I accept it when he says it is so. But I was not talking about the North particularly; I merely stated that fifty per cent of the people of the Colony did not take advantage of the Act.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I assert again the position I rose to assert before. The hon. member referred to the whole Island. Referring to the whole Island, I was perfectly justified in pointing out that so far as this side of the House was concerned the statement of the hon. member was not correct. The North is the part of the Island that I was referring to. I do not take back what I said. I have no wish to accentuate it, but I am not going to allow the hon. member's statement to go broadcast as true, while it is not true of Trinity Bay or of the other districts which I, with my colleagues on this side of the House, have the honour to represent.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I accept your statement as regards the North.

MR. LLOYD—My point is that if the North to the extent of 90% accepted the Bill and that covers a large section of the outport constituencies, there must be a remarkably small section of the rest of the Island that accepted it.

MR. DEVEREAUX—It looks that way. Do you call all Conception Bay North? One might include it from your expressions.

MR. LLOYD—Oh no.

MR. DEVEREAUX—You mentioned three districts.

MR. LLOYD—I mentioned four districts, and these four take ten men out of thirty representatives, and they are 90% in favor of the Bill.

MR. DEVEREAUX—But even so, you have eighteen districts in the colony—you specifically name four.

MR. LLOYD—I named the districts represented by ten men and there are six other hon. members representing two sctions to which this bill does not apply; so that you have the position that the other parts of the Island must have been extremely slack in taking advantage of this Bill; and I should like to see the figures on which the statement of the hon. member is based.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I hope to be able to show it to you to-morrow.

MR. COAKER—The object of the Bill now before the Committee is to make last year's bill more workable. Last year's Bill was a Government measure and passed the House unanimously. Must we infer from the remarks of the hon. member for Placentia that he does not approve of the Government measure passed last year. How is it that we did not hear of those objections last year when the Bill was before the House? He states that his District do not want the Bill, I disagree with him, I feel sure that even in his District the people demand elected Road Boards, and if an opportunity was given them elected Road Boards would be elected all over the District. The trouble is that a few of the old Chairmen who are supporters of the Government want to hold on to the expenditure of public moneys and they refuse to call meetings in order to permit the people to elect their own Boards. They stand in the way of the people establishing Road Boards, but the people as a body demand elected Road Boards. In the Northern Districts fully 95% of the places have availed of the Act to elect their own Boards, the other 5% where no Boards exist were debarred because of the neglect of the Chairmen who refused to call a meeting. Even in Conception Bay 90% of the settlements have elected Boards under last year's act. Bay de Verde, Carbonear, Hr. Grace, Port de Grave and Hr. Main, all those Districts have 90% elected Road Boards.

With regard to the Grants, no one suggested that the Marine or main line grants should be divided amongst the Boards according to population. The allocation of those grants is left entirely to the member of the District who will allocate them according to Petitions coming in from the Districts and according to the most convenient way of expending the main line grant which will be allocated to the various Boards through which the main line runs. With regard to interfering with the liberty of the people as stated by Mr. Devereaux, this Act insures the people perfect freedom and liberty to expand their own moneys and elect their own Boards with which no one can interfere. Moneys in the past have been spent anyway and every way. In one District the District of Bay de Verde in 1913 $4,500 was allocated by the Board of Works Department, mostly in $10, $15 and $20 allotments, out of this amount no returns have been sent in for $1,300.00, because the men who received the amounts were ashamed to

send in returns having performed no work for the same.

There are many reasons why elected Road Boards should be established. I know of no reason why they should not be established. I see no reason why this discussion this evening should have taken the course it has, and the evils complained of are but the imaginations of the member for Placentia. The Prime Minister this afternoon who is in charge of this Bill consented to allow the Clause in despute to lay over for further consideration, that being so, there is no justification for the discussion which has taken place to-night.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.— There is a slight amendment to section 5. We are adding the procedure in the Election Act with reference to corrupt practices and their prevention, with certain modifications. The words "in so far as can be operated" must be added to the section. I do not apprehend that this section is likely ever to be invoked, but it may possibly some day arise in the larger settlements, and then it may be well to have some procedure, and it would take a great deal of working out to get an entirely new procedure. For this reason it was thought best to make adaptation from the election act.

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 motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

MARRIAGE FACILITY 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 Facilitate the Marriage between British subjects residing in Newfoundland and British subjects in the United Kingdom."

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.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

MUNICIPAL COUNCIL BILL.

Second reading of Municipal Council bill.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker: I desire to move the second reading of the St. John's Municipal Bill, and to ask the House to assent to the second reading on the understanding that none of the principles contained therein are in any way assented to or agreed upon. I propose with the consent of the House,to refer the bill to a Joint Select Committee from both branches of this legislature. This Bill has recently been submitted to the Government as the outcome of the work and labour of the City Commissioners. There are a great many principles in this Bill which will require a great deal of thought, a great deal of study, and a great deal of consideration. There are many principles in this Bill which I think will not be assented to by members of this Legislature, but at the same time it is neither fair nor just that we should hastily pass any opinion on these matters until we have bestowed upon it every thought and consideration.

On the second reading of this Bill, I do not propose to delay the House by going into any detail in relation to the four hundred sections which the Bill contains. It is a consolidation of the laws in relation to the muni-

cipal affairs of St. John's, and in addition to the old laws a vast amount of new matter, and many new principles have been introduced, but I think I may be pardoned for a few moments if I refer, in a general way, to the growth of municipal government in this town. Going back to 1888, we find that prior to that date we had no municipal government in St. John's of any sort until the Bill introduced that year under the Thorburn Administration which was, I may remark incidentally. the outcome of a largely signed petition by the people of St. John's in connection with Municipal affairs. Up to that time our local affairs were under the control of the Board of Works, and with the exception of our roads and bridges and some slight sanitary mat ters that were attended to by the Board of Works and the matter of the Fire Department which was under the control of what was known as the Directors of the Water Company, we had no municipal government. In 1888 we had our first election, and well I remember the studied and bitter hostility there was to the new municipal proposals. Property owners here thought their property would be confiscated, that a certain class of men would get hold of affairs in this city, and that unbearable taxation must result from the new state of things. But what was the result? The men who have filled the office of councillors, who from time to time have been elected by the people, have been more than conservative as regards the taxation of the rate payer, and in the performance of their duties. In 1888 we had practically no civil services, but today we can point to our excellent water supply, our fair sanitary system, our first class fire department, our parks, and numerous other advantages as a result of that municipal experiment. Only those who can remember the condition of the town of St. John's previous to 1888 can form any opinion to-night on the advance that has been made. I say then that we all owe a great deal to the Municipal Councillors as well as the Government appointees who deserve our praise for the splendid labour they have accomplished. It has at times been a thankless position, because they have come in for their share of drubbing in the press, and otherwise. Good work was done by the pioneers of civic reform, when we remember that back in 1888 the whole annual income of the Municipal Council was about $60,000 or $70,000, whereas today we have an income of something in the neighbourhood of $220,000, which sum enables us to have the advantages which as citizens we now enjoy.

Two years ago the citizens here in St. John's thought that they would like to make another experiment to see if our municipal affairs could not be still further improved, and in due course a petition was presented to the Government signed by some three thousand rate payers asking that the Municipal Government might be suspended, and that Commissioners should be appointed in order to make enquiries into civic affairs. An Act in pursuance thereof was passed. The Commissioners were appointed, and we have their work to-night in the form of this Bill. It devolves upon us representing the people as to how far we are prepared to assent to the proposals made in this Bill.

Now, I have gone over the Bill myself very fully, and studied every section of it, but I must confess that there are certain portions of it to which I would very unwillingly give my consent. I do not, however, desire to delay the House by going into the matter in great detail, as ample time when before the Select Committee will be afforded to all, but before

asking the House to pass the second reading of the Bill, I would like to refer to a half-dozen of the principal alterations and suggestions.

In the first place, it is proposed to alter the franchise, that is the voting power, and to add to the voters' list ladies who have property within the Municipality. Personally, I have no objection to that. I see no reason why any person, male or female, should not have the right to vote if they have the property qualification. It is also proposed to increase the voters' list by having a poll tax, by providing that all those who do not pay in taxes to-day shall pay a poll tax of $2 per head. Of course, this is on the assumption that there are people in the city who pay no taxes. That is a matter of opinion, and it will be for the House to consider whether there is any such person. The old idea of municipal taxation was in the main the payment of a tax for water and sewerage. taxes. But I contend that you get value for value; when you pay for water and sewerage, you get a quid pro quo. Why should we be supplied with water,and sewerage, and have a vehicle call at our house every morning for garbage, and have this free? What we pay for this service is only one-tenth of what it costs and of the amount we would have to pay if we attended to the matters ourself. I think that it can hardly be called paying taxes. When a man pays for his milk he is not paying a tax. He is not paying a tax when he buys butter or bread. There is no reason in the world why he should get water free. The name of tax is a misnomer and is incorrect in the ordinary acceptation of the term. We get more value for our money in water and sewerage than any other of our needs. I know cases where the people are assessed at three dollars a year or perhaps five dollars, which amounts to a little more than a cent a day, and for this inconsiderable payment they get water, sewerage and garbage removal daily. It is contended that there are certain persons who pay for these services, and that there are others who pay nothing at all. A man who has an office has to buy coal, upon which he pays a tax of something like seven dollars a year if he consumes ten tons of coal. Is not this a tax? Every person is a tax payer under the general revenue of the city. It is necessary to keep this fact in view. The Municipal Council today collects about sixty thousand dollars as a water and sewerage tax, and about one hundred and fifty thousand dollars from the general public in all sorts of direct and indirect taxes, such as coal, road grants, grants for the general revenue for streets, lighting, fire department, city franchise, insurance and other companies Crown Lands etc. All the citizens through these sources contribute taxation to the revenue of the city.

Now the next provision that is suggested is the taxation on owners or occupiers of houses. In the past the principle that the Municipal Council has gone on is to take the rental of a house, so much per cent. for water, and so much per cent. for sewerage. That principle has obtained for years. This percentage was charged on the ordinary rental of the house, the rental which would be obtained if you were renting the house. Now it is proposed that a system should be substituted, and that the amount of taxation should be arrived at by ascertaining the cost of the house. The tenant of the small house, the house that costs least, would pay at the rate of 10 per cent., and the more expensive houses at the rate of 7 per cent. That will work out in favor of the present revenue of the city by obtaining a higher rate from the more valuable property. Take a case in point. Take a house on Circular Road that cost $30,000. The estimated rental of that

house to-day for assessment would be about $1,000 per year. Take one on King's Bridge Road, houses the class of Mr. Harvey, Mr. Outerbridge or the late Mr. Pitts', costing $25,000 or $30,000. Under the old system they would have been taxed at the rental of about $1,000 per year. Now it is proposed that they be taxed on their cost, at the rate of about 7 per cent., and the house that cost $30,000 at 7 per cent. will be taxed as at a rental of $2,100, and the smaller ones at 10 per cent. A house costing $50,000 will be taxed at $3,500 per year, so that in that way larger revenue will come to the city from the expensive house. As to whether this principle is sound or not is a matter, however, that will have to be considered.

Now as regards the constitution of the Council. Under the old law they were elected and held office for four years. It is now proposed to have a continuous council, that is, say three councillors and the mayor will continue for four years, and the three councillors obtaining less votes on the other hand will retire at the end of two years, and in that way old councillors will remain on the board. It is considered in the interest of the city that two or three councillors should remain on the Board who would have complete knowledge and not have an entirely new council at any time.

Then there is the principle proposed in relation to buying out of the landlords by tenants. It is a principle applied to two classes. In the first place the bill proposes that in all future leases there will be implied a covenant providing that the tenant can buy out at twenty years rental. In other words, if this becomes law, any tenant may buy out from his landlord by paying twenty years' rent, and in relation to existing leases it is provided that extensions may take place or purchase out. I mention this to show that these are far-reaching provisions, and have a great deal to be said in their favour.

Now there are other sections in the bill which are also very important. Take, for instance, the provision re side walks and streets. A provision is found in the bill by which owners of property that abut on the side walks will pay the cost of that sidewalk. In other words, when the Council constructs a sidewalk, the houses or property abutting on that street are to be taxed for one-half the cost of it. Then as regards the street itself, if the Council lays down a tarvia or concrete or wood pavement, under this bill the property-owners along that road must pay half the cost, and the city the balance. Then there is a very important principle dealing with future development of the city. In the old days when a man had a field or a piece of ground, he cut a road through it, and allowed persons to build on it, with the result that the city grew without any control. They had to pay nothing, and as a result not only was the city disfigured, but it became dangerous for the people to live there, as there was no sewerage, sidewalk or water, etc. This bill provides that in future no person shall be allowed to build except on the street dedicated by the council as a street of the city, and no house will be allowed to be built thereon, until the expense of making the street and sidewalks has been paid by the owner of the land. In the past the Council laid down the street line, and paid the owner for the portion of his land through which the street ran. A man had a small field, one or two acres, about sufficient to feed a cow, and worth about $20 or $30 per year rental. The Council opens the street through his field and the owner gets

$1,000 or $2,000 per year income. The land has increased in value with the installation of water and sewerage, with the result that in a short time the owner reaps a large income at the expense of the city. Now, the Council proposes that in future the city will be a partner in that development, and if a man wants a street run through his property the council will lay it and make sidewalks, and give sewerage and light at their own expense, but when the property becomes a source of revenue, the owner will have to pay for the improvements which made his land so much more valuable.

Now in relation to the internal affairs of the Council several important changes are proposed. It is proposed to confer on the Secretary-Treasurer very large powers indeed. I need not go into detail now, because this matter will be thrashed out before the committee; and further, in relation to other offices in connection with the administration of the city. Further, there is a distinction drawn between city officers. Some will have to be appointed annually. What this is for I do not know, but the Bill proposes it. Certain of the high officials will have their appointments for life.

Then there is another clause and an important one, dealing with the employment of labor, in which it is proposed that the members of the Council will have no say or no control over the employment of labor or over the dismissal of men employed from time to time.

Now, there are one or two other matters to which I desire to draw attention. Power is asked for by the Council to deal with pensions. In the past there has been no system of pension in connection with officials of the Council, and now they propose that the officials should be pensioned and that the various employees of the Council should have a tax on their salary of four per cent., in order to create a pension fund. That is another matter that will have to be considered because these officials have in the past had no such agreement, and it might be unfair to call on them to pay any portion of their present salary in order to create a pension fund.

There are a number of other sections in the bill of an important character that will have to be carefully considered, and it is for that reason that I consider it best to ask that the Bill be sent to a Select Committee, and ask the Upper Chamber to adopt this course also and appoint a Committee to co-operate with this Committee. In this way it may be possible to adopt the good portions of this measure without very much debate in this Chamber, as it would probably take us from now until the middle of May before we could get to any conclusion in relation to the Bill if no such system was adopted. The Committee will have to go through the Bill carefully, studying the various sections, some of which will require extra examination.

Under these circumstances I would move that the bill be read a second time, and that it be referred to a Select Committee of this House, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council asking them to appoint a committee to co-operate with this one.

MR. LLOYD—I rise Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of seconding the motion for the second reading of this bill, and for its reference to a select committee of both Houses. In doing so I also accept the reservations that have been made by the leader of the government in reference to the many principles of the bill. Some of these many principles I very strongly object to, in fact so much so that only

after careful consideration in reference to the desire to close the House early do I agree to have it referred to a joint select committee. If time allowed I would much prefer that it be dealt with by a select committee of this House because certain rights are touched upon, the protection of which ought to be the prerogative of this House. We in this House stand for the principle that places popular government at the head of all free institutions. Now this charter, as it has been called involves that principle, and in that respect I strongly object to it, and object to the embodiment in it of distrust of public opinion and public elected boards. Were this bill to go through in its present form it would establish commissions in the City Council practically immoveable, and outside of popular control, either of the electors or the Council. That Sir, I think this Chamber cannot stand for. I need not enlarge further on that, but that is the main principle which to my mind is most objectionable. It is distrust of the electors in the first place, and the elective body in the second place. It practically means that we have no trust for and cannot trust the electors and cannot trust those we put on the Council. This I think Sir, will have to be removed or substantially changed.

We have no faith in Commission Government, no great faith; and this is one of the reasons for our objections. My reasons for supporting the motion are that I think the select committee can take from it its excellent features and discard the rest, I think there is an excellent principle in reference to land holders having the right in future of purchasing the land on which they have built their houses or shops or stores. I think it is also an excellent principle that in existing leases where a tenant may put up buildings on leased land that he will have the right of purchasing same. He should also have the right to obtain an extension of his term. I recognize the fact mentioned by the Prime Minister in reference to the system of rental values, if they are reckoned at 7 per cent of cost on the expensive class and 10 per cent on the others, the poorer class will give a far larger income because their tax is heavier. I do not think this principle should be accepted. I think there ought to be the same treatment to all.

A person spends $50,000 in building small houses or tenements, he will have to pay more taxes than if he built one large and luxurious house for himself. I have no doubt that that matter will have the especial attention of the Committee.

I also think that the bill does not go much out of the way in calling upon property and land owners to pay for improvements to their own property When a street is put through and a sidewalk and other additions made, that property has increased in value, and in the end a bigger rental is obtained, and therefore it is only fair to charge up the property with the public expenditure which made it the more valuable. Even so, landlords are now only called upon to pay one half. Now the English law I think goes further still. If a street is paved or the sidewalk paved, the property on either side is called upon to pay it all. That is the house on both sides pay half the cost each, or the whole cost altogether, and the city consequently pays nothing. For this reason I think this is only fair, and not onerous for land owners or landlords, to be charged one half this cost.

Now there is another principle found in the bill, and that is the principle that we call in England the Compound tax; that is that tenants enter the house and pay the rental, while all the collections are made from the landlord; and I agree with it provid-

ing we have some tribunal and some manner of making arrangements with the landlord in the event of finding that he has been called on to pay more than his fair share. There should be some tribunal to which he can apply

Now Sir, it is not necessary for me at this late hour to go into further detail than I have done to indicate that there are some excellent principles in the Bill and there are some principles that are extremely objectionable and ought to be removed. I think in the interests of popular government, in the interests of those who hope for a development of popular government, it is essential that there should be taken out of this bill everything which is a stigma on popular government; that when a council is appointed that Council should be brave and plucky enough to undertake the full responsibilities of the office and they should not be relieved of these responsibilities; that while the City Engineer, Secretary, or Sanitary Supervisor may be given large powers in reference to the employment or dismissal of labor, that the master who controls it all should not be the Mayor or any councillor, but the council as a body. I agree with the bill when it forbids the Mayor or individual Councillors to interfere with the exercise of the powers just referred to, but I disagree totally with that principle which excludes interference by Council. The Council as a corporate body ought to interfere and ought to control, or it is not fit to be there at all. If you cannot trust the council, then do away with it; put a mandarin there, and have a Czar at the head of the institution. Now, Sir, I have, I think, indicated sufficiently my views of all the points that should be dealt with. I think a Select Committee should go into the question thoroughly retain what it thinks advisable in the Bill, and reject what should not be tolerated by this House.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion that this Bill be read a second time and referred to a Select Committee; and in doing so I would like to endorse in a large measure the sentiments expressed by the Rt. Hon. the Premier, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, in respect to the Bill we are now considering. Two years ago the citizens of St. John's forwarded a petition to this House asking us to suspend the Bill providing for an elective council and in their stead to appoint a board of commissioners whose duty it would be to enquire into and suggest an improved form of civic government. I felt that there was no option left me, as a representative of the citizens of St. John's, but to support that petition. This House unanimously decided that it was worth the experiment, and was a step in the right direction. A Board of Commissioners was subsequently appointed, and I think claim can be made that that Board of Commissioners was as representative, as intelligent, and as reliable a board of citizens as it was possible to procure. They were appointed in the first place for one year to administer the affairs of the city during that time, and whilst doing so they were supposed to prepare what is known as a charter for the future government of St. John's. Last year when we met we found that the commissioners, owing to the magnitude of the work in hand in preparing the charter, were unable to finally report to this Legislature, and this Legislature decided that they would continue them for another year of office. Now, sir, I would like to pay a tribute to the industry and interest and hard work that that board put in during their two years of office. They are all busy men,

with a great deal of responsibility in business life and in the commercial world, and I must say that the city of St. John's should at least express appreciation of the efficiency and industry displayed by these gentlemen in carrying out their work. Whilst I do not admit that the report that they have sent in is all that we would desire, yet I am like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he said that there were many admirable features in the Bill. On the other hand, there are some features about the Bill that I most strongly and strenuously object to; but I am not going to go into details to-night, Mr. Speaker. at this late hour, but when we are in Committee on this Bill after the Select Committee reports back, we shall have an opportunity to discuss it in greater detail. I have some knowledge of what municipal government in St. John's is; II spent four years there and I know what the shortcomings of governments of the city have been in the past, and I know something of the difficulties that Councillors have to contend with; and for that reason I will welcome any advance towards perfection in our municipal government. It is not always sunshiny weather in municipal surroundings. Municipal Councils have been criticized in the past and I suppose Municipal Councils in the future while they exist will be criticised adversely, whilst really under the conditions under which they worked they were doing the best that could be done. But, Mr. Speaker I am glad to know that interest in civic affairs seems to be awakening,because I think in the past the worst feature of our muncipal government was the individual indifference of the citizens of St. John's especially of those who had large interests in the city in relation to municipal matters. Why in the past whilst some municipal elections were being held some of our leading citizens would hardly know elections were going on, while at the same time men were being elected to manage these people's personal affairs as far as their city and similar interests were concerned. I think there is one feature about this movement that we can feel thankful for and that is an awakening of public sentiment with regard to our civic matters; and this Bill that is now before the House is a long stride in the direction of reform. A great deal can be accomplished; a great deal of good is in sight; and it will depend greatly on how this Legislature treats that measure. Therefore I think Mr. Speaker that it behoves us, everyone of us, especially those who are directly interested in the affairs of the city, particularly we who have the honor to represent the city in this House, that no undue haste should be allowed or permitted in putting such a measure through this Assembly or through the Legislature, but that the effects of every clause contained therein should be seriously considered and deliberated over. It took the Board of Commissioners two years with a great deal of research, industry and very close attention, to formulate the measure that we are now considering this evening, and if it took these gentlemen two years to lay that bill before us, surely it cannot be expected that we should in the space of two or three days or in fact two or three weeks be able to give that measure the consideration its importance merits. I trust, Mr. Speaker that the Select Committee will be allowed ample opportunity and time to fully consider every section of that Bill; to consider the desirability of changes; to consider the effect on the tax-payer, on the city; and to consider whether we should practically revolutionize the whole machinery of

civic government,—because in a great measure it aims to revolutionize. Whilst I appreciate that it will be very difficult indeed to formulate any charter, or any constitution that will be perfect in its working, still at the same time we should tread warily and not make undue haste in adopting some features of this Bill, which, as has been pointed out this evening, would abrogate the rights of the citizens and set up a condition of affairs that should not be tolerated in any self-respecting community. In every city, at least on this side of the Atlantic which one may visit, one can see marked advances, marked improvements taking place, and can note the close attention that is being paid to health doctrines and the cleanliness of the places generally. You notice streets are widened and cleaned up, and paved, and otherwise made fit for human habitation. The people are awakening to the fact that for those who live in the city,that that is their home, that is where they have to spend their lives and rear their families and there is enlightening all around and the people are appreciating the fact that once a man takes an interest in his own home and endeavors to make it more comfortable, more happy, and more beautiful, the same feeling is going to manifest itself in regards to the city where he lives; and that is the condition that I hope will emanate from the movement now on foot here and the interest that is being taken by the people generally in civic affairs. I therefore hope that when the Select Committee meets it will give every feature of this Bill the consideration it deserves and which its importance merits so that when it comes back we shall have a measure placed on our statute books entirely in the interests of the city and something in advance of what has been in existence in the past in this place.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker. I do not think—particularly in view of what has been said this evening and because of the motion now before the House,—that anything should be said further on this subject. I merely rise to speak in the spirit in which the Colonial Secretary has spoken because as a representative of the city I feel that I should at least be heard in the discussion of a measure that so materially affects my constituency. I have pleasure in supporting the motion and concur in its sentiments that this bill be read a second time and then referred to a Select Committee of this House for consideration and report.

There is very much in the Bill that is admirable, there is much in it that requires consideration; there is some of it that cannot be accepted and with that general statement as to how the Bill presents itself to me and bearing in mind the fact that it is going to a Select Committee and the further fact that there is a Citizens' Committee considering the matter at this period I shall confine myself to the acceptance of the second reading of the Bill and the spirit of the reservations that have been made by other speakers who have preceded me.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Bill was ordered to be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. J. R. Bennett, Hon. M. P. Cashin, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. M J Kennedy, Mr Higgins, Mr. Clift, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Lloyd.

And it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that body to appoint a Committee to confer with the Committee from the House of Assembly respecting the said Bill.

PATENTS BIILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Lloyd the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 109 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland entitled "Of Patents," was read a second time.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Bill was ordered to be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Mr. Emerson, Mr. F. J. Morris, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Clift, Mr. Lloyd, and Mr. Clapp.

RE PAY TO SICK SOLDIERS.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House and in doing so I would like to refer to the matter that was before the House in relation to the Soldiers of the Regiment who were in Hospital. I promised the House yesterday that I would communicate with the Record Office and find out what was the position in relation to this matter and I received a message from Captain Timewell today which I will read to the House: "Regulations preclude men from having money while in hospital. Arrangements are made through the War Office for men to draw money from Mediterranean army paymasters, such being evidenced by frequent refunds by this office. No refusals to men in credit have been made by this office. Men discharged from hospitals in Great Britain are paid by this office until they join the depot. Frequent cases occur of men with large allottments becoming short of money and cabling to relatives. Suggest you quote concrete case for investigation." I think that explains the position. The King's Regulations preclude the payment of money to men while in hospital. Men who were with the Mediterranean Expeditionary Forces draw money through the Mediterranean Army Pay Office, and a refund is made by Regimental Pay Office. There have been no refusals of money to men who are in credit in the Office in London. There are cases of men who made large allottments to their friends here and they send telegrams out to the people here to forward the money. They have done this for the purpose of having the money here for their use when they call for it as for instance when they are on furlough. That money belongs to themselves. These men may not have money at the Record Office. If the hon. member who introduced the matter into the House wishes me to quote the case to which he referred and to have it investigated, I shall do so.

MR. COAKER—I have no objections to do that.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I also saw Captain Montgomery to-day and he showed me the King's Regulations and pointed out a circular issued since the War broke out and in it was specifically stated that men in hospitals are not to receive any money. If they require anything out of the ordinary provision made for them, the Medical Officer in charge will provide it and he will keep an account against the Regiment and a refund will be made. On their discharge from hospital they are given one pound (£1) and a passage is provided them back to the unit to which they belong. I hope this explanation will satisfy hon. members that the point has been covered.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, All the satisfaction that the reply of the Hon. Colonial Secretary gives is that it is the King's Regulations. It does not cover the fact that there is a grievance. It is practically an admission that there is a grievance because it simply states that the men during the time that they are in hospital receive no money and when they are discharged from hospital they receive $4.80 to do them until they get back to the Depot.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—That is the regulation and all the rest of the Army have the same rule.

MR. LLOYD—It does not follow that because more than one is suffering from the grievance that therefore there is no grievance. It does not make the grievance less because one or two thousand are under the same disability.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Well what do you expect to do about it?

MR. LLOYD—That is up to you. You are in charge and the Government can bring influence to bear in reference to our own soldiers. The mere admission that there is a grievance is not satisfactory.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I did not expect to satisfy the hon. member.

MR. LLOYD—It is impossible to satisfy me with an answer of that kind. It does not meet the case.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Of course if you were here you would be able to do anything you desire.

MR. LLOYD—It appears to me that the Hon. Colonial Secretary is losing his head.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Is it any wonder?

MR. LLOYD—Perhaps not, that is a matter for the Colonial Secretary himself. I say, he is surely losing his head because while we have spoken of a grievance, we have not charged him or his Government with being to blame. All we have done is to bring the attention of the Government to the grievance and asked the Government for an investigation. If he defends the conditions then he must take the responsibility.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Well, it is the King's Regulations. I suppose you expect the King's Regulations to be changed for you.

MR. LLOYD—The Hon. Colonial Secretary is forgetting himself. He is making this a personal matter, and it has not been made a personal matter so far. All that has been done is to present the grievance. We have not charged the Government or the Colonial Secretary with any blame in connection with it. The grievance exists and the reply, which did not come from the Colonial Secretary but from Captain Timewell, is an admission that the grievance exists.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, For the information of the Colonial Secretary I may say that the name of the Volunteer to whom reference was made was Albert Victor King, Number 1168, Malta. The money was sent by Thomas King and the amount was six pounds (£6) and the sum of $10.35 was asked for expenses. The message which I have in regard to the expense is one from the Superintendent of the Money Order Department here to the operator at Catalina saying that the expense in connection with the transfer of that money was $10.35. With regard to one remark made by the Colonial Secretary he seems to be aggrieved that Mr. Lloyd did not agree with the reply. I think with Mr. Lloyd that there is no one to blame here. If you are going to ask four or five thousand of our young men to go across to the other side you cannot deny our right to protect them and when we ask a question we expect it to be attended to.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 12th.

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

PETITIONS.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Coley's Point asking that a Post Office be built at that place. This petition is largely signed. At the present time there is a way office on the north side of Coley's Point, which was put there some time ago; but the people of Coley's Point have to walk two miles to this Post Office for their letters, and they now see the necessity for having it in a more central situation. It is suggested that if the Government cannot see their way clear to build this Post Office something might be arranged whereby a boy or a man would be employed to take the mail around, as is done at present in Harbour Grace and Carbonear. That would help these people out. I ask that this petition be sent to the proper Department.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled the Report of the Select Committee on the bill relating to "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Weights and Measures and the Inspection of Lumber."

On motion this Report was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

The Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

The Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on Tuesday next move the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

GUARANTEED STOCK COMPANIES BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill, "An Act Respecting Companies, Payment of Whose Capital Stock or of Interest thereon is guaranteed by the Government," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported a Resolution which was read a first time as follows:

Supplemental Supply, $124,415.94.

The said Resolution being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Re-solution was agreed to.

SEALING BILL.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries presented the following Report:

House of Assembly,
April 12th.

The Joint Committee appointed to consider the Sealing Bill, beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred, have made some amendments which are embodied in the Bill submitted to the House.

A. W. PICCOTT,
M. P. CASHIN,
JOHN ABBOTT,
R. G. WINSOR,
W. F. COAKER,
W. F. LLOYD,
R. K. BISHOP,
JOHN HARVEY, (with reservations on certain sections).
M. P. GIBBS,
M. M. YOUNG,
J. J. MURPHY.

On motion it was ordered that this Report be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY laid on the table of the House an answer to Mr. Hickman's question—No. 7 on the order paper of yesterday's date. These documents were originals, and

he would ask that they be returned.

MR. TAGETT—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Heart's Desire, asking for a telegraph office. I ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

Mr. Targett gave Notice of Question.

MR. STONE asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to have the Spur Line to Trinity completed; if so, when will operations be resumed.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The Contractors have instructions to go on with that work. I will look into the matter.

MR. LLOYD—Have the Contractors refused to carry out instructions?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Not that I am aware of. I will enquire into the matter, however, for the hon. member.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a copy of the returns for all monies allocated by his Department to J. S. Rowsell, of Bonavista, for Marine Work at Villa Verte, in Trinity District, during the years 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—That question has been answered.

MARRIAGE FACILITY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Facilitate the Marriage between British subjects residing in Newfoundland and British subjects residing in the United Kingdom", 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.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 6 George V, Cap. 18, entitled 'An Act respecting the Administration of Local Affairs.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill with some amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill, entitled "An Act to amend and Consolidate the Law Relating to Weights and Measures and the Inspection of Lumber."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It will be remembered that when we were on this Bill the other day, a point was raised by the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's, Mr. Devereaux, in relation to the gauging of codoil. He, in a very lucid manner, pointed out that certain discrepancies were occurring in relation to the gauging of oil, and that these discrepancies were unfair to fishermen and others in the Colony. The point was certainly an important one, and created quite a discussion, and it was considered that before the passage of this Bill was finalized some consideration should be given to this matter. A Select Committee was therefore appointed to make enquiries, and, if possible, suggest a remedy. That Com-

mittee, Sir, has since had two meetings. The first, through the courtesy of Mr. Job, was held at the premises of Messrs. Job Bros . and Company, for the purpose of having a practical demonstration as to the relative capacities of these casks which are alleged to contain a different quantity from what the gauging rod sets out. The full Committee met, and we also had there Mr. O'Mara, the Chief Inspector of Weights and Measures, with his standardized measures, to give us a demonstration in relation to the matter. Two ordinary kerosene casks were taken from a pile which was on the premises, and filled with water, which, for the purposes of demonstration, was just as good as oil. The gauging rod showed that one contained 41½ gallons and the other 41 gallons. By the regular standard gallon measure as kept in the office of the Chief Inspector, the first cask was shown to contain 43 gallons, and the second cask 42½ gallons. This showed, Sir, that there is, as alleged, a discrepancy between the contents of these casks as shown by the gauging rod and the amount that they actually contain. I have received from Mr. O'Mara an official report in relation to this matter, which I will now read to the Committee. (Hon. member read report.)

Now, Sir, I think it will be appreciated that that is a considerable difference when the enormous number of casks of oil that are annually turned over by the fishermen to the merchants and exporters is considered, and it calls for some remedy. The Committee have considered the matter in all its different phases, and they are convinced that some steps should be taken to remedy this, at least in some degree. This applies not only to kerosene casks, but also to linseed oil casks and the casks in which are imported the oil or fat used by the Butterine Factories. I understand from the Chief Inspector and from the members of the Committee that these latter casks are in precisely the same position as kerosene casks, and therefore they should come within the scope of any amendment which might be suggested. It was decided, therefore, that an additional section be added to the Act, covering this point. I do not think that there is anything further that I can add. I feel sure that we have discovered an equitable way out of the difficulty and one which will, I am sure, prove of benefit to the people of 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.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 13th, 1916.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bonavista, asking that a sum of money be granted them to build a breakwater in Bayly's Cove. This Cove is very much exposed to the full force of wind and sea from a westerly and northerly direction. About one hundred fishing boats belonging to the fishermen of the Cove are moored there throughout the fish-

ing season. With any sudden change of wind day or night these boats are exposed to great danger of being sunk or otherwise destroyed,and oftentimes it is the sad misfortune of many to watch their boats fill with water and sink or part their moorings and drive on the rocks and become wrecks, which means a great hardship to a class of people who can ill-afford to suffer the loss. There is no need for me to further comment on the matter, as the petition speaks for itself and very plainly states the facts. I may say that I heartily support the petition and can fully confirm what it contains, because I have a thorough knowledge of the situation. This is where I fished for many years, consequently I know whereof I affirm. I oftentimes wondered why the Governments in the past did not do something to improve such a rough fishing settlement as the one referred to by the electors of Bonavista. The petition is very largely signed. I hope the Government will give it every consideration and do all possible to make Bayly's Cove more safe by the construction of a breakwater at that place.

I also wish to present a petition from the electors of Brooklyn asking that large steel steamers be prohibited from prosecuting the seal fishery, and other public matters. This petition is largely signed, and is similar to others that have been presented during the session of the Legislature. I ask that the petitions be referred to the departments to which they relate.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Southwest Pacquet, asking that the S.S. Earl of Devon call there. The Earl of Devon did call there previous to last year, and the people do not know why she was taken off. I trust that the Colonial Secretary will see that she calls this year.

The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs tabled the Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of the St. John's Municipal Council for the year ending Dec. 31st, 1915.

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

The Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had appointed the Honourables Messrs. Bishop, Angel, Knowling, Harvey, Milley, Gibbs, Robinson, Power and Blandford, a Select Committee of the Legislative Council to co-operate with the Select Committee of the House of Assembly in relation to the Bill, "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John".s

RETIRING ALLOWANCE BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

MR. TARGETT asked the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. for an itemized statement of moneys sent out out by the Crown Lands Department to the District of Placentia and St. Mary's during the years 1913 and 1914.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That statement is being prepared.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs for a detailed statement of the duties collected by his Department at the port of Placentia for the year 1913, 1914, and 1915.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg to table that statement.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of

the Hon. Colonial Secretary the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Weights and Measures and the Inspection of Lumber," was read a third time.

MR. DOWNEY—Mr. Speaker, I recognise that it is unusual to project a debate on the third reading stage of a bill, but as I was not in the House when this matter was being discussed I would like to place myself upon record to the extent of recognizing that a necessity exists for a correction in the present method of gauging oil and other liquids as practised in this country.

From what I have learned of the debate which took place in this chamber a few days since I can gather that the honesty of the gauging rod was impeached. I hold no brief for the gauging rod—if I had I should be well advised to plead guilty and to urge extenuating circumstances in its behalf.

A Gauging Rod is but a rule-of-thumb method—based however upon mathematical calculation—of ascertaining the content of casks. The gauging rod now in use was constructed well over a century ago and when constructed its readings were practically accurate. The gauging rod was designed to measure casks as they were made in those days when their contour varied very considerably from that given casks to-day and for many years past. One hundred years ago casks were made so that from the quarters thereof to the chimes they had a sharp and uniform taper; in other words, each end of the cask corresponded to the frustrum of a cone, whereas to-day casks are more ellipitical in form, and that a variation exists between the two types of casks may be demonstrated by taking a cask with cone-shaped ends, as formerly made and a present day elliptically shaped cask, and though both may be of precisely the same length and of precisely the same diameter at the bung and at the head, yet it will be found that the elliptically shaped cask will contain appreciably more than the other. The error is from three to as much as five per cent and will be found to be in exact proportion to the degree of curvature given to casks as made to-day. The transition was so gradual from one type to the other that the error crept in without attracting attention until it increased to the extent that we find operating at the present time. As a matter of fact, the cone-shaped casks of long ago are now almost entirely obsolete, being only used in the wine trade. I fully agree with honourable members of this Chamber that it was difficult to devise a remedy for this condition of things—the weighing process would be both cumbersome and costly—but I think the alternative adopted, that of making an allowance above the gauging point to the extent of about 4% will be equitable for both buyer and seller so long as wood is the medium employed in the manufacture of casks. But I foresee the time when steel will be employed, and as steel is a medium that will be susceptible of any contour, should it be found that a greater degree of curvature—which is not at all likely—be given to steel casks, then a further rectification of the allowance now provided for will be necessary. The one really comprehensive remedy for the condition of things complained of would be the standardization of all oil packages and the construction of a new gauging rod adapted thereto, but I am quite content to let the remedy now prescribed go, at least for the time being, as I am convinced it will give a full measure of satisfaction to all concerned. If in the future, through the introduction of steel and a further alternative in the contour of casks, a second correction be requisite I have

no doubt the Legislature of the time will recognize this and promptly remedy it.

The bill was 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.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Ad ministration of Local Affairs" 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.

SHIPBUILDING BILIL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the 8 Edward VII. Cap. 8 entitled "An Act for Encouragement of Shipbuilding."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. In section 3—last section but one—there is a provision stating that where two auditors disagree as to the accounts, that an umpire shall be appointed by the two jointly. There is no provision however for the case where the parties cannot agree upon an umpire. I would suggest the usual course that where the authorities cannot agree upon an umpire, that the umpire shall be appointed by the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof on the application of either party.

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.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

HERRING FISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law relating to the Herring Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the Bill with an amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

SEAL FISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Seal Fishery."

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 reported, and recommended that the Bill be referred back to the Select Committee.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be referred back to the Select Committee.

GUARANTEED STOCK COMPANIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting

Companies, payment of whose Capital Stock or of Interest thereon, is guaranteed by the Government." was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

INFLAMMABLE OILS BILL.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister presented the following Report—

Assembly Room, April 13, '16.

We, the undersigned members of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report upon the Bill, entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Inflammable Substances." submitted to them, beg to report they have considered the Bill, and beg to recommend certain amendments which they have made.

Saint John's, April 13th 1916.

E. P. MORRIS, Chairman.
A.W. PICCOTT,
M.P. CASHIN,
W.F. LLOYD,
W.F. COAKER,
E. PARSONS.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

PATENTS BILL.

Mr. Lloyd presented the following Report—

Assembly Room, April 13, '16.

The Select Committee beg to report on the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 109 of the Consolidated Statutes etc" that the Measure take the form appended.

W. F. LLOYD
W. M. CLAPP
E.P. MORRIS,
CHAS. H. EMERSON,
F.J. MORRIS,
J. A. CLIFT.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

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

RE NORTHERN STEAM SERVICE.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that there are a large number of men up in Green Bay who are anxious to come on here to get their schooners and start for the fishery. The coast is now clear of ice, and there is no reason why they should be longer shut off. Perhaps a steamer can be dispatched from here next week. I do not know if the Prospero is ready to take up the service yet, but if not, perhaps the Government might get some other ship such as the Erik to make one of two trips until the Prospero is ready. There is a very large freight offering for the North which is awaiting a steamer, and I would ask that the Government look into this matter and see what can be done.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —I will be glad to take this matter up, and whilst I may not be able to give any definite answer to-morrow, I will do so as soon as possible.

RE PROHIBITION BILL.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker, a matter arose in connection with the action of the Government at the opening of this Legislature. It may be remembered that it was understood from what the Prime Minister said in his statement to this House, that this House will not close until the Government has stated its attitude in reference to the Prohibition Bill, and the petitions.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite correct. In the early days of the session when this question in relation to Prohibition arose, there was some doubt expressed on the point as to whether the Proclamation which

the Government proposes to issue putting Prohibition into force, would be valid, in the event of the petitions now before the Supreme Court being successful. I then undertook on behalf of the Government that this House would not close until that matter was set at rest. As all knew, the recount proceedings have been disposed of. The election took place in November. Petitions might have been immediately served and long since brought to trial, but nothing has been done in that matter beyond filing, which was two months ago. No further step has been taken. They were served but nothing has been done. I have written the Attorney General to take whatever steps in relation to the matter he considers necessary either to have the petitions dismissed from the rota of the Court, or else to have them proceeded with. Up to the present time no action has been taken, but I still say that the Legislature will not close without this matter being placed beyond peradventure.

RE WEST COAST SERVICE.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier if he has ascertained what steamer will ply between Bay of Islands and the Labrador. My reason for asking is to find out whether the 'Home' will be on that part of the coast; if so, I would like to call the attention of the House to a petition which I presented several sessions ago and which spoke in very harsh terms of the condition of the ship as to passenger accommodation and other things. When the 'Meigle' was substituted for the 'Home' everything went well, and the people of the coast were satisfied with her both as a freighter and passenger boat.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I may say on behalf of the Prime Minister that yesterday the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself saw Mr. Reid in connection with this and other matters, and he told us that as the ice had not yet left that coast, it was very likely that a steamer such as the 'Sagona' would take a few trips. As very few ships are available, it is likely the 'Sagona' will go. I might also say to the hon. member that the Government will be glad to take the matter he has referred to up with the Reid Newfoundland Company.

MR. CLAPP—I may say that the people are perfectly satisfied with the 'Meigle.'

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 14th.

The House met at three of the [illegible] the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

PETITIONS.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Harbor Grace and Bay Roberts in reference to the Labrador mail service and the Marconi service. This petition is similar to those which I presented some time ago asking for better facilities, better boats, and an improvement in the Marconi system by the erection of small stations along the Labrador coast to connect with the larger stations now in operation. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary, and I trust that the Government will give the matter its very best consideration.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition just presented by my colleague.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I have a petition, which I ask leave to present, similar to that just presented by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The petitioners ask for the improvement of the regular mail service on the Labrador. They say that they were handicapped very seriously

last year because of the dislocation of the service; that one steamer is not sufficient; and that at least two are required to accommodate the service satisfactorily. They also ask that the Marconi system be improved by the addition of smaller stations to connect with the larger ones. I ask that this petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of New Perlican on the subject of railway extension. Petitions bearing on this same subject have been presented to the House before, and therefore it is not necessary that I should make any remarks in relation to the matter. I would merely ask that the petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates. I also ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Elliston on the subject of a road. I ask that this petition also be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. CURRIE—Mr. Speaker, on your behalf, Sir, I ask leave to present a petition from a number of the residents of the town of Carbonear on several very important matters. They ask, amongst other things, for the extension of the water service, and that a hydrant be erected near St. Patrick's Church. At the present time, in case of fire, there is no protection for that edifice. I am sure that the several matters referred to in the petition will receive every consideration. I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Spout Cove, Bay de Verde, asking that a flag station be put at Small Point to accommodate the resident of Spout Cove and Small Point. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition, I ask that it be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to present a petition from a number of the inhabitants of the South side of Trinity Bay. The petitioners ask for the appointment of a Magistrate on the south side of the Bay. They point out that the district of Trinity has only one resident Magistrate that he is on the north side and has no jurisdiction on the south side of the Bay, and that the south side is served more or less casually partly from Brigus, partly from Carbonear and partly from Bay de Verde. I ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department of Justice.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition just presented by my colleague.

SHIPBUILDING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 8 Edward VII, Cap. 8. entitled "An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding," 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.

HERRING FISHERY BLL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law relating to the Herring 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.

GUARANTEED STOCK COMPANIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fish-

eries, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Companies, payment of whose Capital Stock, or of Interest thereon is guaranteed by the Government."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the Bill with amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

INFLAMMABLE OILS 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, "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Inflammable Substance."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman. Since we last met and discussed this Act for the Consolidation of the Inflammable Oils Act, it must be remembered that it was sent to a Select Committee; and the Committee gave it full consideration; we had the Government analyst before us and we considered every section of the Bill in connection with his technical advice on the various matters relative thereto. There were two or three questions that arose which it was considered might affect the trade and private interests by making the safeguards too exacting and by having the restrictions too great. Everyone must feel that it is desirable to have regulations restricting the sale and storage of these inflammable oils, especially those of a dangerous character, as complete as possible, but at the same time not unnecessarily so, so as to interfere with the traffic, although protecting the public and lessening the dangers from fire. We had the analyst visit the various premises in the trade particularly, and he has made a report as follows: (report read). Particular attention too is given the outports so that we would not make it too difficult for persons who require to use or store oil there—it is different from St. John's where proper buildings will be established; and I think that provision is now made for every case so as on the one hand to protect the people and on the other not to interfere with the trade.

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.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

PATENTS BILL .

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Lloyd, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill, "An Act to Amend Chapter 109 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Second Series) entitled 'Of Patents.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill with some amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered 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 Cus-

toms the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Certain Retiring Allowances," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

SEALING BILL.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries presented the following report:—

We, the undersigned members of Select Committee on Sealing Bill, beg to report that we have considered the matter referred to us and have confirmed former recommendations.

A. W. PICCOTT
W. F. COAKER
M. P. CASHIN
JOHN ABBOTT
R. G. WINSOR
W. F. LLOYD

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 17th, 1916.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Baine Harbour in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's on the subject of a public wharf. I need not state to the House that Baine Harbour is an important settlement in the District of Placentia and St. Mary's, and is a port of call for the S. S. Argyle, which calls there twice weekly. The unfortunate position there is that there is no public wharf. They had one some years ago, but it was in an unfavourable position, and the natural consequence was, of course, that it was allowed to become useless, as it was not repaired for many years. They did not consider repairs necessary. Now the inhabitants of that place ask that a sum of money be allocated for the building of a new wharf. When I had the opportunity of visiting Baine Harbour some time ago the inhabitants pointed out to me a very suitable place for a new wharf. I have much pleasure therefore in supporting the prayer of the petition, and ask that the petition be sent to the department to which it relates.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker: I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition which my hon. colleague, Mr. Devereaux, has just presented from the inhabitants of Baine Harbour, and trust that it will be given every consideration.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from Little Harbour West on the subject of the mail boat calling there. This settlement is an important place on the West side of the district of Placentia and St. Mary's; the mail steamer now passes by the mouth of the harbour, but does not go in; and it would be a great convenience to the inhabitants of that place and its vicinity if it were made a port of call. Under the present circumstances, it is a pretty difficult matter to add more ports of call to those already on the schedule; but I presume the matter will soon be adjusted and that Little Harbor West, like many other places around that Bay, will be served in this fashion. I beg to ask that the petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition just presented by my friend, the hon. member for the district of Placentia and St. Mary's. I may say that the schedule in use for the mail boat service around this Bay is being readjusted. I have this infor-

mation from the Government, who will later on have the opportunity of making it possible for the public around these places to receive more convenience from the S. S. "Argyle" than, owing to circumstances, is at present being enjoyed.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Stock Cove, asking for a sum of money sufficient to build a bridge at that place. I understand by the nature of the petition that this bridge is badly needed. I ask that the Government would give this matter their earliest consideration and grant the petitioners' request.

MR. TARGETT—I have here, Mr. Speaker, a petition signed by the inhabitants of Hant's Harbour for a Magistrate. For the information of the House I might read it; here it is: (The hon. member reads). This petition is very largely signed, and I trust that the Government will give its fullest consideration to the prayers therein contained.

MR. STONE—I have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition.

MR. DEVEREAUX—I have been asked, Mr. Speaker, to support this petition, and I gladly do so. This is a very large district of from nine to ten thousand inhabitants, and there are places without a magistrate for a space of thirty or forty miles. I trust this petition will have the consideration of the Government.

MR. HIGGINS—I have also been asked, Mr. Speaker, to say a word or two in support of this petition. Apart from what has already been said, I have had reason in a professional way to appreciate the necessity or at least the great advantage, of a Magistrate being appointed for the South Side of Trinity Bay. It is practically impossible for a Magistrate residing at say Broad Cove, Bay de Verde, to satisfactorily cover the jurisdiction down the South Side of Trinity Bay. And with the increased jurisdiction of Magistrates in civil actions, it must be a great inconvenience to the people interested not to be able to readily have access to justice. I understand that under present conditions the Magistrate who at present covers the territory referred to, cannot possibly visit the places mentioned as frequently as would be desirable. I have pleasure in supporting the representatives from Trinity, and the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's with respect to this petition.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Jones Within, asking that the sum of $300 be allocated for the construction of a road. The road extends from Hillview to Hatchett Cove, and from Hatchett Cove to St. Jones Within. Also another petition from the same settlement, asking for $150 for the construction of a bridge. Both these petitions are very largely signed, and I would ask that they be received and referred to the Department to which they relate.

MR. TARGETT—It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to support the prayer of the petition just presented by my colleague, Mr. Stone.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Jennings gave notice of question.

GUARANTEED STOCK COMPANIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting Companies, payment of whose Capital Stock or of Interest thereon is guaranteed by the Government," 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.

INFLAMMABLE OILS BIILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled: "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Inflammable Substances," 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.

PATENTS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Lloyd, the Bill entitled: "An Act to Amend Chapter 109 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Second Series), entitled of Patents," 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.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

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 Trading with the Enemy"; "An Act to Amend Chapter 44 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Second Series)), entitled: "Of the Rebuilding of Carbonear," and "An Act to Amend Chapter 115 of the Consolidated Statutes (Second Series) entitled: 'Of Passenger Accommodation on Board Steamers and Sailing Vessels,'" 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 Incorporate 'The Union Electric Light and Power Company' and for other purposes," without amendment.

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 OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman: In placing before the House this afternoon the Additional Estimates, we ask for the sum of $83,-515.00, made up as follows:

Old Age Pensions	$20,000
Institute for the Blind ...	1,000
Light Houses	33,475
Roads and Bridges	50,000
Mail Clerk, Fogo District	40
	$83,515

I would wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Government having considered the financial position of the Colony, have decided to vote the sum of $20,000 for Old Age Pensions. It is now seven years since I first asked that a vote should be granted for the support of the aged and infirm fishermen of the Colony. When I came down seven years ago and proposed that vote of $20,000, it appeared to us to be a large sum of money, but we had considered the matter as carefully as we could, and found that this amount was all that we were in a position to vote for this very worthy purposes,and from time to time we increased the vote by as large an amount as our position warranted. The first vote of $20,-000 provided a pension for four hundred old fishermen throughout the Colony. The following year we voted an extra $20,000, as the applicants amounted to something like twelve hundred people, and again in 1912-1913 we voted $20,000, or in other words we took $200,000 of our surplus for that year and placed it in 4 per cent. debentures, voting the balance.

I think this $20,000 will cover all applicants or applications that have been made to us up to this time of the present Session. The number is I think something like four hundred, and these are just as much entitled to the Pension as those who have already been receiving it. We were not always in a position to give this matter the practical sympathy that it merited, but today, I am pleased to say, we are in a position to vote the sum of $20,000 to cover this very important matter; we are doing this at the first opportunity that appeared possible to us, and I know this vote will receive the support of this House, and the appreciation of the people outside this House. The Government has, since it first took hold of the vote for Old Age Pensions, availed itself of every opportunity to help out those very deserving people who were worn out in the services of the country, and I am sure there is no vote that can come before this House that will be more justly appreciated than this vote for Pensions.

Under the heading of the Institute for the Blind, I am asking the sum of $1,000. This is a most desirable and necessary vote. We may recall that a few days ago, the Hon. the Colonial Secretary, stated that he had visited the Institution for the Blind during his visit to Canada, and found it in a most satisfactory condition. He also found that a large vote would be necessary if we wish to increase the number of pupils at the Institution, and it was upon this assurance that the Government decided to pass this vote of $1,000. When we see the great things that are being done in that Institute for those who are physically affected to the extent of being totally blind, I am certain that this vote will meet with the hearty approval of every member of the Legislature.

The next section explains itself. Light Houses, $33,475.00. It was passed in order that the necessary repairs would be effected to several light houses throughout the Island, which repairs are absolutely imperative, and it is necessary that they should be attended to this year.

Under heading of Roads and Bridges, I am asking for a sum of $50,000, which is to be distributed per capita throughout the various Districts of the Island, for the repair and construction of Roads and Bridges.

There is no further information that I can give in introducing these Additional Estimates, but any questions which hon. members may desire to ask, I shall be very pleased to answer.

MR. LLOYD—I would like before making any comments upon the Additional Estimates that have been brought before us this afternoon to compliment the Government upon the promptitude with which it has adopted the suggestions offered from this side of the House. I would also congratulate the Government upon the promptitude with which it has furnished replies to the various questions asked from this side of the House. The Government was at the first session rather unsatisfactory in this respect, and considerable dissatisfaction was experienced on this side of the House by the manner in which the Government dallied with our questions especially at the first session of this present term; but, from that time forward, I have been glad to note a marked improvement in this respect. During this session we have nothing to complain about the way the Government has responded to the questions put forward. The answers have been given with promptitude, and this fact I attribute to the splendid training that the Opposition has given the Government for the past few years.

The matter of Old Age Pensions was strongly urged upon the Government by the Opposition, and it is pleasing

to note that this is one of the suggestions which have been adopted. We are very pleased to acknowledge their adoption. The same thing applies to the vote asked for the Halifax Institution for the Blind. It may be within the recollection of some members of this House that, some years ago, the authorities of that Institution, owing to calls made upon them, were obliged to raise the cost of training each pupil from two hundred dollars to two hundred and fifty dollars a year, and the Government was forced to reduce the number of pupils that it maintained there. That is to say, instead of having twenty pupils at two hundred dollars, the same amount as formerly was voted, but sixteen pupils instead of twenty were sent in at a cost of two hundred and fifty dollars. This present vote means then, the raising of the number of pupils sent from here, (at least so I take it) to the original twenty. Then, again, we come to the vote for public works, roads and bridges. This side of the House endeavoured to stimulate the Government in this direction, aided by the efforts of the member for Placentia and St. Mary's, (Mr. Morris). Constituents have been pointing out to members for a long time the immediate necessity of repairing the roads and bridges throughout the country. The money granted was insufficient to keep them in an ordinary state of repair. Many of the roads and bridges throughout the country have been maintained by means of the surplus grants which the country has been fortunate in being able to allocate during the past few years. But the consequence has been that a crisis has been reached, and it was imperative that some special effort should be made this session in this direction, and I am glad to see that the necessary measures have been adopted. I am afraid it will not go very far, but it is a substantial move in the right direction, and is better than nothing. I think I am but voicing the general sentiment of this side of the House when I say that I am glad to state that we are satisfied that the Government has made an honest endeavour to meet and adopt so many of the suggestions that have come from this side of the House.

MR. CLAPP—Mr. Chairman: I feel that I must congratulate the Government as well as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for providing in these additional estimates for the construction of three light houses in St. Barbe District. I must also congratulate the Government on the vote that we ask for Old Age Pensions. As regards the $50,000 for roads and bridges, if that is per capita, I do not think that it will benefit St. Barbe District as much as it might, because the District is such a scattered one. It is only a drop in a bucket as far as a main road is concerned, but then half a road is better than no road at all.

I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that I do not see any provision made for a Motor Ferry at Bonne Bay. The Government may say that if we want a Motor Ferry we should take it out of our Special Grants, but I think that every member will realize that the Special Grant is only a small sum compared with the size of the District, and has proved insufficient to meet the needs of the people. Trinity and Placentia were provided with a motor ferry by the Government, and I would ask here again that the same be done for Bonne Bay. Bonne Bay is a part of the district which contributes handsomely towards the revenue,and as I suggested before, it is only those who travel on the punt that runs between Bonne Bay and Norris Point who can realize the inconvenience suffered by the men, women and children that travel across the Bay. I trust something will

be done in this direction. I have already brought this matter before the House and upon a petition very largely and influentially signed, and I should like to see the Minister of Finance put in a small amount of five or six hundred dollars to provide a ferry for Bonne Bay.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Take it out of the special grant. You have not as many roads to use it on as other districts.

MR. CLAPP—We are now trying to construct a main road. If we take this amount out of the grant we will get no road at all. I think the Minister of Public Works said he would recommend this ferry, and I presume he has not changed his mind in that direction.

(Re wooden tank at a light house).

MR. JENNINGS—I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has considered the advisability of erecting a concrete tank. I may say that at the station on Puffin Island the tank is constructed of brick with cement on the inside of it, and that it suits the conditions splendidly. The drinking water is contained in that tank, and the tank is admirable. A wooden tank would as a matter of course, have to be renewed in a few years, and I understand that a wooden tank was constructed last year at Exploits Bay which was a failure. Possibly that was the fault of those who constructed it. I do not know if the Minister has considered the matter, but I think a concrete tank would be advisable.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I may say that we will do our best to put in this tank. In regard to that tank which was a failure, it was constructed by somebody down in his own district, and perhaps he did not give it the required amount of attention. I do not suppose it was altogether the fault of the party that constructed it, but the people wanted the tank put in a hurry, and he had to do the best he could. This matter will receive my attention.

MR. COAKER—I have much pleasure in endorsing the remarks of the member for St. Barbe, Mr. Clapp, regarding the ferry on Bonne Bay. You have a vote for six thousand dollars for the Bay of Islands Coastal Service, and there is no objection whatever to this as far as we are concerned; and I think when you consider that Bonne Bay is a very large Bay with a very large population, which is entirely out of reach of railway connection, and only has connection with Bay of Islands once a fort night, and if anything better can be done to make things better for the people of Bonne Bay you ought not hesitate in doing it. The member for St. Barbe has put up a very strong appeal on behalf of this ferry, and it is regrettable that the Government cannot see its way clear to grant the sum of five hundred dollars for the operation of a ferry in that very important centre. I think you should take into consideration that the District of St. Barbe received a very small share of the vote for ferries that we voted this session, and which we have been voting for sessions past; and if you consider that, I think you will concede that the District is entitled to something more than you are doing at the present time. I would like the Government to take this matter into consideration and see if some provision cannot be made for this ferry at Bonne Bay.

There is another point I would like to refer to. I have not noticed in these Additional estimates any vote for that experimental light that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries spoke about when the lighthouse vote was up. I do not know, but I suppose it is the intention of the Government to give a vote—it would not require a large sum—to prove the value of these

lights. If we can operate lighthouses on the principle he suggested here, that is operate a lighthouse without the assistance of a keeper, you surely ought to lose no time in proving whether this is feasible or not; and I presume a grant will be given to the Minister to erect one of these lights and test the merits of this new system.

We have nothing to complain of in the other Additional Estimates; in fact if anything is to be said we must say a word in favour of what has been done. The Government deserves a certain amount of credit for having the courage to adopt suggestions from this side of the House and place them in the Estimates as they have done here, and the whole country will appreciate it, and especially will these four hundred old men who have been looking for pensions, appreciate the vote of $20,000 for Old Age Pensions. All over the country the people will appreciate this grant of $50,000 for additional public works. I wish it was one hundred thousand. Our own District of Twillingate wants very many improvements in the way of repairs, and the work at Shoal Tickle will probably eat up our share of this vote. I do not see how we can do it for less than the whole amount we will receive from this vote. I trust that the Premier or the Colonial Secretary or whoever has charge of the Engineer's Department will not forget to send Mr. Hall to Twillingate as soon as possible and have a report sent in on the construction of the breakwater at Shoal Tickle in order to come to some decision as to what we have to do.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—With reference to these new lights, I may say that we are putting them at Harbour Deep, Williamsport and Groais Islands. The vote for one thousand dollars is, I think, sufficient for that.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the omission from the Estimates of a grant for the water supply at Change Islands. I drew this matter to the attention of the House while in Supply, and it has been pointed out in the reports of the Government Engineer and Doctor Brehm that to give a sufficient supply there to safeguard the inhabitants from an attack of typhoid, six wells should be sunk there, and I understood that in the Estimates we have to-day before us an amount of $1,400 would be put in for that purpose. I may get the same reply from the Minister as was given to Mr. Clapp: "take it out of the $50,-000." Well,I suppose our portion of that will be about $2,000, and if you take $1,400 from that there will be only $600 left; and it is a very awkward position to place any person in, to give $1,400 to one place when there are so many needs in other parts of the district. I cannot see how that can be done. This is not an ordinary expenditure. It is a very special need. It makes no difference what part of the world we are in we must have a good water supply if we are to exist and and enjoy health. It is no good sending our soldiers to Gallipoli if they cannot get a good water supply. It will only result in disease and death. Still at our very doors the danger to life and health is just as great, and still it is not appreciated and no action is taken. It has been brought to the attention of the Government in a very forcible way by the Reports of the Government Engineer and Dr.Brehm,that there is danger of another outbreak of fever, and another outbreak may mean the expenditure of five or six hundred dollars, with the probable loss of life. I really did think from the remarks of the Minister of Public Works and the Hon. Colonial Secretary that something would be done about this, and

that $1,400 would be made a special grant for this very vital and necessary purpose.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I do not think that the appeal of the member for Fogo should go unanswered. This is a matter, I take it, of vital importance to the people of Change Islands. If they are to exist at all they must have drinking water that will keep them in health, and if it is a fact that the Reports of the Government Engineer and the Public Health Officer of the Island are condemnatory of the water supply of that place and give distinct recommendations as to what should be done, it is up to the Government to make some reply and say whether they intend to do anything or to say that they intend to let the health of these people be jeopardized.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I think that the proportionate part of that vote of $50,000 should be spent for this purpose. Each and every district in the country is practically in the same position. Even in my own district we have to provide wells, and they are built in many instances out of the grants for the district, and I think that the per capita proportion of the $50,000 voted here this evening, which will go to Fogo district, should be used for this purpose. This amount voted to-day is not voted solely for Roads and Bridges, but for any need that may be greatest. If Marine works are necessary, it will be spent for marine works, if it is found necessary to spend it on Roads and Bridges to keep them in a condition of repair, there is no reason why it should not be spent for that purpose. I do not see how we can fairly ask for any more for special purposes than the $50,000 which I asked for here this evening.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: In answer to the hon. Minister I would say that if through the negligence of the Government in this matter, an outbreak of typhoid fever occurs, which is not at all unlikely, it will have to spend the money, and in addition the people will have to suffer. A grant would be a preventive measure, and as much consideration is due to it as would be given to a special vote for consumption. It is a matter of preventing disease; and just as you give special grants to the Fever Hospitals and to consumption hospitals, the House should be prepared to give a special grant to prevent diseases which may be brought about through the use of bad water. All parts of the Island are not alike in this respect. I judge from what has been said this afternoon, that this is an exemplary case. In some places the water supply is especially good and in some places it is especially bad, owing to the nature of the soil. I have been in places where the water supply was excessively bad. I think that special grants for dealing with this special difficulty should be considered.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman: I might say that a similar case to the one under discussion occurred some years ago at Bell Island. The Government Engineer went over there and made an enquiry and made certain recommendations, and the grants for the district were spent for that purpose. The same thing happened at Bonavista, and a similar course was followed; and there is no reason why the member for the district should not allocate an amount out of his share of this $50,000 for this purpose. If that thing were allowed to go on, we would want a special grant for every district for wells.

MR. LLOYD—Certainly.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—But we have not got them. We are voting special money for special pur-

poses, and the hon. member for Fogo can, if he chooses, build his wells at Change Islands out of his share of this $50,000. We don't bind him to spend it on roads or bridges or marine works.

MR. LLOYD—The fact is that roads and bridges have not received very much attention during the last two years, because there has been practically no money to spend on them.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The regular grants have been spent.

MR. LLOYD—Yes, but the Minister knows as well as any member in the House that roads and bridges have not been repaired solely out of these grants; they have been repaired very largely during the last dozen years, out of surpluses, and those surpluses have not been available during the last two years. Therefore, the roads and bridges need repairs this year. But the question of the Change Islands water supply is a matter of life and death, and surely some provision should be made for it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: As this matter is primarily under my Department, I would like to say that it is quite correct that when the attention of the House was called to this matter I promised the hon. member that I would bring the matter to the notice of the Government. This I did, but it is contended that as the Government were voting $50,000 for special purposes, that the probabilities were that as the district of Fogo would not probably require a large amount in other directions, the hon. member could allocate the amount required to remedy the water supply at Change Islands out of his share of this special grant. I quite agree with the Minister that every district in the Island has peculiar claims upon the Govermnent and has pressing needs. As far as Fogo district is concerned, I have not heard many complaints from the hon. member as to the condition of the roads down there or anything of that kind, and consequently we might assume that that district is not very much in need of large additional grants for this purpose, and that he would be able to deal with this Change Islands matter out of his special grant. However, we will not be closing the Estimates this afternoon, and if we get a fair representation from the hon. member as to the condition of things in his district, I have no doubt that the Government would consider this matter and see what could be done. At the same time I am quite in accord with what the Minister has said in this connection. If one district is given special treatment the result will be confusion and trouble, because other districts who may have need of large public works, such as bridges or wharves or something of that sort, will also be expecting special grants. However, as has been pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, this is a matter which affects the health of a community, and it is therefore very important, and I think it might be considered in a different aspect from ordinary requests for public works. I think, then, Mr. Chairman, that the matter might be let stand over to another session, and before the House closes we might see if it is possible to do anything.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I am very much obliged for the sympathetic remarks of the Colonial Secretary in regard to the need of Change Islands. Now, all the districts in the Island are not alike, and if any hon. member in the House is under the impression that Fogo district is not in need of money for public works, I would beg to disabuse his mind of that error. When you were allocating your surplus revenues, and were sending grants all over the Island for digging

wells and for repairing roads and bridges, Fogo district did not get a very large amount.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—It got its per capita amount.

MR. HALFYARD—Well, I don't know what was done with it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I know what it got, and it was spent in the district.

MR. HALFYARD—Change Islands did not get a well. I know of places in this Island where money has been spent for the digging of wells and where there have been splendid streams running right through the locality. Wells have been dug within twenty or thirty yards of streams of pure water. The people were given the money and they did not know what to do with it, and so they dug wells, not because they needed them, but merely as an excuse for spending the money. That applied in some places, but the District of Fogo did not get any money to spend in that way. We could spend this whole special grant of $50,000 in Fogo district if we had it.

At Cat Harbor and its vicinity roads are almost impassable and bridges are rotten and tumbling down endangering the lives of man and beast which have to pass that way. We also want $400 to extend the public wharf there. From Cat harbor to Doting Cove some thousands of dollars are wanted to make the roads and bridges what they should be. At Doting Cove and Musgrave Hr., there are similar needs for roads, bridges and wharves. The same condition applies to a more or less extent in every part of the district. At Ladle Cove the breastwork that protects the road from the sea is out of repair, while the road for hundreds of yards from Ragged Harbor to Apsey Cove via Ladle Cove is knee deep in turf and mud. Carmanville, Noggen's Cove and Fredericton have need for hundreds of dollars. From Fredericton to Garden Bay via Man Point the bridges are dangerous while the ruts in the roads are extremely dangerous to pedestrians. Hundreds of dollars are required to repair these roads. Bridges are washed away at Gander Bay; and last year when the Chirman of the Road Board applied to the government for a sum of money to rebuild the bridge nothing was granted. From Gander Bay to Victoria Cove and Roger's Cove there are miles of roads out of repair, and knee deep in mud. At Horwood where people from outside places have settled within recent years to try and get a living for themselves and their families, the roads are in a wretched condition. In 1914 a petition asking for the sum of $500 for repairs to roads was sent to the Legislature from Horwood. Island Harbor a most important fishing settlement has no money to keep its roads and bridges in repair. Hundreds of dollars are required for this one place alone.

At Change Islands there is no public wharf. The people are depending on the good will of private individuals for freight to be landed from the Coastal steamers. It would take about $2000 to build a wharf there. You cannot expect business men to be giving the public the use of their wharves without any compensation. The same thing applies to Seldom Come By, a most important and thriving fishing settlement which is fast becoming of great importance commercially, with no public wharf. Fogo has a canal which requires widening or deepening, a large sum of money is required for that purpose. Barr'd Island and Joe Batt's Arm are asking for grants to repair roads and bridges, while the road from Joe Batt's Arm to Tilting is in a most deplorable condition, and how doctors and clergymen get over that road by horse and waggon with-

out serious accidents is a mystery to me. There are some other smaller places which are just as bad and even worse than those I have named. The Committee will thus see if I take $1400 out of the small grant I shall get for Fogo district and give it to Change Islands for wells, what can I do for other parts of the district. I appreciate what has been said and I thank the hon.leader of the Opposition, Dr. Lloyd for the remarks he has made, and I trust that what the Colonial Secretary has said will be put into effect, and that a vote of $1400 will be allocated as a special grant for this purpose.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman. I just want to set the hon. member right on one or two points. He said, in the first place, that when the government were allocating special grants in the past that Fogo district did not get its share. That is not correct. The government were more than particular that each and every district got its proportionate part. I think that the hon. member should not have made that statement. I presume that he made it because he did not know any better. Not alone did his district get its proportionate part of the surpluses that were spent during the years that we have been in office, but last year Fogo district got an additional grant of over $6,000 to finish a wharf there.

MR. HALFYARD—If I am wrong in any statement that I have made, I am prepared to take it back. As the matter has been called to my attention, however, I shall ask for a statement of the expenditures made in Fogo district during the last three or four years, and when I get that statement I will be in a better position to judge as to whether Fogo district got its full proportionate share of surpluses or not.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman.The Hon. Colonial Secretary must know something of the conditions in Fogo district, and the Premier must also have some knowledge of them, as he was down through the district.There is, as has been pointed out by the hon. member, a wharf badly needed at Change Islands, and also one at Seldom. These two requirements are very pressing, and there are numerous other requirements which will have to be attended to out of the $2,-000 which will probably be the district's proportionate share of the $50-000 that is being voted here to-day. It may be that the Minister is quite right when he says that Fogo has received its full share of the surplus grants, but I would point out that the Premier went down to the district in 1913, and made improvements here and there, and one of them was a wharf at Fogo, which has cost in the neighborhood of $14,000. That is why you had to find this $6,000 this year for the Fogo wharf. The wharf was built, and certain moneys had been spent by private parties in connection with it and you had to find the money to reimburse these parties. So that we do not give you very much credit for that. It was done for the good of your Party, in order that you might win the election of 1913.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman. For the purpose of being historically correct, I would like to point out to the hon. member that he is entirely astray as regards the public wharf at Fogo. It had nothing whatever to do with my visit. When I went to Fogo in April 1913,the wharf was nearly finished. As a matter of fact I think, if I remember rightly, the Commission for the building of that wharf was issued one year before the election.

MR. COAKER—No. It was started

in February, as you went there in April.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I will table the commission to-morrow so as to be clear upon the point. Further, in order to remove any possible doubt that it was not a political move, the member for the district, Mr. Earle, who was then in opposition to the government, or at least had sat in opposition to the government, was one of the Commissioners.

MR. COAKER—No. It was his son.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well, that is practically the same.

MR. LLOYD—Oh, no. That is another story.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—You may think you know all about it.

MR. LLOYD—I know a little about it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well, anyway, I will say this—and I don't think it will be disputed—that the commission was issued with the full knowledge and approved of, and after consideration with, the member for the district, Mr. Earle. I do not think that will be disputed. As a matter of fact, that wharf cost $12,000. Half of it was paid, I think, out of a surplus grant, and the other half had to be paid since. When the work was undertaken it was not considered that it would cost anything like what it did actually cost. It was found that a good deal of money had to be spent in excavation work, land had to be bought, and the wharf had to be lengthened in order to make it valuable for large ships. What the Finance Minister has stated is critically and accurately correct in connection with all the surpluses raised during the four years having been allocated per capita to all the districts. There was no discrimination whatever. In the old days, I will not say under what administration it was, the custom was to spend certain grants in certain districts, but during the past four years—previous to 1913, the whole of that large sum of money—probably over half a million dollars—was spent on public works, marine works, and works done under the superintendence of the department of public works; but the amount was voted per capita and spent in the various districts. I know that is true of Fogo. Just one other word, I may say that when I was in Fogo district I never made any reference to public works for that place, never advocated or promised public works, and the public work referred to this afternoon was a public wharf half constructed; but I made no reference to it at that time.

MR. LLOYD—Will the accounts for the District of Fogo be tabled?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Yes. I will have them tabled.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the remarks I made this afternoon on the subject of conditions at Change Islands, I wish to add something more in order that I may be distinctly understood. Evidently the member for the district did not understand me. The position I intended to put forward was that I agree with the Minister of Finance that no discrimination should be tolerated in any district for the allocation of any special amount; but I pointed out at the same time that this Change Islands matter was out of the ordinary and one that took on a very serious aspect last fall; for not alone did conditions demand the sending down of Dr. Brehm, the Health Officer, and Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer—with consequent costs — it cost between $500 and $600 to fight the outbreak of typhoid fever there; and that strengthens my advocacy of the consideration of this matter that if the hon. member for the district cannot

see his way clear out of this special grant to spend the sum necessary to remedy conditions there, that something additional should be done by the Government. When I brought this matter to the notice of the Minister of Finance he said he thought that out of the special grant they ought to be able to look after the water supply of Change Islands, but if the district was unable to do that I think the Government should, from the standpoint of economy,because we may have another outbreak of fever there and be in a similar position as we were last fall. I may say that, as the Minister of Finance has stated, this is a matter that will be considered by the Government before the House closes, and no doubt a satisfactory result arrived at.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, I may say for the information of the Colonial Secretary that if something is not done soon in Change Islands there will be another outbreak of disease there. In fact, there is one case there at the present time, so that it will be seen that the danger is imminent. The Premier does not wish to give the House to understand that my remarks inferred that he had made a promise for the erection of certain works in Fogo district during the 1913 campaign. I did not mean to convey that to the House. Nobody ever hears of an astute politician like the Premier making any such promise on the eve of a general election and nobody would think of saying that he would go down to Fogo and promise the people a wharf that was going to cost four or five thousand dollars. But a similar grant was at that time given to Barr'd Islaand for a breakwater, and also to Joe Batt's Arm. As Mr. Halfyard pointed out, if the Premier wishes, he would be glad to have him visit there again. I should not mind if he went to Twillingate district and conferred some benefits on the people there. He has never favored my district with a visit, but probably before the four years are up he may be able to see his way clear to go down there; and if he needs anyone to accompany him I will have great pleasure in doing so, so long as he promises that wherever he goes he will give the people everything they require.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I would like to draw the attention of the House to something which was brought to my notice through a reply to one of my questions as to the allocation made to outport post offices, for rent, coal and oil. I have part of the question answered. I find that $951.51 has been spent in supplying the different post offices with coal and kero. oil. Now I think it is very unfair to the post offices that are left out and do not get any special remuneration for fuel, etc.; and in this connection I would like to quote a sentence copied from the Report of the Postmaster General which reads as follows:

"The fact that some Postmasters are paid rent and supplied with fuel, oil, etc., while the greater number receive nothing but their salary rather complicates the matter, and it is unfair to add to a Postmaster's salary in this way unless all are treated alike. Whatever amount, if any, is allowed for rent and fuel, it should appear in the estimates in a separate column and be paid with the salary, thus saving a great amount of time and worry to the officials of the Postal Department, Public Works Department and Contingencies."

I would like to knew if the Government intends to grapple with the situation and try and make an adjustment so that all the officials in the post offices will be placed on the same basis. You had an inspector appointed to report on the condition

of post offices in the outports. I do not know whether you intend to accept the recommendation made by that inspector or by the Postmaster General or not. Anyhow, you will see that the Postmaster General thinks that the method now of compensating some officials is very unfair. It should be made general or cut it out and treat all alike. Here is a statement showing what was sent to each post office:

Baine Harbor — 1 ton N. S. coal	$ 7.00
New Bonaventure—1 ton N. S. coal	7.20
Topsail—2 tons N.S. coal	15.00
Tizzard's Harbor—1 ton N. S. coal	7.50
Old Bonaventure—1 ton N. S. coal	7.50
Safe Harbor—½ ton N.S. coal	3.25
Bay Roberts—3 tons N.S. coal	19.80
Mercer's Cove—2 tons N.S. coal	13.00
Harbor Breton—43 gal. kero. oil	11.08
Petrie's Crossing—1 ton N. S. coal	8.00
Jersey Side, Placentia—3 tons N. S. coal	25.00
Rose Blanche—2 tons N. S. coal	16.50
Rose Blanche—½ cask kerosene oil	4.83
Curling—3 tons N.S. coal	33.30
Twillingate South—½ ton N.S. coal	4.20
Pool's Island—1½ tons N. S. coal.	13.00
Twillingate—2½ tons N.S. coal	19.75
Fogo—2 tons N.S. coal	16.00
Holyrood—2 tons N.S. coal	16.00
North Sydney—6 tons Anthracite coal	51.00
North Sydney—6 tons N.S. coal	18.00
North Sydney—Hauling ashore coal at Sydney	6.00
La Scie—2 tons N.S. coal	19.00
Coley's Point—1 cask oil, etc.	11.10
Woodford's—1 ton N.S. coal	8.50
Kitchuses—1 ton N.S. coal	8.50
Freshwater—8 tons N.S. coal	67.35
Placentia—½ ton N.S. coal	24.00
Placentia—3 tons N.S. coal	24.00
Hermitage—1 ton N.S. coal	6.60
Marystown—3 tons N.S. coal	42.50
Catalina—3 tons N.S. coal	24.00
Heart's Content—2 tons Nut coal	27.40
Port Rexton—½ ton N.S. coal	4.00
Trinity—3 tons Anthracite coal	39.00
Trinity—Kerosene Oil	9.28
Burgeo—2 tons N.S. coal	12.00
Greenspond—½ ton N.S. coal	5.80
Riverhead—½ ton N.S. coal.	3.80
Red Island—1 ton N. S. coal.	9.60
Green's Harbor—1 ton N. S. coal	11.60
St. Mary's—2 ton N.S. coal.	19.20
Hickman's Harbor—1½ tons N. S. coal	18.40
India Islands—½ ton N.S.coal	6.80
New Harbor—Coal	19.20
Princeton—Coal	11.60
Colinet—Coal	11.60
St. Mary's—Freight	2.00
Foster's Point	11.60
Little Heart's Ease	11.60
Dildo—Coal	11.60
Robert's Arm—1½ tons N.S. coal	17.75
Alexander Bay—1½ tons N.S. coal	17.75
Three Arms—1½ tons N. S.	
Riverhead—1 ton N. S. coal.	7.60
Wabana—7 ton N. S. coal, (Mines 4, Main 3)	42.00
Bell Island—3 ton N.S. coal.	18.00
Hr. Grace, S.S.—1 ton N. S. coal and 1 cask of oil	19.23
Channel—4 ton N.S. coal	26.00
Bristol's Hope—½ ton N. S. coal, 18 gal. oil	9.24
King's Cove—3 ton N.S. coal	22.20
Hr. Grace—1 cask kerosene oil	10.52
Bonavista—2 ton Anthracite coal	27.00
Colliers—1 ton N.S. coal	8.80
Collier's Central—1½ tons N.S. coal	12.60
Pool's Cove—1 ton Anthracite coal	11.50
	$951.51

That is the list I have received. It is only a fractional part of the number of post offices. I think there are about 620 post offices, not including Postal Telegraph Offices. The number I have cited are getting compensation; and even in the alloting of compensation there is unfairness, because some offices get only a half ton of coal and some as high as 8 tons. I do not know if the coal that is allocated is given as the case demands; but I draw the attention of the Government to this matter and would like to see what the Postmaster General has said about it, carried out, and a readjustment of matters made by the Government so as to remedy this condition of affairs. These allowances to certain post offices are being circulated around and the people are finding out what is being done next door; and when they find out that some people are getting certain things that do not come to them as well, there is bound to be dissatisfaction. I trust that the matter will be taken under immediate consideration.

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 asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a 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. 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.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

SEALING BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Seal Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman: In introducing this Bill respecting the Seal Fishery, I might say that last year it was brought before this House and passed, and sent to the Upper House, but they turned it down and sent it to a Select Committee. That Select Committee, made up from both Houses of Parliament, did not arrive at any definite conclusion. This year the bill has been brought in here and sent to a Select Committee chosen by this House and by the Upper House, and they have reported that this Bill should be introduced. The men on that Committee were men who were quite conversant with the Seal Fishery and have given this Bill their very best consideration. The Seal Fishery of Newfoundland is one of great magnitude, and the Committee taking this into consideration tried to deal with it so that it would be in the best interests of the Island, and it was not until after very careful deliberation that they came to the conclusion that this Bill should be introduced. I hear it said by quite a number of people that the Committee were somewhat prejudiced against this industry. My own opinion is that the Committee are not prejudiced whatever. They

took the Bill and gave it their very best consideration, not with a personal feeling, but as Newfoundlanders who wished to see the fishery and the men who prosecuted it dealt with in a right and proper manner. The men who prosecute the fishery take their lives in their hands when they go on the ice. If they are lost, their homes are destitute, and the Colony is called upon to look after their family—their widows and orphans, who are left behind. Your Committee, therefore, gave such an important matter their very best consideration. The one aim of each and every man on the Committee was not to do anything that would injure the industry; they wanted to help it along. In the first place we must remember that conditions have somewhat changed. We have not a great many of the steel stamers that we have been using the past few years. There was a difference of opinion about this matter with the Committee, before these vessels were sold, but now that the owners have been well remunerated by the selling of these ships, the Committee has thought it wise to prohibit that class of vessel prosecuting the fishery any longer. This can now be done without working any hardships on the owners. We have a number of sealing vessels that belong to the older class. In earlier days all the ships, such as the Ranger, Neptune and Terra Nova, carried to the fishery over 300 men. The men were satisfied to go in these days and put up with the hardships and discomforts that very often accompany a trip of seals, but that time has passed, and the merchants, of their own accord, have cut down the number of men to go in that class of ship to about 270. In those of the 'Venture class much about the same number was carried. One argument put forward on that matter was that men were prepared to put up with the discomforts, and that in the newer class of ships there were greater comforts than there had been in the past. Well, that argument can stand for what it is worth. It was shown last year that these ships with all the new machinery that was put in to propel them along have not done much better than the older class of ships. In fact last Spring the Eagle brought in more seals than all the other ships put together. The main object of this Bill is to look after the interests of the men. Their welfare is considered in every way. In addition to that the Masters and Owners are not left out. They have been given great consideration by the Committee. The owners have been put to quite a lot of expense in fitting up the ships and putting food and other things on board for the prosecution of the voyage. In introducing this bill I wish every one in the House to view it with an unprejudiced mind. The first thing to consider is the crew. They are the bread-winners of the country. The owners might have the ships put in the trade, but the ships are no good without the men. It is also true that the men are of little good without the ships; the two go together. In the past four or five years the merchants have been satisfied to spend money for the comfort of the men, giving them better sleeping quarters and better provisions, and this year they have been giving a better price for the seals. Under this Bill the owners, masters and men pull together better, and with that condition existing the trade ought to benefit materially. As each section is read I would ask hon. members to give it their best consideration and to view it without prejudice, considering the welfare of the country and the people.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. In rising to support the measure now before the Chair I would like to point

out the satisfactory nature of the bill. Last year it was introduced from this side of the House and met ready support at the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and other gentlemen on that side of the House. Unfortunately for reasons that I need not go into at the present time it did not meet with the approbation of the Upper Chamber. The result was that it was turned down. This year a more fortunate position has been arrived at because the Minister of Fisheries has taken up the matter on behalf of the government. Last year the Legislative Council turned it down when it was brought in from this side of the House. This years the position is this that not only will the bill be supported by the whole House, but it is really a government bill taken up by a proper official of the government,the Minister of Fisheries. That shows at all events that it commends itself to the whole House and to the government and that is a strong point in its favour.. I would next like to emphasize this point that one of the main features of the bill is a recommendation emanating from the Judges of the Supreme Court, sitting not as judges but as a special commission to investigate the great disaster that happened two years ago. One of their recommendations was adopted at the earliest possible time. That was in reference to the installation of the Marconi system on all sealing ships. The other recommendation was a penalty for having men on the ice during the night and especially at a time when they might be exposed like they were in the Newfoundland to a storm. When I speak of penalizing, I mean making the owners responsible for the consequences of the acts of their servants which result in death or disablement. It is a fair and proper principle that the trip and those responsible for the trip should bear the brunt of any disaster that would occur during the venture. If the capital of an industry cannot bear its own burdens it is not worth having. It is improper and unfair to throw the burden of loss from disablement or death on the poorest people of the country and allow the rich men who carry on the venture to remain free of any loss that the venture entails. The principle adopted is a wise one. It is a partial adoption of the principle of the Workingman's Compensation Act, that is if a workman suffers loss or injury in the course of his employment then the industry should bear the brunt of it and not the workingman. This Sealing Bill cannot be complained of as being an excessive stretch of that principle. It is in reality the most moderate adoption of the principle. It does not go one quarter as far as the ordinary Workingman's Compensation Act because under the Workingman Compensation Act if a workman is injured in the course of his employment, the employer is always responsible. This is not the obligation placed upon the industry or owners in this bill. Compensation does not become payable merely because injury has resulted in the course of his employment but only when the injury is caused by a sealer being out on the ice at night. That is by throwing risks, not ordinary risks but extraordinary risks on the crew by keeping them out at night. If a sealer meets with accident in the course of his employment which has not occurred by this account, no compensation is provided. The bill is nothing like so broad as the Workingman's Compensation Act. It merely gives compensation in cases of death or disablement when men are kept on the ice at night when they should have been on board the ship. That was the recommendation of the Judges of the Supreme Court, sitting not as Judges

but as a special commission to investigate the Newfoundland disaster. It will be seen that this obligation is thrown on the owners but it might well occur that the owners will turn around and say "we are innocent parties, it is the captain who is in fault or the second hand." It was on that account that the owners last year objected strenuously to that clause. They said the industry could not stand it. Well, who is going to stand it? If death or disablement occurs, there is someone left dependent, and it is a generally recognized principle of law that the owners of the industry should stand the loss. The financial loss should not be thrown on the dependents or the victims. Let us go a little farther. Take the case of Captain or second hand, the bill does not propose to let them escape if they are in fault. If they send men on the ice at night when they ought not to be on the ice and death or disablement occurs, not only will the owners be responsible for compensation, but the men in fault who are in charge of the ship will also be dealt with as accused parties. If they are found guilty under this Act, if death occurs, they become felons, if disablement occurs, they are guilty of a misdemeanour, and they are liable to imprisonment, because it is proposed to inflict punishment for sending men on the ice, under these conditions when these results occur. Outside of this there are other matters in the bill that are of some importance. I do not wish to dwell on them because there are other parties in the House more competent to speak on them than I am. I may say that this principle of which I have spoken is one that receives my heartiest support' and I hope that the Upper House will see the wisdom of enacting legislation this session.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I have just one or two observations to make upon this bill. This matter has received quite a lot of consideration. I do not know that any bill introduced into the House since we had seats here has received such consideration as this one. I do not think that anyone will conclude that the Select Committee that sat to consider this matter could be convicted of doing anything from personal motives or in the way of animosity. I think that all look at it from a national point of view. Many of the suggestions that could not be accepted by the Upper House last year, in which we could not see eye-to-eye were adopted by this Committee and they will be found embodied in this bill.

The Committee took two points into consideration in dealing with this bill. One point was that they wished to consider the safety of the crew. Another was that they wished in considering the safety of the men they were obliged to apply very severe penalties for any breach of this act that could be traced to the officers of the ship, for they considered such an offence should be treated in a very drastic way. It is alright for some people to talk about the men going on the ice without orders, and all that sort of thing, but the captain of that ship is the man in charge, and it is his duty to look after the safety of his crew. On the other hand it was considered that for any offence for which the owners could be held responsible there should be a heavy penalty.

Clause "two" might be cited as an example of what the Committee recommends for safeguarding the men. This section provides that no man is to remain on the ice between certain hours; that if he is ordered to go there is a severe penalty or punishment for the person that orders him, if it is proved. The crews in future, if this bill becomes law, will not have to work after dark or before sun-rise. This was not done because the Committee thought that the cap-

tain should be interfered with in any way, or, that they thought it might take longer to get seals, but just because the Committee thought that there should be some hard and fast rule laid down to govern this question. For this reason, although a crew is allowed to take seals aboard or to do any work around the ship, yet it is absolutely forbidden to have men sent out to work, taking seals after dark or before daylight. The first and only reason for this is to preserve the safety of the men. Another section, section 3 provides punishment. The punishment is a severe one. We who were on the Committee thought that no punishment could be too severe for this offence. There could be no punishment too severe for a master who would risk the lives of any of his crew, and in such a case it is recommended that that such a master shall not only be punished in the ordinary way, but that he shall lose his certificate, and so be debarred from ever again going to the sealfishery as master. This is a very severe punishment, but as I have said, there is no punishment too heavy for a man guilty of such conduct, in the future the master will realize who is responsible.

I do not wish to infer that there are captains who deliberately risk the lives of their crews; but it is known to everybody that there are lots of risks in this industry, and the captains will after this have to be responsible for it. We know that all are anxious to get seals, but we also must take into consideration the fact that they have on board these ships some two hundred and fifty men, all under the charge of the captain, and these are a first charge on him. There is a prevailing feeling to take a chance at the seal fishery that would not be tolerated at any other caling in life. Now we want to do away with that. We want to make this industry as safe as it can be made by law. I think this is as perfect a law as can be made with regard to punishment for captains or officers who do anything wrong.

There is one important clause in this Bill, in which provision is made to stop the larger ships from prosecuting the fishery; and if there is anything that has caused a difference of opinion between the owners and this House, it is that one section. It is thought that if by this clause these ships will be prohibited from going to the fishery, that in future they will clear from Canadian ports. I do not think this will be the case. I do not think that if this law is placed on our Statute Book it will be possible for these ships to clear from foreign ports, because if the Government of this country asked the Government of Canada to stop it, they would be only too willing to do so, provided they believe us to be sincere.

I was talking to some Canadian members when I was at Ottawa recently about this question, and about the small steamers which had prosecuted the fishery, the whalers of which there was so much talk about last year, and they said that if any intimation as to the desirability of not having these ships cleared before a certain date had been transmitted to the Department of Marine by our local Department of Marine, that these ships would, were it proven in the interest of the fishery, have to sail on March 10th.

I do not think there will be any difficulty if the bill in arranging this matter becomes law, because the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as I have said, could communicate with the Canadian Government, asking for legisation to meet the case. So as far as that part of it is concerned, that could be easily overcome.

The question then arises as to whether one steamer which has not been

bought by the Russian Government should be debarred under this clause. Shall we allow that steamer to prosecute the fishery and so discourage the others, or shall we allow this ship to go and prepare the way for the return of the whole steel fleet. If you allow one to go what can you do to prevent the ones which have been sold to the Russian Government from being re-purchased by the owners here to prosecute the fishery; as we now hear they are about to do. We cannot allow one to go and prohibit the others. Why should we let the Bowrings with the Florizel enter the fishery, and keep out the others. To debar one steamer only, would mean but the taking of 270 men from the fishery, while by doing so you would encourage 12 or 14 ship crews. I do not mean by this that the Florizel would take all the seals, if sent to the sealfishery, but with her superior speed it is possible for her to make competition uneven and create dissatisfaction.

The men want to see the ships equally balanced, and 150 petitions, signed by ten thousand fishermen, have been presented to this House asking for this. They know and everybody knows that great results will come if the steel ships are debarred. The owners would not be deprived of making money. This year we have a lesson of this before us. Six or seven loads of fat have been brought in. There was more in these trips for the owners than there would have been had steel ships prosecuted the fishery. These ships bring in loads worth from $70,000 to $80,000, and there is consequentliy a good profit for the owners, while in the case of the steel ships they have to get 25,000 or 30,000 seals before they pay expenses. Take the Florizel for example. She brought in this year 46,000 or 47,000 seals, and it will be found that after paying the expenses this year and the expenses of the failure of last year that she will not have cleared $5,000 for the owners. You take, on the other hand, the Eagle, which got 33,000. She made twice as much for her owners as did the Florizel. The wooden ships can make $25,000 profit on a load, while the Florizel would not clear $1,000 for her owners on the same number of seals. The getting of a cargo of 25,000 seals in one of these steel ships does very little good to the country. It is all used up in expenses. You take on the other hand, the wood ships, and it will be found that the country benefits to a wonderful degree, because of the small expenses incurred in operating and preparing the ships.

I feel, Sir, that if we carry out the clause where steel ships of the larger type are forbidden, in a few years we will have with us again, a fair fleet of wooden ships. In all probability two ships which were once used at the sealfishery, but which were sold to the American Government and used on the Pacific Coast, will likely be purchased and used at the sealfishery. The Aurora, if she should ever return from the expedition she is engaged in, would likely be added to the fleet. These ships would have sufficient capacity to bring in all available young seals each year.

Another clause prohibits taking hoods for three years. Under the circumstances it is only right and proper for this House to see that any species of seals are not exterminated. The hoods have had a chance to increase during the past two years, and if for three years more we enforce a close season, there is no reason why there should not be quite as many brought in in the future as in the past. This, too, can be done without any great inconvenience, and what will possibly be lost to the owners and men in the next year or so will undoubtedly be made up afterwards. In fact they

stand to gain, and it is only fair for us as legislators to make such provisions as are necessary in this case and provided for in this act.

There is another serious and important clause relating to the right of property in seals. The time has now been extended to forty-eight hours. In the bill last year the time was twenty-four hours, but this alteration has been made in order to meet the wishes of the Upper House, and is that period of time which the Joint Committee of both Houses decided upon as being most beneficial to this industry. There is still a difference of opinion prevailing on this matter, but I may say that this Bill is in the nature of an experiment,and anything that practice will prove unworkable will be altered by future legislation. The one aim and object of this Bill is to benefit the industry. If, after two or three years, it can be shown that this clause is not advantageous to the welfare of the seal industry, our laws are not as the laws of the Medes and Persians, and can obviate any provision conflicting with the interests of the people. It will be the duty of the Legislature to amend the provisions of this Bill, should the occasion arise, but this Bill is a fair and honest attempt to improve present conditions and merits a fair show, and I sincerely hope that this House will regard it in that light.

Another provision of surpassing importance is, that in connection with the insuring of the sealer at $1,000, if, through exposure he is incapacitated in any way he is entitled under this provision to a certain compensation not exceeding one thousand dollars. This clause, no doubt, will be thoroughly appreciated by the whole country, for the time has passed when the man, who loses his life at the seal fishery, from exposure, should leave a family destitute. It has been argued that, if we meet with a disaster such as that of the "Newfoundland" the ship-owners will be ruined in consequence of this provision. I hope never to see an occurrence of that disaster, and as ever since that time it has been the one aim and objct of our Legislature to prevent the possibility of a like disaster, I do not think it likely that Newfoundland will suffer a similar sorrow again.

Last year the owners of sealing vessels objected to this very provision, because, as they set out, the cost of this insurance was greater than the profits of the industry would warrant, and they suggested various compromises, such as the men themselves paying a share, the Government paying a portion, and the owners a portion, say one-third, but their suggestions met with the resistance of this House. The Select Committee's decision you have here, embodied, in this Bill. This Bill is brought before you with a strong backing, as it is recommended by a Joint Committee of both Houses. It is fair and reasonable, and has for its one object the preservation and safety of the crew, and the encouragement of the industry as far as possible.

I believe the day will come when the seal fishery will be conducted with smaller ships propelled by motor power. This, in itself, will mean an impetus as regards shipbuilding, and there will be a turn in the tide as far as the sealers' portion of the voyage is concerned. I am prepared to give everything in connection with the industry full and fair consideration. The men must be encouraged, if they are going to conduct the seal fishery in wooden ships. Of course it is only natural to suppose that wooden ships will disappear as time passes. I personally give them about 20 years to pass away. It has been said that ships, such as the Sable Island, are not large enough to engage profitably in freighting in summer, and that

they cannot pay if utilized only for the seal fishery. Personally, I believe, there will be lots of work in the future for ships of that size, that is to say, ships of about four hundred to four hundred and iffty tons. These ships will be able to make both ends meet without difficulty from the mere fact of their engaging in the local coasting traffic of this Colony, as well as the seal fishery.

I believe that in 1918 when our contract with Bowring is over, where we have two ships now, we will have four ships of the size of the Sable Island taking their places. These ships will be built so as to contend with ice conditions, and will be especially constructed and adapted for the sealing industry, and will be a valuable addition to the sealing fleet if the big steel ships are debarred. If we make any progress in connection with our Scotch packed herring industry, and can, in this connection, meet the requirements of American trade this class of steamer will be particularly useful and take a prominent position in connection with that service, for it will become a large industry if we take care to attend to it properly. I believe the day will come, if we progress as we ought to and give the requisite attention to fishery matters when we will have work in summer for twenty ships such as the Sable Island. If so the problem of finding a fleet of small steel ships will be solved, to great benefit of the Colony.

It is my hope that the Bill will stand as we have it now before us, and I trust that the Upper House will be in sympathy with its provisions, and that we will not have any further trouble with that House over Legislation of this nature,

MR. LLOYD—I beg to move an amendment as regards this section to be inserted after the words "misdemeanour," namely, the words: "punishable upon conviction by imprisonment for a period not exceeding one year," and then at the end of the next sentence, "any such breach which shall result in the death of any sailor shall be a felony, and punishable, on conviction, for a period not exceeding three years."

MR. DEVEREAUX.—With reference to Section 13, I would like to know why it is that tonnage is fixed at 450. Is there any reason why other ships should not go if you fixed the section in some other way. I would like to know if it is not possible to include ships that happen to be large and allow these ships to go especially those that have already been there and that have been built expressly for that industry. I think this is most unfair discrimination. We all know that certain firms have been exploiting the seal fishery for more than a century and the effect of this section is to place them in an unfair position. I would like to know if there is any explanation that can be given that will suit the case .

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I think the explanation of that point was given by Mr. Coaker in his remarks.

MR. DEVEREAUX.—I have heard the explanation of the hon. member for Twillingate but even that does not satisfy me. The second largest trip brought in this year was brought in by the Neptune, and was 35,000. Supposing the owners of these large ships were satisfied to be limited to cargoes of 35,000 why would it not be fair to allow these ships to go to the ice. The hon. member for Twillingate has stated that they would not go out for that. That may be so, but I think they ought to be allowed to say whether they will or not. I only ask, Mr. Chairman, in order to satisfy myself with regard to this point and as to whether it is equitable, and whether we are dealing fairly in connection

with an industry that is of interest to many others besides those who may have ships of 450 tons and less .

Now this Section 13 is really a step backwards, because for the last 10 years (and particularly during the last 5 or 6) we have been attempting to improve the condition of the men, and this will be a great retrogression in going back to the wooden ships, because as has been stated more than once in this House, it is impossible to have such regulations with regard to the old wooden ships—which were considered a couple of years ago obsolete ships—as will provide proper accommodation for the men, and we were told that this class of accommodation could only be provided for ships like the Florizel and Stephano and other large ships going out. If you do allow this section to go as it is you will debar the country—and not only the capitalist but the small investor who has $300 or $500 to invest—from repurchasing these steel steamers that have been sold when they are again placed on the market in a year or so from now, and it is only reasonable to suppose that these ships which were so valuable a few years ago will be just as valuable at that time. We will be depriving these people of the opportunity to purchase these ships and use them in this industry.

Now there is another point. No matter how you confine this fishery if there is money in it, if there is 15 or 20 or 25 per cent. to be made out of it you will find sufficient energy and enterprise outside the Island to go into it. And as far as the Canadian Government is concerned I presume it is made up in the same way as other Governments, and it will work in the interest of Canada and not in the interest of any other country. If there are corporations formed in Canada next year you will find that if those corporations consist of Canadians, the Dominion Government (or any other Government in the Dominion), will not dare stultify the energies of its own people and will not dare to interfere with the exploitation of a new industry and one which has given evidence here in the past of being such a valuable one.

I am ready to accept what the hon. gentleman has said in connection with the smaller ships, but in the condition we are now, and surrounded by the circumstances that we are now, you will find it will be impossible to charter them for many years. It will be impossible for the next half century to construct such ships as he has named. If we confine the fishery to what comes within this section we will find that in a few years we will lack shipping altogether. The hon. gentleman has himself stated that the wooden ships cannot last forever; the utmost we can hope for is another 10 or 15 years, and if we will not allow people who wish to place their capital in this industry the end may be that that industry will wholly decline.

However, I want to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the various other sections of the Bill. They are just what are required by the fishermen of this country and have thrown a certain amount of security over the men themselves.

There is great stress made in one or two regulations as to the men going on the ice in the night, and the danger of being lost in the night, but I think if you take the history of this fishery for the past 150 years you will find that no accident—in its incipient stages at least—ever occurred in the night. Everyone knows that this industry is a dangerous one and a hazardous one and one in which accidents are likely to occur, but they may occur at 10o'clock in the forenoon or 2 o'clock in the afternoon or 5.30 in the afternoon just as well as in the night,

because conditions of storm may arise in twenty-five minutes or twenty-five seconds that will make it impossible for the men to see their ship or for the captain to rescue his crew.

This section 13 is really the kernel of the whole matter with reference to the fishery and how it may be conducted .

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Placentia asks for an explanation of section 13. Well, the only explanation that I can give him is that the Committee, which represented both Houses, who had this Bill in hand, gave this matter their fullest consideration, and they came to the conclusion that the larger ships should be debarred from prosecuting the seal fishery. Now, take the case of the "Bonaventure" and the "Bellaventure." The net tonnage of these vessels is something in the neighborhood of 460 tons, and, as far as I can learn, these vessels are capable of carrying a dead weight of bout 1,200 ton. The Committee first thought that they would make the maximum 500 tons but afterwards that was cut down, so that all these ships would be treated alike. It was thought that this would encourage the men to go into the wooden ships. If it is considered that the wooden ships are not comfortable enough for 270 men, well, there is no reason why the number of men cannot be cut down. Then, there is another argument that might be brought forward—that the "Florizel" was the only steel ship that was out to the ice this spring. Now, I happen to know that the "Florizel" and "Stephano" might have been sold long before the "Lintrose" and "Bruce" but the Bowring people kept those ships for the seal fishery, and also for use in the trade between New York, Halifax and St. John's. I suppose they could not see their way clear to dispose of them, although they were offered large sums for them, because they would not be able to replace them. Some few days ago I showed the members of the Government a report from Lloyds of the ships built in 1914 and 1915, in which was pointed out the great drop in the tonnage of Great Britain, France, Norway, Japan and the United States. Ships cannot be got today, and that was why, I suppose, they were compelled to retain them. No doubt it was worth their while to send the "Florizel" to the ice. She only took 270 men—the same as the "Eagle" and the "Terra Nova." No doubt, these men lived more comfortably, and they brought in more seals. The hon. member for Placentia says that he thinks that if these ships were limited to 35,000 seals, it would serve the purpose which it is hoped to attain. Well, the Committee did not think so. It is a question, of course, for this House to decide. If the House thinks that the present section is too severe, and that this class of ship should be allowed to prosecute the fishery, but limited to 35,000 seals, I suppose the majority will only have to rule, but, as Chairman of the Committee, I shall certainly stand by that Committee until I hear their views on this matter.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Chairman: I was on this Sealing Committee last year. This year, I suppose, I did not get along in time, and I was not put on the Committee. I have looked over the Bill, and I have no fault to find with most of the sections. A great many of them are similar to those which we had last year, but I agree with the hon. member for Placentia that to cut out the "Florizel" is rather severe. Now, I have no axe to grind in this matter. I have no interest in any of these steamers, nor am I in any way connected with them, but I think that we should deal justly with every man. The Bowrings, like other

ship owners, probably had an opportunity of selling those ships last year, and they preferred not to do so. As a matter of fact, everybody was pleased when that style of ship was introduced into the seal fishery, because they were more comfortable for the sealers than the old wooden ships, which were practically condemned. Now, I think it would be unfair for this House to prohibit the "Florizel" from taking part in the seal fishery, if her owners wish to send her. If it is thought that she would bring in too many seals, then limit her to 35,000 or 40,000; but I think it would be only fair and right to allow her to continue in the business. I think that the Committee might take this matter into consideration. The objection to the small steamers, a few years ago, was that they were merely used for the seal fishery, and had to lay up during the remainder of the year, because freights were low, and they would not pay. Now, of course, freights are high, and those steamers would pay; but, I suppose, in a few years, when the war is over, things will get down to normal again, and conditions will be the same as before the war, and then the same objection will apply to these steamers as before. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Twillingate that we would be much better off if we could get back to the old style of prosecuting the seal fishery in small vessels. I also believe, in fact I have been advocating it for the last five years, that we should have a close season one year in every six. I believe that will have to come, if we continue as we have been going, and if, as is not at all unlikely, others interest themselves in the business. Five or six years ago there was great talk of building oil plants in Nova Scotia and of prosecuting the seal fishery from there. As far as I could, I persuaded these people out of it, and said that if too many ships got into the business it would not pay anyone. I believe if we had a close season every six years, and if we could get back to small vessels, like we were years ago, that the seals would increase and that the business would pay this country much better than it is paying today; and then, of course, half the voyage would go to the men. So far as the remainder of the Bill is concerned, I have much pleasure in supporting it. I have no objection whatever to any part of it, except this one section. If the House considers that it is right to do this, and to cut this steamer out, then, of course, I must abide by that decision; but I think it would be wise to consider the matter well before we go any further.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman: I should like to move as an amendment that this section should not apply to steamers that have heretofore engaged in the fishery.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman: I beg to second that motion, and in doing so I wish to say that I have no personal interest in the matter at all, but I don't want to see ourselves going backward, if we can avoid it. For the last few years we have had this sealing matter before us, and we have discussed it very fully, and we have tried to improve matters; but I think that if we decide that the Florizel, and steamers of her class, cannot prosecute the seal fishery, that then we are taking a step backwards. I think that the fairest way to deal with the matter would be to limit the voyage. If we do that, I think we will get over the difficulty, and do away with the idea of destroying the seals wholesale. If there were an accident at the icefields at any time, it would not be difficult to get in touch with a boat like the Florizel, with her Marconi apparatus, and have her render the necessary assistance, while one of

those old wooden ships would not be able to move. I think if the members of the House would consider this matter carefully they would agree with my ideas. I second Mr. Devereaux's amendment, and in doing so feel that I am acting in the interests of the fishery and everybody connected with it.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman: In a discussion like this, one not acquainted with the details naturally does not want to say anything, but my ideas on this matter are in line with the remarks of the hon. member for Bay de Verde. There appears to be no doubt about the fact that the House is unanimous in wanting to pass this Bill. I don't think there is any diversity of opinion at all about that. And even with regard to this section 13, there does not appear to be any difference of opinion, because, broadly speaking, as I understand it, the principle behind section 13 is the preservation of the seal fishery. The idea underlying the section is to prevent large steamers who might get large catches, from engaging in the fishery. But what strikes the layman, who doesn't know anything about the details of the business is: Would not the same result be accomplished by a restriction such as has been suggested? In other words, how much more is your herd of seals depleted by a wooden ship bringing in 35,000 seals than by a steel ship bringing in 35,000 seals?. How much more is your herd depleted by the Neptune or Eagle bringing in 35,000 seals than by the Florizel bringing in 35,000. Well, then, if that principle is sound with regard to the matter of quantity, is it not worthy of consideration by those hon. members who have spoken already in the early stages of the debate, and who are naturally especially interested in the welfare of the crews—is it not worthy of consideration, I repeat, that we ought not, if possible, shut out a steamer that is able to give crews better accommodation than some of those that we want to see engaged. Now,my mind is absolutely open on this matter, as must be the minds of quite a number of the members of this House, but frankly the position that does appear peculiar to me is that steamers that have been out to the ice this year and that are capable of bringing in say 35,000 or 40,000 seals will be encouraged under this Bill to sail again, while we are taking the chance of losing to the trade of the country ships such as the Florizel. I do not know whether 35,000 as a catch would pay, but I consider it right, as has been said, that these people should be given the opportunity of coming in under a restricted catch. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to consider the position that must strike a lot of ordinary members around here as to whether it is not possible to have that amendment considered without the necessity of going to a division. I take it that there is no desire on anyone's part here to force the amendment, and if the Committee think it possible to meet the position presented by that amendment, I am sure that no member in the House would wish to have any divergence of opinion, in the sense of a division on the bill at all.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr Chairman: I cannot agree with the hon. member for Placentia in the amendment which he has just proposed. I take it that it is unfair competition on account of the difference in power of ships like the "Florizel" and "Stephano" and ships of that class prosecuting the sealfishery, as against the wooden ships; so that there is little room for wooden ships to get any seals at all where such a ship as the "Florizel" and her class would be in the neighbourhood of a patch. I consider that very unfair. Then again,

the hon. gentlemen who have been talking on this subject vary in their opinions; one minute they say that they would like to see the seal fishery prosecuted under the old system, and that if we could go back to the old days of sailing ships, so much the better for the Colony; and on the other hand they turn around and say they do not like to see the "Florizel" cut out, as it is very unfair to her owners. What are you going to do? Are you going to give the monopoly again to the steel ships and to cut out wooden ships totally? It seems to me as if the intention on the part of some is to give the monopoly to the steel ships again to allow them to be brought here again by some capitalists with power to become monopolists. I cannot support that amendment. It is wrong in principle. The measure as it stands I think, is all right. Permitting steel ships to continue prosecuting this fishery opens other possibilities not yet apparent; for instance, go forward a few years and see the seal fishery prosecuted by these ships; science enables their owners to possess aeroplanes with which to locate the position of the seals; and this information is conveyed to these powerful ships; the result would be that the whole patch would be picked up by a few steel ships, and the profits divided amongst a few capitalists. That would be like the sweeping of the Atlantic ocean by a few capitalists with a few traps and taking up all the fish, or having the fishery on the Banks of Newfoundland controlled by a few people. I think it is bad in principle. I cannot support that amendment; and if the House divides, I certainly shall vote against it.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Chairman: I think that the solution of many questions concerning it lies in the measure now before us. I think that the suggestion of the Select Committee relative to 450 ton steamers is very wise, and if adopted ought to bring forth many benefits. Consider what an enormous catch these large vessels require before it becomes a profitable undertaking for them. They say that less than 30,000 seals would not pay the "Florizel." It is, of course, different with the smaller ships. In this case, 5,000 would be a paying voyage for one of this class. My hon. friend, Mr. Moulton, the member for Burgeo, says that he longs for the day to come when we will get back again to the small ships. The way to get back to that state is to disallow the participation of large steamers in prosecution of this industry. I see great good resulting from such an enactment; its value is apparent; and I think this House will support the retention of the clause in this Bill which provides for such legislation.

MR. GRIMES—As the representative of a District which contributes quite a large number of people for the prosecution of the seal fishery, I have to support the clause in the Bill now under discussion. I am strongly of the opinion if we are going to allow steel ships to prosecute the seal fishery it will have the effect of bringing that fishery under the control of a few individuals. Confined to ships of small tonnage as specified in this bill namely, 450 tons, there will be a distribution of wealth that will be shared between a very much larger number of persons. Big ships require big capital which is only the possession of very few in this country, and such ships if allowed to engage in the seal fishery, means this very few will get the lion's share. We must view this section of the Bill from the standpoint of sealer as well as owner. It is natural for the owner to use methods in the prosecution of the fishery as will allow it to be conducted at the lowest minimum of cost, to allow the greatest margin of profits. Under present industrial conditions, it is na-

tural for the sealer and the people in general to protect themselves by all means possible against methods which will lessen employment and concentrate wealth in the hands of the few. The capitalist thinks of his profits, the sealer of his bread and butter that may be taken from him by the new methods. Big ships mean the same catches made with fewer men. There could be one justification only for the Government to allow the use of large ships, and that is competition from other places engaged in the same fishery by the use of big ships. No such competition prevails at the present time, or if it does it is of such insignificance as not to give any worry. Until such competition takes place there is no valid reason for this Legislature to allow any departure from the old methods which serve the interests of the greater number as it has done in the past.

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 motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

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 Revising and Consolidating the Public General Statute Laws of the Colony and for the Publication of the Same," and "An Act to Amend and Continue in Force for a Further Period the Act 5, Geo. V. Session 1, Cap. 4, entitled: 'An Act respecting a Volunteer force in this Colony,'" without amendment.

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

RE PROHIBITION LEGISLATION.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: Before the House rises I would like to ask the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Government what position the Prohibition Proclamation stands in. The days are passing, and as far as I can understand we shall be in session for a short time only from this date; and no definite information has been submitted to the House relative to this matter. On another occasion, the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister stated that he had instructed the Attorney General to take some steps in reference to the petition now before the Court, and that in any case if there is any doubt on the matter remedial legislation will be forthcoming. We are now approaching the last days of the Session, and we do not know what the Attorney General has done nor have we any formal notice of legislation in this connection. I would like the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Government to supply me with this information.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I merely wish to reiterate what I have already said earlier in the Session, that if necessity demands it, legislation will be introduced to remove all doubt on this subject. I understand that the parties interested in the petiiton now before the Court have decided not to withdraw it; and I have already requested the Attorney General to prepare whatever legislation is necessary, and it will be introduced probably this week, but at all events immediately after Easter recess.

MR. LLOYD—Will you be in a position to state to-morrow when it will be introduced?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes. There is no intention to close the House without placing this matter beyond doubt.

MR. LLOYD—Yes—I understand

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I had hoped that the necessity for such legislation would be obviated if the parties withdrew the petition.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 18th, 1916.

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

PETITIONS.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bay Roberts, and I might read it for the information of the House. (Member reads). This is largely signed by business men and others who feel the necessity of a telephone service at that place in connection with their business, and I might say that I recommend the petition to the Government and hope they will take the necessary steps to fill this long-felt want of the people at Bay Roberts. The people there do not want to be living behind the times, and I hope the Government will give this matter their consideration. It is signed largely by the merchants and business people.

MR. PARSONS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Piccott, and hope the Government will see its way clear to give its best consideration to this improvement in facilitating business. I hope the Government will see its way clear to answer the prayer of the petition.

MR. CLIFT—I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition from the inhabitants of Campbellton and Michael's Harbour, and other places in the vicinity, asking for the sum of $1,000 for the purpose of repairing the road between Campbellton and Michael's Harbour, and also for the purpose of fixing some bridges along that road, which are now in a dangerous state of repair. The petition is very largely signed, and this is an important road. I have very much pleasure in presenting this petition and commending it to this House.

I also ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Julie's Harbour and vicinity asking for the sum of $200 to finish the wharf at that place, which wharf is now partly under construction,and the petitioners ask for that sum in order to complete it. I beg to support the prayer of this petition, also to ask that both be referred respectively to the Department to which they refer.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Norman's Cove, and other places at the bottom of Trinity Bay for a lighthouse. While discussing the estimates this year 1 called the attention of the Minister of Marine to this condition, and he promised to consider it. However, I have here the petition from the inhabitants of Tickle Harbour, Norman's Cove, Dildo and New Harbour, very largely signed. It is signed by Robert Smith and 209 others. I hope the Government will see their way clear to help the people of these settlements out in this respect, and ask that the petition be received and referred and passed over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to support the petition just presented by my friend and colleague, Mr. Stone, and hope that the Government will see their way clear to grant its prayer. The large number of signatures show that this is something which would be very welcome to all the people of the places at the bottom of Trinity Bay.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Seldom Come Bye, Fogo

District, asking that two Fog Alarms be erected, one on Cabot Island and the other on Penguin Island. This is the most dangerous part of the coast of Newfoundland, and the most frequented by schooners and steamers during the greater part of the year. These Islands are passed and re-passed by schooners from nearly all sections of the country, especially by coasters and fishing schooners of Conception, Trinity and Bonavista Bays in the prosecution of the Labrador Fishery, while schooners from Notre Dame Bay pass and re-pass these Islands continually fall and spring in the carrying of freight to and from St. John's. There have been many hair-breadth escapes, while many lives have been lost as well as much valuable property in the locality of these Islands. A similar petition was presented this session by Mr. Jennings, the hon. member for Twillingate, to which I gave my support. Fog alarms on these Islands as a guide to navigation are just as necessary as lighthouses, and I heartily support the prayer of the petition, and beg to refer it to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the immediate attention it deserves.

I also beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Cape Cove, Fogo, asking for $30 for repairing bridges in that neighbourhood. The petition sets forth that the bridges here are out of repair, and as a result traffic is interfered with. I support the prayer of the petition and ask that it be referred to the Department of Public Works.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Law dealing with the regulation of Saw Mills.

The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Law respecting the exportation of Timber.

SUPPLY RESOLUTIONS.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time, as follows:

Additional Estimates $83,515.00

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman: In presenting to-day my eighth Budget I desire to congratulate the Colony on the prospect that there will be, at the end of the fiscal year now only ten weeks off, a surplus of Revenue over Expenditure. Thus we are returning to the favourable conditions experienced by the Colony until the past two years, when, as a result, in the year 1913-14, of the reduction in duties the previous session and, in the year 1914-15, of the dislocation of business consequent upon the war, deficits were experienced. Now, however, I am glad to say, the pendulum has swung back again, the balance has readjusted itself and we can see the Colony on the upgrade once more. Moreover, with the conditions as they are at present and with the prospects before the country during the next twelve months, it is not unreasonable, I think, to express the hope that in the session of 1917 there will be a similar gratifying condition of affairs to announce.

Inasmuch as an exposition of our fiscal affairs calls for reference to

three annual periods, I shall briefly deal with those that are embraced within every Budget Speech, namely, the year that has passed, the year that is current, and the year that is to come. For the last fiscal year, which ended on June 30th, 1915, the outcome of our operations was a deficit of $755,983, which we liquidated, first, by using the balance of the cash reserve, $198,150.64, or, say, $200,000, remaining in the Bank of Montreal to the Colony's credit; second, by raising a loan of $500,000 from the Bank of Montreal, for which we provided by a Bill passed at the last session, and, third, by carrying over as a debit balance into this year's accounts, the outstanding expenditures of 1915-16.

For the Current fiscal year 1915-16 I estimate a Revenue of, roundly, $4,160,000, and an expenditure of $4,100,000, leaving a surplus of $60,000, or just enough to liquidate this outstanding obligation and enable us to begin the fiscal year 1916-17 with a clean sheet.

For that year, beginning with next July, I frankly admit that, in view of war-time conditions, on the one side, and the Prohibition problem, on the other, it is impossible to approximate at all closely the likely outcome, but for reasons which I shall set out in detail later in this address, I look to our being able to obtain enough Revenue during that twelve months, not alone to meet our indebtedness, but to yield somewhat of a surplus also.

I shall now proceed to deal with these three years in greater detail. Our financial period 1914-15 was practically coincident with the first year of the war. The fiscal year began on the first of July, the war began on the first of August. During eleven months, therefore, absolutely abnormal conditions prevailed in regard to our financial and commercial affairs. It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to recall some phases of the situation, but on the other hand it will assist in making clear what has transpired if I briefly review the operations of these eventful twelve months. When the war broke out the Colony was enjoying a period of nearly normal prosperity. It is true that world depression the previous year had affected us somewhat, and that the high-water mark of imports and exports had not been fully maintained, but the cloud was passing away, industry and commerce were flourishing, everything pointed to an autumn and winter of comfort and contentment for our people. In a minute, however, all was changed. With the opening of hostilities, the uncertainty as to exchange with foreign countries, the fear of German commerce raiders, and the disinclination of business people to import or export commodities until matters righted themselves somewhat, a very critical situation was created, so much so, indeed, that there was a strong agitation for a moratorium, as it was feared that direful consequences might ensue. Gradually, however, a more hopeful view of things followed, the exchange difficulty was overcome, the German raiders were swept from the seas, and commercial and financial operations between various countries were resumed, if even on a limited scale; and increased as the months went by. The effect, however, of the uncertainty that prevailed, was to greatly limit imports into our Colony, and thereby to reduce our Customs Revenues. In order that all may realize what the effect was on our imports, it is only necessary for me to give here the returns of imports for the past five fiscal years:—

Value of Total Imports.	
1910-11	$13,383,910
1911-12	14,733,499
1912-13	16,012,365
1913-14	15,193,726
1914-15	12,350,786

It will be seen very clearly from these figures that in the first year of the war our imports were reduced by more than three million dollars as compared with the previous year.

An analysis of the imports under their four principal divisions, namely, from Britain, Canada, United States, and all other countries, shows the situation during the five-year period, to have been that this decline was all-embracing. Thus, whereas in 1910-11 our imports from Britain were about three million dollars, they increased in 1913 to nearly four and a half million dollars and dropped again in 1914-15 to two and a third million dollars, the decline that year being exactly a million and a half dollars as against only $600,000 the previous year. With regard to Canada the imports grew from $4,600,000 in 1910-11 to $5,200,000 in 1912-13, and declined again by $700,000 last year. So also with regard to the United States. Our imports from that country advanced from five million to $5,800,000, and dropped again last year to $5,000,000, while what we obtained from other countries advanced from $740,000 in 1910-11 to $820,000 in 1912, and declined again to $590,000 last year. These figures, showing the same trend in all cases, make it evident that our most prosperous year was 1912-13, that the depression throughout the world next year reduced our imports by a million dollars in round figures, and that then, the following year, as a result of the war, we had a decline of three times that amount.

The extent of our recovery the past nine months has been such as to put it beyond all question that the decline last year was directly attributable to the war. For virtually every week of the nine months that have now passed of the present fiscal year, there has been a substantial increase in the Customs Revenue, totalling $757,788.64 up to March 31st. The barometer of Customs Revenue for the past five years tells the story more clearly. The figures of the duties received from imports during these five years are as follows:—

1910-11	$2,898,615.25
1911-12	3,184,633.90
1912-13	3,283,304.35
1913-14	3,089,627.53
1914-15	2,744,567.85

The actual Customs Revenue for the nine months of this year was $2,712,000, or almost exactly the same amount as was received for the twelve months of last year. This clearly proves that when the war broke out importers, instead of renewing their stocks, abandoned importing in a large measure and tried to utilize the goods they had on their shelves. Thus our imports contracted largely in volume, and our customs receipts were diminished, until now, having sold out these goods, dealers are having to import largely, and as they have to pay a much increased price for the commodities over last year, the Revenue is gaining in two ways, first, by the duty on the increased quantity of imports, and, second, by the additional amount obtained from the increased cost of goods themselves.

The justice of these conclusions is confirmed by a study of our exports for the past five years. The figures are as follows:—

1910-11	$11,975,747
1911-12	13,874,809
1912-13	14,572,889
1913-14	15,134,543
1914-15	13,136,880

This shows a steady advance for the first four years of the five, due in part to the constantly increasing prices received for our staple products, but of course, when the war began, when there was a question of entry into vari-

ous markets, when lobsters become unsaleable and when the iron ore mines at Bell Island shut down, there was a reduction in the value of our exports, but fortunately this only totalled two million dollars instead of three million dollars in the reduction in our imports, so that our people had the benefit of a million dollars in this way, which was available for the purchase of foodstuffs and other essentials.

A similar analysis to that which I have already made of our exports to Britain, to Canada, to America, and to other countries, disclose the following result. We increased our exports to Britain in five years from $2,300,000 to about $3,200,000, the figures remaining about constant the last three years and the increase being due in a great measure to our shipments of pulp and paper. Our exports to Canada increased from $1,750-000 in 1910-11 to $2,250,000 in 1912-13, dropped $350,000 the next year and dropped a further $600,000 the past year, a fact ascribable to our exporting comparatively no ore during the first year of the war. Our imports to America increased from one and a quarter million dollars to nearly $1,-700,000 in 1913-14, while the decline last year was only $150,000, showing that the articles we now send to America are what may be described as absolute necessaries for them, and therefore not easily reduced in either volume or value. Our exports to other countries grew from six to three-quarter million dollars to somewhat over eight million dollars the year before last and then dropped again to seven million dollars in the last fiscal year the exports of lobster and iron ore to Germany contributing in a large degree to that falling off.

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that for the fiscal year 1914-15 we exported only 1,094,244 quintals of fish against 1,247,314 quintals the previous year, a reduction of 153,070 quintals, which at slightly over $6 a quintal, represent a million dollars in itself, or one-half of the total decline in our exports during the twelve months.

The reduction of our total trade imports and exports during the last fiscal year by over five million dollars, or twenty per cent. of the whole, reflected itself in a decline in our general revenue of $365,689.80, or an average of one thousand dollars a day for the whole twelve months.

The statement of the principal items of revenue last year and the previous year is as follows:

	Amt. Collected 1913-1914	Amt. Collected 1914-1915
Customs	$3,083,313.46	$2,744,567.85
Postal and Telegraphs	215,124.95	228,504.20
Crown Lands	146,021.39	94,165,02
Fines and Forfeitures	5,221.18	3,915.39
Liquor Licenses	5,096.45	4,938.50
Inland Revenue Stamps	18,151.88	18,891.55
Interest on Guaranteed Loans	56,313.64	56,485.24
Broom Department Penitentiary	9,239.85	8,169.29
Fees Public Institutions	4,459.29	3,563.45
Taxes and Assessments	38,651.32	38,468.85
Estate Duties	———	9,843.16
Miscellaneous General	36,735.72	41,126.83
	$3,618.329.13	$8,252,639.33

These figures show that during the last fiscal year the Postal and Telegraph Revenue increased by $13,389, the miscellaneous general revenue in-

creased by $4,391, and estate duties yielded $9,483. The increase in Postal and Telegraph Revenues is due in part to an enlargement of business, but also to the purchase of stamps required under the new Stamp Act, while estate duties appear for the first time as a head of Revenue. On the other hand, the Customs revenue decreased almost $340,000, the Crown Lands Revenue almost $52,000, and other items showed trifling decreases.

As to our prospects, in the light of these conditions, for attaining a surplus on the 30th of June next, I can merely say that for the nine months of the current fiscal year which ended on Friday, March 31st, the revenue of the various departments, according to a statement prepared by the Auditor-General, was $2,999,065.82, or, roundly three million dollars, and he estimates that during the next three months we shall have $1,136,768.36 additional, not including amounts to come in from Estate Duties and from royalties on pit-props exported, which I am putting at the low estimate of $25,000, making a grand total of revenue of, say, $4,160,000, and as his estimate of expenditure, based on the actual outgo for the past nine months, is $4,100,000 for the year, we therefore count upon a surplus of $60,000, or enough to wipe out the debit balance from last year.

The Auditor General's estimate is as follows:

Heads of Revenue	Actual Revenue to March 31, 1916.	Estimated Revenue for the Balance of year	Total for year 1915-16
Customs (including outstanding Bonds)	$2,712,305.68	$900,000.00	$3,612,305.68
Postal	92,257.13	62,742.87	155,000.00
Telegraphs	63,233.92	31,766.08	95,000.00
Inland Revenue	17,153.28	4,846.72	22,000.00
Crown Lands	53,722.15	41,277.85	95,000.00
Liquor Licenses	4,728.50	———	4,728.50
Fines and Forfeitures ..	2,489.17	1,510.83	4,000.00
Taxes	1,864.97	36,435.03	38,300.00
Broom Dept., Penitentiary	4,599.59	4,400.41	9,000.00
Fees Public Institutions..	2,628.42	1,371.58	4,000.00
Int. on Guaranteed Loans	28,242.62	28,257.38	56,500.00
Miscellaneous	15,840.39	16,159.61	32,000.00
Estate Duties	———	8,000.00	8,000.00
	$2,999,065.82	$1,136,768.36	$4,135,834.18

Estimated Revenue '15-16 $4,135,834.18
Receipts from Death Duties and Pit Props Exports ...$25,000

The Auditor-General's estimate of expenditure is as follows:

	For Year (Estimate).	
Public Service Act $4,051,690.37		
Audit Act, say	30,000.00	
Supplementary Supply, say	125,000.00	
	$4,206,690.37	
Less Audit Act, to be repaid from the War Loan .. .. ..$ 15,000		
Dropped Balances, say 100,000	115,000.00	
	$4,091,690.37	
Say Total Expenditure of		$4,100,000.00

We have next to consider the question of the fiscal year 1916-17 and the prospects of financing the Colony successfully through that period with the previously existing problems of wartime conditions, shipping shortage, import difficulties, and the like, accentuated by the decision of the electorate last November that a Prohibition policy shall go into force at the end of the present year.

The most perplexing problem which confronted the Finance Ministers of every country—even of neutral nations—during the first year of the war, was the dislocation of trade conditions which prevailed everywhere and which made it difficult, if not impossible, for even the most careful observer to forecast the trend of commercial activity and the magnitude of its swing. For Newfoundland the balance swung against us very decidedly, causing a shortage in the Revenue of $750,000 but this year a perfectly revolutionary transformation has been effected, and the pendulum has swung back again even more decidedly. Despite the disadvantages which now confront us in the increased cost of many articles of commerce required in the Colony, in the growing difficulty of obtaining others, in the grave features of the tonnage problem, which has resulted in warehouses in New York, Halifax and Montreal, and in the railway yards at North Sydney, being crowded with goods from Newfoundland during the winter, which could not be got forward; we have been able, as a result, first of the increased imports, occasioned by the selling down of previous stocks; second, of the increased returns from ad valorem duties; and third, of the war taxes imposed by the Legislature, to increase the Revenue for the current year, without any serious hardship to the people, to almost $4,200,000.00, and the commercial, financial and industrial circumstances of the Colony, moreover, make it manifest that we are entitled to look forward to the coming fiscal year to maintain this very satisfactory condition of affairs if not, indeed, materially improve them.

What are our obligations for the next fiscal year? it is now proper to ask. I reply that for the financial year beginning on the first of July next and ending on the 30th of June, 1917, we voted Main Estimates already this session totalling $4,079,907.63, besides Additional Estimates voted last week amounting to $83,515. This makes a total estimated expenditure for the next fiscal year of $4,163,422.63 , or, say $4,165,000. There will, of course, be some Supplemental Supply at the next session to add to this, but on the other hand there will be the customary dropped balances, which will virtually offset the excess. This year, for instance, our Supplemental Supply is $125,000, but our dropped balances will total $100,000. We have therefore to consider at the present moment the possibility of obtaining a Revenue of $4,165,000 to meet this expenditure.

Can we obtain this Revenue? I am confident that we can. To begin with, we have every expectation of securing for the current year a Revenue of about $4,160,000, or an amount equal to our prospective expenditure for next year, and this in spite of many drawbacks and disadvantages. Moreover, there are large quantities of goods in transit to this Colony, or which will be in transit between now and the 30th of June, that will not reach here in time to be included, as they probably should be, in this fiscal year's accounting. They will, therefore, go to swell the returns for the coming fiscal year. Then there will be the regular imports during the twelve months, which will be affected to a small or

large extent, by the earnings of our people, by the progress of the war, and by the possibilities of securing tonnage for their transport. In addition, there will be large quantities of pit props—a conservative estimate says 150,000 cords—cut and prepared for shipment, which, it is hoped, will be taken out of the Island during the next twelve months, and which, if this does result, will mean an addition to our Revenue of $150,000. There will also be substantial amounts realized from the death duties on estates. These are factors which, in the main, should make for a largely increased Revenue, and it is but fair to emphasize that, from the viewpoint of the business man, the prospect never looked more encouraging for a prosperous and successful year for our people. The war has taken between 3,000 and 4,000 of our young men, who are, one may say, permanently employed at fair wages and who, by the allotments the soldiers leave to their families and by the separation allowances the naval men obtain for their relatives in augmentation of their own grants, provide for the circulation of large sums among a class who might, under ordinary circumstances, be without a good deal of this money. Then, owing to the requirements of the pulp and paper companies, the saw mills, and the pit prop trade, there is abundant employment for thousands of men in the lumber woods. Similarly, at Bell Island, owing to the increased demand for iron ore for various forms of war work, as well as for commercial purposes, the mines are being operated on a scale of unexampled activity, and there is abundance of labor obtainable there also. Finally, owing to the enormous enlistment of men in Cape Breton for the war, the coal-mining and steel-making companies in that territory are also making very heavy demands upon our local labor, with the result that, I understand, more than two thousand people have been carried across Cabot Strait during the past twelve months to work in connection with these industries, and it looks now as if there would be a still greater range of employment open to our people in Cape Breton than ever before. All these things, therefore, combine to make the year one of exceeding promise for our people, and this, remember, does not take into account at all the opportunities offered by our staple industry, the fishery, where, with prices ruling as they are to-day, there is a prospect of men earning perhaps more than ever they did before. Hence, there is no reason to doubt, from all the indications evident at the present time, that the next fiscal year is certain to be a highly prosperous one and that this prosperity is equally certain to be reflected in the Revenue returns because much of this money will go into the purchase of duty-paying articles.

Another circumstance not to be overlooked in considering the present situation and the prospective outlook is the comparative immunity which the Colony has enjoyed from the commercial disturbance that has attended the present struggle in Europe. I cannot, perhaps, better describe this than in words of the Annual Report of the Board of Trade, which says:

"Probably no British Colony has suffered less through war conditions than Newfoundland has. The principal markets for shore cured fish—Brazil, Spain, Italy, and Portugal—have fortunately not been interfered with by war conditions. The Greek market was closed by order of the British authorities from early November to December 20th, and being one of the principal markets for soft cured Labrador fish, a certain injury was sustained through loss of con-

sumption, but the embargo being raised it is earnestly hoped that this market may be held open to us while the balance of the catch is being realized, and if so, the trade of the Colony has very much to be thankful for. The effect of the war has been to advance the prices of codfish, herring, cod oil, and, excepting as regards lobsters, that were largely marketed in Germany, the export trade of the Colony has so far suffered nothing and in the production of pit props the Colony has found a valuable addition to its export trade."

Hon. members will, of course, have in mind the contingency that the fiscal situation for the coming year may be unsettled by the result of the recent prohibition election,—a decision that the total prohibition of the liquor traffic in this Colony should be inaugurated with the next New Year. This means, therefore, that beginning on that date, a source of Revenue which in the past has amounted to, roughly $400,000, will be eliminated. The Government has been faced with two alternatives, each carrying their own weighty arguments, in considering the new condition to which this will rise. These were, first, whether we should, at this session, introduce legislation to enable us to secure additional Revenue to offset the possible shortage which will follow the stoppage of liquor imports, and second, whether we should wait until next session and see what will result in the meantime in regard to local trade, and in regard to the war. We have decided upon the latter alternative.

I am not in a position to make any exact estimates as to the loss in Revenue which will be caused through the enforcement of prohibition and the consequent non-importation of wines, spirits, liquors, etc., in so far as the loss for the six months of the year ending on the 30th June, 1917, is concerned, as so much depends on the importation, which at present is uncertain.

The total collection of duty on liquor for the year ending June 30th, 1915, amounted to $380,000 from all sources, including local manufacture. As the Revenue for the year commencing July 1st, 1916, will only represent a half year (since Prohibition comes in force on the 1st January, 1917), I estimate that only half that amount will be collected. In other words what liquor will be taken out of bond and what liquor will be imported between 1st July, 1916, and 1st January, 1917, will not amount to duty more than $190,000. This shortage I estimate will be covered by Revenue from other sources, and I have not considered it necessary to recommend that any additional taxation be imposed this year, but in the Budget Speech of next year the whole of this loss of $380,000, which will occur for the first time beginning July 1st, 1917, will have to be reckoned with. The question then, will be as to what the actual loss of Revenue will amount to, having regard to the fact that the purchasing power of the people, for the other goods, will be increased by $1,000,000, that being about the amount spent on liquor.

I am having estimates prepared in relation to this matter, and am not now in a position to state definitely to the House what the Revenue will gain in this way, and at the best it can only be an estimate; but, assuming for the sake of argument, that our liquor bill is $1,000,000, I think we can allow that half of this is spent by well-to-do citizens and by visitors to our shores. From this quarter we can hardly expect any equivalent expenditure on dutiable goods, as money spent by them on liquor will to a large extent be hereafter saved by them, and

probably banked or otherwise invested; but assuming for the sake of argument that half of that amount will be expended on dutiable goods by them, we ought to collect, at 30 per cent., $75,000 from this class. Now, as regards the other $500,000 spent by the poorer classes, we may assume that the whole of this amount will be expended by them and put in general circulation; but all of this will not be spent on dutiable goods. Some of it will go for the purchase of farm and other local products, some on amusements and some on goods that are duty free; but we may assume that they will spend half of it on goods paying say 30 per cent. duty. That will mean another $75,000, or a total of $150,000, which will come back to the Revenue, after Prohibition is in force.

The loss, therefore, will be $230,000, which is the difference between that $150,000 and the $380,000 at present obtained from duty on liquor. This loss of $230,000 will have to be provided for in the fiscal year commencing July 1st, 1917.

We have, then, to face for the next year a grand total of expenditure of $4,165,000, and for the current fiscal year we have in sight a Revenue of almost identically the same amount, a fact which fairly guarantees our ability to meet it. We have to remember, however, the contingency that next year we may be short $200,000 through loss of revenue from liquor imports, but as against that we have in sight the possibility of realizing $150,000 from the export of pit props and probably another $100,000 from estate duties, not to speak of the possible augmentations of Customs Revenue that may result during the year.

We feel, too, that we ought not, if it can be avoided, attempt the imposition of further taxes on the people of this Colony at the present juncture, and we are confident that if matters can be continued until the end of the year, we will be in a better position to work out a plan, and the public will have a better appreciation of the reasons to actuate us, than if we were to come forward with proposals now for the collection of Revenue which may not be needed in part, if at all, because it may prove that under the operations of this Act, on the one side, and under the changed conditions which the close of hostilities in Europe will bring about on the other side, matters will so transform themselves in this country that it will be possible for us to get along without imposing any new taxes. As evidence that this is by no means an unlikely contingency, I would point to the fact that, whereas in 1908, there was a deficit of $200,000, we had in the following year a surplus of $420,000, representing a difference of Revenue in one twelve months of $600,000, and that even now in the Budget I am submitting to you, we look to make up in the present year not alone the deficit of $750,000 on last year's account, but also enough, in addition, to meet the increased expense of the public service and to give us a surplus as well, or roughly, a change of over a million dollars this year. Hence, I do not think it is too much to ask the House to consider that we are reasoning fairly when we submit that it may be found a year hence that there will be no necessity to impose additional burdens because of the adoption of the prohibition policy.

Furthermore, if we should find between now and the end of December, that there is reason to apprehend a shortage in Customs or other Revenue, the House can meet for the next session at a very early date in the New Year, and we can then make such further provision as may prove necessary

to counteract any reduction that will become evident. I am hopeful, however, that such an outcome will not be necessary.

Everything goes to indicate that we are destined to have large Revenues and a prosperous season. The high prices obtained for our fishery products latterly, in some cases the highest ever realized, have contributed materially to the widespread prosperity enjoyed last year. The winter transpired without even an utterance as to distress in any part of the country, and the outlook for the present year, with our sealfishery opening so favourably and such good prices ruling, and with the prospect of high rates for codfish as a result of the short Norwegian catch, is at least equally favorable.

The sale of the large sealing steamers last Fall proved a very profitable transaction for the owners thereof, and local funds were substantially increased thereby, while on the other hand the purchase of vessels in Canada and United States to meet the growing demands for tonnage for transport of the commodities essential to our Colonial existence, is providing the Colony with a flotilla of sailing vessels which represents a large investment of capital, and which it is to be hoped will prove advantageous to all interests concerned. Goodly sums have also been paid for vessels for the general fishing industry and the estimate was put forward here a few evenings ago that $250,000 a year was spent for this purpose annually. The fact that so many new vessels are being brought in this year is a gratifying circumstances in more respects than one. It will mean that all the profits accruing from the movement of much of our commerce, will be retained by local parties instead of, as heretofore, going to swell the dividends of the owners of steamers which had no interest in the Colony beyond the amount to be obtained for the freights on the cargoes brought into or away from it. It is to be hoped that one of the results of this war will be the recreation of our local shipping fleet, which was of such magnitude and importance in byegone days, and which proved the mainstay of many local industries, such as the shipwright, the blacksmith, the sailmaker, etc., and which assured to us a large seafaring community, and many of our own young men filling positions as navigators.

The coal problem has been solved. Provision has been made for procuring enough salt for our fishery needs the coming summer. The Red Cross, Reid and other steamers will ere long relieve the congestion of freight at New York, Halifax and Sydney. Steamers from the Great Lakes are being procured for the Montreal trade, and the import of foodstuffs will thus be safeguarded, while the vessels being purchased for fish carriers will ensure the conveyance of our staple products to foreign markets. On the whole, then, we have reason for thankfulness at the prospect.

I might add that the annual report of the Colonial Savings Bank for the year ended on Dec. 31, 1915, shows that it had then on its books deposits aggregating $2,411,946.16, and that the four Canadian Banks doing business in the Colony had on deposit at interest and in their Savings Branches, on the same date, no less than $9,906,154.43. These figures, totalling $12,318,100.59, are the savings of our people, and amazing to relate, have increased by nearly one million dollars, or $912,-424.26, to be precise, over the previous year. Then, the value of the debentures held in the Colony on the same date was $3,804,216, while the statement as to Life Insurance shows that there were current in the Colony on

the 31st of December, 1913, some 5067 policies of an aggregate value of $7,-745,559.85, and on the 31st day of December, 1914, there were 5482 policies of a face value of $8,325,329.06, an increase during the year of 415 policies, with a face valuation of $579,-769.21. The reserve, or re-insurance value of these was $1,738,218.59.

The net Public Debt of the Colony at the end of June last was $30,214,-332.63. This included $1,033,865 of the war loan required on account of our military activity and $960,000 of special loans in the Bank of Montreal, $460,000 on account of Enactments authorized in previous sessions, and $500,000 to cover last year's defcit.

The usual financial statements will be found by hon. members on their desks and therefore I do not propose to refer to them at length. I have also attached to this address extracts from the Auditor-General's report dealing with loans, trust funds, or war expenditures, etc., which I propose to have printed as part of this review, in order that hon. members may be facilitated in the preparation of any remarks they may have to make on our finacial situation. I feel sure that every hon. gentleman in this House, and the country outside, will rejoice that in spite of the great war in which so much of the world is now involved, the Colony has been able to maintain such a high standard of material advancement and progress as it has the past twelve months, and I am confident that I but reflect the feeling of the Legislature and the people in general when I express the hope that before we meet again this devastating struggle will have terminated, and the world be once more embarked upon the ocean of peace; and that we, in common with the Allied countries, may be able to give our undivided attention to the pursuit of the arts of concord and the development of the well-being of the great Empire of which we form part, along lines that will redound to the greater glory of the British flag and the greater advancement of its people.

I propose to have this speech printed to-morrow afternoon, together with the resolutions for effecting the changes in the tariff outlined here today; and I therefore beg leave to move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again on Monday next.

The only tariff changes we propose are two—one a provision for the free entry of a certain class of iron hoop used in making herring barrels, and the other for the free entry of material for installing wireless telegraphy on board of ships engaged in the trade and fisheries of the Colony. The Resolutions for this purpose I now table.

RESOLUTIONS.

Submitted to a Committee of the Whole House, by the Minister of Finance and Customs, on Ways and Means.

RESOLVED—That Schedule A to the Act passed in this fifth year of the Reign of His Majesty Edward VII., Chapter 9, entitled "The Revenue Act 1905" as already amended by subsequent Acts, be further amended, by striking out of item 79, after the word "nosed," in the last line, the words "over 68 inches in length."

RESOLVED—That Schedule of Cap. XXVII. entitled "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1905," be amended, (a) By striking out the words "Hoop iron or hoop steel,splayed, punched or nosed, and cut in lengths not to exceed sixty-eight inches, to be used in making herring barrels, ad val. 10 P.C."

(b) By striking out the words "material for installing wireless telegraphy on board of ships engaged in the trade and fisheries of the Colony—ad val. 10 p.c."

RESOLVED—That Schedule B to the Act passed in the fifth year of the Reign of His Majesty King Edward VII., Chapter 9, entitled "The Revenue Act 1905," as already amended by subsequent Acts, be further amended, by adding the words "Material for installing wireless telegraphy on board ships engaged in the trade and fisheries of the Colony."

RESOLVED—That a Bill be introduced to give effect to the foregoing Resolutions.

SURPLUS TRUST AND LOAN EXPENDITURE, 1914-15.

Act	Service	Additions from 1913-14	Expenditure 1914-15	Balance to 1915-16
61, 62, 63 Vic. Cap. 33.				
	Agricultural Bounty	$939.69	$25.90	$913.79
61 Vic, Cap. 10.				
	New Market House	10,000.00	.....	10,000.00
1st. Geo. V. Cap. 32.				
	New Poor Asylum	148,426.37	.....	148,426.37
	General Hospital Improvements	2.19	2.19	.....
	Marconi Installation	8,836.37	.....	8,836.37
		$157,264.93	$2.19	$157,262.74
4th. Geo. V. Cap. 24.				
	Telegraph Construction	2,505.02	2,505.02	.....
	Lighthouse Construction	43,195.19	41,820.31	1,374.79
	General Hospital Improvements	14,092,57	14,092.57	.....
	Additions to General Post Office	3,499.70	376.94	2,622.76
	Lunatic Asylum Improvements	7,000.00	1,268.70	5,731.30
	Colinet Bridge Repairs	1,400.00	350.00	1,050.00
	Public Buildings, viz.:—			
	Freshwater	2.95	.....	2.95
	Spaniard's Bay	1,685.25	1,356.53	328.72
	Bay Roberts	2,671.03	2,574.34	96.69
	Harbour Grace	1,161.61	355.29	806.32
	Channel	2,500.00	1,592.07	907.93
		$79,713.23	$66,791.77	$12,921.46
Surplus Trust:—				
	Roads and Bridges	66.63	66.63	.....
	Marine Works	3,136.41	2,243.69	892.72
	Elections	431.26	384.25	47.01
	Board of Agriculture	775.27	775.27	.....
	St. John's Agricult. Society for Hay.	2,264.38	521.63	1,742.75
	Postal Contingencies	55	55	.....
	Encouragement Herring Fishery	22.91	22.91	.....
		$6,697.41	$4,014.93	$2,682.48

4th. Geo. V. Cap. 23.			
Railway Con. and Arbitra. Awards .	$807,179.59	$641,161.91	$166,017.68
5th Geo. V. Cap. 8.			
War Loan, amount realized	$963,380.00	$741,600.00	$221,780.00

SURPLUS TRUST FUND.

The account of the Fund since its inception is as follows, viz.:—

DR.

To amount received from Consolidated Account from 1901-02 to 1912-13, inclusive		$1,272,807.47

CR.

By expended to June 30th, 1915, as follows, viz.:—		
Roads	$501,480.96	
Lighthouse Construction	57,000.00	
Harbor Improvements and Marine Works	241,720.84	
Outport Government Buildings	23,347.82	
Extension Marconi System	14,000.00	
Completion of Fever Hospital	3,000.00	
Construction Museum (in aid of)	30,000.00	
Extension General Hospital (in aid of)	30,254.48	
Encouragment Herring Fishery	26,967.94	
General elections 1908 and 1913	92,281.58	
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 (in aid of)	10,000.00	
Erection of Fence around Constabulary grounds .	1,213.30	
Board of Agriculture (in aid of)	8,000.00	
St. John's Agricultural Society (for hay)	6,757.25	
Post Office Contingencies (in aid of)	8,000.00	
		$1,270,124.99
Balance to 1915-16		2,682.48
		$1,272,807.47

The general statement above shows the expenditure of the Account of the Surplus Trust Fund Balance from 1913-14. In my last year's report, I fully explained the nature of the allocations made by the Government from this Fund in 1913-14. None have been made since.

LOANS.

Loan 61 Vic. Cap. 10.—$10,000 Voted under the Appropriation Act of 1898 for the erection of a New Market House. This sum remains intact to the credit of the Loan in the Bank of Montreal.

Loan 61, 62, 63, Vic. Cap. 33—This balance remains in the Bank of Montreal to the credit of the Agricultural Loan.

Loan 1st Geo. V. Cap. 32—The several amounts authorized by and the expenditure made under this Loan are as follows, viz.:—

Service	Amount Authorized	Expended 1912-13 & 1913-14	Ex-pended 1914-15	Total	Balance to 1915-16
School Buildings	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	....	$100,000.00	
New Poor Asylum	150,000.00	1,573.63	....	1,573.63	148,426.37
Lt. House and Marconi	100,000.00	91,163.63	....	91,163.63	8,836.37
Dredge	50,000.00	50,000.00	....	50,000.00	
St. John's Municipal Co.	32,000.00	32,000.00	....	32,000.00	
Hr. Grace Public Building	15,000.00	15,000.00	....	15,000.00	
Improvements Gen. Hosp.	73,000.00	72,997.81	2.19	73,000.00	
	$520,000.00	362,735.07	2.19	362,737.26	157,262.74

The only amount expended under this Loan in 1914-15 was $2.19, the balance of the sum authorized to be spent on Improvements to General Hospital. Of the balance of $157,262.74 apparently on hand, the sum of $135,250.00 has not been raised. There is consequently only $22,012.74 available for expenditure, $13,176.37 on account of New Poor Asylum, and $8,836.37 on account of Marconi Installation. The expenditure noted as having been spent on account of the New Poor Asylum, was really spent in connection with some repairs to the Lunatic Asylum. I have asked the Government to amend the Act so as to make the Loan applicable to the latter Institution.

Loan 4th. Geo. V. Cap 24.—The several amounts authorized by and the expenditure made under this Loan Act are as follows, viz.:—

Service	Amount Authorized	Expenditure to 1914-15	Balance to 1915--16
Telegraph Construction	$140,000.00	$140,000.00	
Erection of Light Houses	56,000.00	54,625.21	1,374.79
Construction and Improvements Public Buildings, viz.:—			
General Hospital Improvements	62,000.00	62,000.00	
Addition to General Post Office	14,000.00	11,377.24	2,622.76
Public Building, Freshwater	5,250.00	5,247.05	2.95*
Public Building, Grand Falls	16,250.00	16,250.00	
Public Building, Spaniard's Bay	9,500.00	9,171.28	328.72
Public Building, Bay Roberts	17,500.00	17,403.31	96.69
Public Buildings, Harbor Grace	4,000.00	3,193.68	806.32*
Public Building, Channel	8,500.00	7,592.07	907.30*
Improvements Lunatic Asylum	7,000.00	1,268.70	5,731.30*
Repairs Colinet Bridge	1,400.00	350.00	1,050.00
Unappropriated	18,600.00	.....	18,600.00
	$360,000.00	$328,478.54	$31,521.46

*These balances not being required have, for account 1915-16, reverted to the unappropriated Balances and are available for re-allocation to other services permissable under the Loan Act.

From the unappropriated balance at the close of 1914-15 of $50,000, the

following sums were appropriated in 1914-15:—Improvements General Hospital, $12,000; Improvements Lunatic Asylum, $7,000; Colinet Bridge, $1,400, and Construction of Lighthouses, $11,000.

Loan Act, 4th. Geo. V. Cap 23—The expenditure under this, the Railway Loan, during 1914-15 was distributed as follows:—

To Reid Newfoundland Company for construction, etc.	$634,161.91
Debt. of Agriculture and Mines for Arbitration Awards	7,000.00
	$641,161.91
Leaving a balance for 1915-16 of	166,017.68
Balance from 1914-15	$807,179.59

WAR LOAN.

The following is a statement showing the amount realized from the War Loan of £200,000 from the Imperial Government, viz.:—

Transferred to the Newfoundland Treasury, £137,000 at varying rates, viz.:—4.80, 4.79, 4.78½, realizing	$656,780.00
Paid over to the Regimental Record Office in London, £63,000 at $4.86⅔, realizing	$306,600.00
	$963,380.00
The expenditure, including the whole amount paid over in London, amounted to	$741,600.00
Leaving a balance to 1915-16 of	$221,780.00

As a matter of fact, the Record Office in London was authorized, up to the 30th June, to spend £19,000.00. The actual sum transferred by the Treasury was therefore:—

To the Finance Committee of the Patriotic Fund	$435,000.00
To the Regimental Record Office in London	92,467.00
The actual expenditure during 1914-15 was therefore	$527,467.00

Less the following balances in hand:—

Finance Committee Patriotic Fund	$1,692.87
Regimental Record Office in London	17,766.53
	$19,459.40
The actual expenditure up to June 30th, 1915, was therefore	$508,007.60
To this must be added this sum—advanced under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act by Order in Council, being for sundry expenses in connection with the war, and repaid to the Treasury,—(See my Report under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act	$16,663.96
And making in all	$524,671.56

I cannot find any Legislative authority for the raising of an expenditure on account of this Loan, except the authority of Loan Act 5th, Geo. V. Cap. 8, to raise $250,000, and the inferred authorization contained in the Volunteer Force Act.

OTHER LOANS.

The following is a statement of the Debenture Conversion Loan 5th. Ed. VII. Cap. 1:—

	Balance from 1913-14	Received in 1914-15	Expended in 1914-15	Balance to 1915-16
Conversion of Debentures	$32.15	$92.60	....	$124.75

This Act provides for the conversion of Debentures to coupon-bearing Bonds. Under it $6,200, in Debentures, was redeemed during the year and replaced by Bonds The balance in hand represents the adjustment of difference between the value of Debentures surrendered and the Bonds given in exchange for them. The aggregate of Debentures converted since the passing of the Act is $2,103,970.41, leaving $71,210.15 to be converted.

TEMPORARY LOANS.

On the 30th June last, the position of the Temporary Loan Account was as follows, viz.:—

Loan Act Service.

		Amount Raised	Amount Expended	
1912	Lighthouse Construction	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	
1914	Telegraph Construction	140,000.00	140,000.00	
1914	Lighthouse Construction	56,000.00	54,625.21	1,374.79
1914	Construction and Improvements Public Buildings	164,000.00	133,853.33	30,146.67
1915	To cover part Deficit Account 1914-15	500,000.00	500,000.00	
		$960,000.00	$928,478.54	$31,521.46

The above $960,000.00 has been obtained from the Bank of Montreal and bears interest, $360,000.00 at the rate of 4½% per annum, $500,000.00 at the rate of 5½% per annum.

PUBLIC DEBT.

The Funded Public Debt of the Colony was increased by the following sum during the fiscal year under report, viz.: under

War Loan at 3½% Interest	$491,582.48	
War Loan at 4½% Interest	512,280.70	
		$1,003,863.18
Act V. Ed. VII. Cap. 1 ,at 4%—Debenture Conversion		$6,250.00*
		$1,010,113.18

*$50 of this entered to Debenture Conversion Account in 1913-14, but not to Public Debt until 1914-15.

And reduced under:—		
Act 61 Vic. Cap. 10—Public Service at 4%	$6,000.00	
Act 56 Vic. Cap. 1—St. John's Rebuilding at 4%	200.00	
		6,200.00
The net increase for the year being		$1,003,913.18
Add Balance on July 31st, 1914		30,450,765.27
Gross Funded Debt		$31,454,678.45
To this sum must be added the amount of the Temporary Loan in the Bank of Montreal (see preceding paragraph)		960,000.00
Gross Public Debt		$32,414,678.45

The net Public Debt of the Colony will be arrived at by making the following deductions, viz.:—

Gross Public Debt as above		$32,414,678.45
Less—Due to the Colony by the St. John's Municipal Council $1,429,631.22		
Shares of the Harbor Grace Water Co. held by the Government	13,700.00	
Amount paid off by the operation of the Sinking Fund established under 56 Vic. Cap. 13, as on the 30th June, 1915	757,014.60	
		2,200,345.82
		$30,214,332.63

The Colony pays interests on that portion of the Loan 56th. Vic. Cap. 13, which has been paid off. This interest, added to the Sinking Fund, is applied to the purchase and cancellation of Debentures issued under this Act.

BALANCES (Current).

The balances to the credit of the Colony at the close of the fiscal year 1914-15, were as follows, viz.:—

Surplus Trust Fund	$ 2,682.48
Agricultural Bonus	913.79
Conversion of Debentures	124.75
Loan 1898—Market House	10,000.00
Loan 1911—Deposit Receipt of Temporary Loan of $100,000	22,012.74
Loan 1914—Deposit Receipt of Temporary Loan of $360,000	31,521.46
Railway Loan, 1915	166,017.68
War Loan	221,780.00
Total Amount to Credit of Colony	$455,052.90
And to its Debit:—	
Exchequer Account—Current	$57,832.51
Imported Copper	175.88
	$58,008.39

I have not included the following in the foregoing statement, viz.:—

1. Temporary Loans, Dr.	$960,000.00
2. Guaranteed Debts, Municipal Council, Cr.	1,429,631.22
3. Government Investments	13,700.00

1 and 2 really form part of the Funded Public Debt of the Colony, and in a previous paragraph I have set off the amount of the Government investments against the Public Debt.

In addition to the foregoing balances there were at the close of the year under consideration the following balances in the Bank of Montral to the credit of the several Departmental Trust Fund Accounts indicated. These consist for the most part of moneys required to meet allocations for certain purposes which have not yet been completed, but for which the Colony is nevertheless liable:—

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT:—

For extension of the Telegraph System in Twillingate District	$308.90	

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT:—

For Constabulary—purchase of machinery	$240.64	
For Education, balance of votes to credit of the several Denominations	1,178,45	
		$1,419.09

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES:—

For Railway Awards—Balance from 1913-14	$5,257.59	
Received from Loan 1914-15.....	7,000.00	
Cheque re-deposited	850.00	
	$13,107.59	
Paid out for Awards and Fees 1914-15	$10,988.68	
Balance to 1915-16		$2,118.91

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT:—

Marine Works, to cover allocations issued, the work on which was not completed at the close of the fiscal year	$761.97	
Musgrave Harbor Breakwater—Balances	66.29	
		$828.26

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT:—

Unallocated Road Grants and returned allocations awaiting re-issue	$429.43	
Cash Notes ,for redemption of balance of old issues of Cash Notes issued by Public Works Department and still in circulation	3,623.21	
		$4,052.64

TREASURY DEPARTMENT:—

Treasury Cash Notes, viz.:

Balance on July 1st, 1915		115,468.05
Cash received from Public Charities Department for purchase of Notes		21,937.50
		$137,405.55
Notes redeemed and cancelled during 1914-15		110,007.25
Balance to 1915-16		$27,398.30
Outstanding Letter of Credit Cheques of the several Departments for 1912-13, 1913-14, being provision for their encashment	1,701.34	
		$29,099.64
		$37,821.44

NOTE:—The cheques have been during the present financial year ,re-paid to the Treasury Those of them which may from time to time be presented for payment are provided for from the General Contingency vote.

IN THE SAVINGS BANK.

Cash to the credit of the Teacher's Pension Fund ,viz.:—

Balance from 1913-14		$8,040.33
Amount added in 1914-15, viz.:—		
Savings Bank Interest	$214.76	
From Educational Grand	5,003.55	
Annual Contribution from Government	1,600.00	
Interest on Debentures held by Fund	1,200.00	$8,018.31
		$16,058.64
Withdrawals for year 1914-15		$6,140.71
Balance to 1915-16		9,917.93
		$47,739.37

The Teachers 'Pension Fund, established under the Education Act, 1912, stood as follows on the 30th June, 1915:

Bonds of the Colony in the custody of the Savings Bank	$60,000.00
Cash to credit of Current Account in the Savings Bank	9,917.93
	$69,917.93

The Old Age Pension Fund amounts to the sum of $200,000.00 in Bonds, in the custody of the Bank of Montreal.

Copper Coin to the value of $3,120.00 on the 30th of June last, was held by the Treasury for issue, $880 of the total received from the Mint having been sold and the proceeds paid to the Bank of Montreal in liquidation of the cost of the issue, viz.: $1,055.88. The Bank therefore is still owed $175.88.

The Treasury Cash Notes Stock Account has been closed by the sale to the Public Charities Department of the Balance of Stock, viz.: $21,937.50, held at the close of 1913-14.

The Register of Life Insurance Companies securities has been examined by me and compared with the receipt certificate given by the Bank of Montreal, in which Bank these securities are deposited. I have found the entries amounting to $1,738,218.59 correct.

At the request of the Government, and of the Patriotic Association, I have audited the accounts of the Finance Committee of the Association, including the principal account in the Treasury, the general account kept by the Deputy Paymaster and the regimental accounts. These several accounts, commencing with the initiation thereof in September, 1914, I have found to be correct. I now conduct a regular monthly audit of the same. These regimental accounts are kept on the military system so as to co-ordinate them with those kept in the Regimental Record Office in London. The system is an entirely different one to that obtaining in the regular Government accounts, but the audit, so far as the accounts kept in Newfoundland are concerned, can be effectively conducted, and has proved eminently satisfactory. I beg leave, however, to point out that I am not in a position to exercise the same control over these accounts as I exercise over the regular Public Service accounts. I desire, however, to say, that as far as my experience of the expenditure goes, it has been as a rule carefully and economically conducted. The work of the Regimental Pay Office here is both onerous and extensive and I have much pleasure in stating that it is admirably performed.

The Record Office in London sends a monthly statement audited by Messrs. Read, Son & Watson in London, to the Finance Committee here. This statement is transmitted to me and, after examination in my office, is sent to the Deputy Paymaster.

Although this report deals with the Colony's accounts for the fiscal year ending 30th June last, I deem it advisable, as far as the War Expenditure is concerned, to bring it down to the 31st of Dec. last. Up to that date the Colony has received on loan from the Imperial Government, the sum of £400,000 sterling in two loans of £200,000 each. The second loan was received in November last and, up to the 31st of December, 1915, no draft had been made against it. Of the first loan, £137,000 was transmitted to Newfoundland and £63,000 remained in London to be drawn against on the order of the Finance Committee, by the Record Office, to pay regimental and other expenses of our troops in Europe. These drafts were charged to the First Newfoundland Regiment's Account here and accounted for monthly, as I stated above, to the Finance Committee by the Paymaster in London:

The following is a statement of the Finance Committee's General Account to the 31st December last:

DR.

To received from the Treasury	$953,066.62
To received on account Cash Repayments for goods sold, etc.	4,192.87
	$957,259.49

CR.

By expenditure 1st. Newfoundland Regiment	$701,574.67	
By expenditure Reserve Force	247,091.92	
By balance in the Bank of Montreal	8,592.90	
		$957,259.49

BALANCE IN HAND.

In Bank of Montreal as above	$8,592.90	
Petty Cash, 1st. Newfoundland Regiment Account	81.83	
Petty Cash, Reserve Force	144.51	
		$8,819.24

I am not in a position to give the balance in hand at the Record Office in London as on the 31st of December last, as I have not yet received the monthly statement for that month.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

QUESTIONS.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement re Telephone extension in the outports during the years 1913, 1914 and 1915, giving the following particulars: 1. The number of miles of telephone wire erected; 2. The number of telephone offices opened with the name of the locality in which each office is located.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The information asked for by Mr. Halfyard under question No. 1 is being prepared.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs how many officials now employed in the Customs Department, have not been appointed by the Governor in Council in accordance with the provisions of the Audit and Departmental Acts.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The information asked for by Mr. Halfyard under question No. 2, has already been given.

MR. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to table an itemized statement of the cost of Bridge and Tank erected last year at Bowl Island Light Station, in the District of Twillingate.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES—The information asked for by Mr. Jennings under question No. 3 has been answered already.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was read a 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.

SEALFISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Seal Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman: When the Committee was sitting last evening I proposed an amendment to this bill, permitting steel steamers over 450 tons already going to the seal fishery to continue to do so. I

would ask the Clerk to read the amendment to the Committee. (Clerk read the amendment.)

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: I might say that Hon. Mr. Crosbie seconded this amendment of Mr. Devereaux, but afterwards he told me that he wished to withdraw from the amendment, and he gave me his reasons for so doing. The ships that have been sold to the Russian Government may not come back any more. Bowring Brothers, the owners of the 'Stephano' and 'Florizel', had been asked to sell them before negotiations occurred between the Reid-Nfld. Company and the Russian Government for the 'Lintrose' and other ships, but they refused to sell their ships, knowing that the Colony needed them at that time for freighting and other purposes. They could have sold the two ships, the 'Stephano' and 'Florizel', and realized good prices for them, but they considered the needs of the country and kept their ships. We all know that the 'Stephano' did not prosecute the Seal Fishery the last couple of years, and this year she was kept on the route freighting between New York, Halifax and here, and this year Bowring Bros. only sent one ship out. Hon. Mr. Crosbie gave me to understand that that is why he thought the proposition to permit both ships to go would not be fair. I just want to make the House clear on that before the amendment is put. Hon. Mr. Crosbie thought that we should deal squarely in the matter, and I thought that before the amendment is put that this aspect of the case should be put before the Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I would just like to say a word or two on the matter that is now before the Chair. It seems to me that half a loaf is better than no bread, and in this case if we can secure what we all desire it might be well not to take any risks. The bill that we are considering, it will be remembered, was unanimously passed by this House last year. I do not think there was a dissenting voice. We gave the matter a lot of thought and consideration, and we have the bill now before us in the same form, with but one exception. I am not aware that there are any other amendments in this bill of any importance, and if we can secure the object which we wish, namely, the restriction of sending out to the seal fishery large steel ships not at present in the trade, and at the same time deal justly and not injuriously with those who are engaged in the business, we will have effected something that will be a great advantage and will reflect credit on the wisdom of the House. It is proposed in the Bill, in the section that we are now considering, that hereafter no ships will proceed to the seal fishery of over 450 tons. Now, I think all would be prepared to vote for that section, if it was not for the Florizel, for this reason, that all the other ships have been sold except the Stephano, which is not likely to engage in the seal fishery again. These large ships are very expensive, and as was pointed out by the hon. member for Twillingate, they take a great deal of money to fit them out and clean them up after they come back, so that in order to get a paying trip they have to secure a cargo of seals. As I say, all the ships except the Stephano and Florizel, that have engaged in this industry the last few years, have been sold. The owners have parted with them, and we may reasonably assume that they will never come back, and in any case those who bring them back will do so with their eyes open. They will know of the existence of this law and cannot claim that any hardship has been inflicted upon them by this section. In other words, we lay down

a principle that hereafter no ships not engaged during the last year, of over 450 tons, will be allowed to prosecute this venture, and we make a special provision dealing with the Florizel, but we handicap her. We say that she shall not be allowed to bring any more than 30 or 40 thousand seals. This year she brought in forty-five or forty-eight thousand seals, and the prospects at one time were that she might have brought in double that catch, having regard to the fact that her competitors were absent. In this matter we must make haste slowly. We must not on the one hand interfere with the fishery itself, but on the other hand we must not seriously injure those who have put considerable capital in the enterprise. Dealing with ships that have left the business is alright, but in this case the owners of the remaining ships have put their money into the industry, and they are entitled to-day to a certain consideration. I do not mean that the mere fact of their having put money into the ship is any justification or reason for our not preventing her going to the ice, if her going to the ice is serious and vital to the life of the industry, but I do not think that one ship will make much difference. Further, if we penalize her by limiting her catch, she will not go out unless her owners have no inducement elsewhere. There is a justification for the limitation of 450 tons. There was a time when we had a flotilla of vessels of 400 sails going to the ice. 'Way back in the fifties there were 400 ships that went out to the seal fishery, taking about 13,000 men, and bringing in about 650,000 seals. At that time seals were worth from $8 to $9 a quintal. That was an industry worth two or three million dollars to the country, and the number of other industries like block-making, sailmaking and ship-building which arose and lived out of the prosecution of the seal fishery gives one to understand the great value of that fishery to Newfoundland. That is all passed away now, and instead of 13,000 men last year, only about 2,000 went out, and where you had 400 ships before, to-day you have only 10 or 12. Where you were getting $8 or $9 a hundredweight, there were a few years ago worth only $4. They have of late years increased in value, and this year went as high as $6, and it may be possible that this will be an inducement to sailing vessels to begin the prosecution of this fishery again. It may be found practicable to get a class of schooner, like the Labrador schooner, that was fitted out in the olden days to secure a catch of seals, and another small class of steamer may be encouraged to go into the business. I think we are wise in passing this Bill to-day in relation to all future vessels that may go out to the ice, but I do not think that we are wise if we penalize this ship by preventing her going out under any conditions. I think the case will be met by preventing any future additions of over 450 tons, and at the same time to allow the Florizel, whose owners have invested in the vessel, to go out, but handicap her by making it illegal for her to bring in more than 30,000, 35,000 or 40,000 seals, whatever the case may be. We ought to have reason to justify faith in this bill. I have had considerable experience in connection with the seal fishery. Hundreds of men in my district have been looking for berths year after year, and I have got hundreds upon hundreds of berths for them. Lately the men do not want to go out in the smaller ships. They all want to go out in the large ones. Since the introduction of the large steel ships I have found the greatest trouble in getting men to go out in the old ones, because the competition is so unfair and the condition

of life on the large ships is so much better than on the small ones, and for that reason we do not want to encourage other large vessels to continue in the business, but I think the proposal suggested by Mr. Devereaux to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be a fair way out of the matter, by limiting future tonnage and allowing the Florizel to go out under the restriction proposed. For the life of me, when you limit the Florizel to 35,000 seals, and not allow her to bring in more than that, what difference is there between her and any other steel or wooden ship of a smaller tonnage under 450 tons, that you permit to go out and bring in a like quantity? We should not allow our personal feelings to interfere with our judgment in a large national industry like the seal fishery.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. I do not want to spend much time in debating this matter. I was surprised to learn in the closing remarks of the leader of the government that the views which he expressed were those of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries after the declaration made by him yesterday that he intended to stand by the recommendation of the Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I made no such statement.

MR. LLOYD—Well it was so near to that that the difference would not make much difference. It is clear that the Leader of the House wished it clearly to be understood that what emanated from Mr. Devereaux was being brought forward by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to meet the situation, and if he brought it forward to meet the situation we must assume that it met with the approval of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Perhaps later we shall see what the Minister has to say on the matter. I would also like to know where the Minister of Public Works stands, because of his emphatic declaration of last evening.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—You will find that the Minister of Public Works will stand to his guns.

MR. LLOYD—Well done. You will be given an opportunity to stand by your guns, more particularly after the attitude taken by the leader of the government. We regard his attitude as one of abject surrender. I say it is abject surrender because this bill has been brought in here as a government measure.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—It is no such thing. The bill as it came in here originally did not contain this section. This section is not in the original bill and was put in there by a Select Committee.

MR. LLOYD—Well it was brought in here by the Select Committee with practically an unanimous verdict.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Well, that does not bind the House.

MR. LLOYD—It is none the less an abject surrender, because the principle was laid down by a Select Committee and was unquestioned until Mr. Devereaux brought in his amendment. My position in regard to that is that we are going to stand by those who send in petitions to this House from 150 settlements that are interested in the fishery,the petitions of 10,000 fishermen who are asking to have the Florizel excluded. I said that I did not intend to prolong this debate. We are quite ready to reach an issue on this matter now. We are not prepared tc accept the amendment.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I may say that no member of the government has spoken to me to alter my opinion in this matter or asked me to alter it. I am as much a rock in this House as the Hon. member himself, and when I say a thing I mean it. I was a member of the Select Committee that sat on this bill. When the bill went to the Com-

mittee this section was not in it, but it was proposed to put it in and although one member on that Committee proposed to exclude the Florizel in the operation of this section, he did not get any sympathy and the Select Committee signed the report in favour of this clause that we are now discussing. An amendment has been suggested and the House can deal with it. I am prepared to stand by the Committee on this resolution.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Just one word. I was a member of that Select Committee. I considered the bill, and signed the first report that was brought up. The first report which we dealt with limited the size of the ships to 500 tons. At the second meeting it was suggested that the size be limited to 450 tons. I do not know the reason for that.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—The limitation of those ships was spoken of at 500 tons, but it was left over to find out the size of the different ships from Lloyd's Register.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—But it was understood that the number of tons was to be 500. No one at the meeting seemed to know the exact size of the Bellaventure or any other steel ship. The meeting was adjourned in order that the necessary information may be obtained. Then another meeting took place. I know nothing about this meeting. Still another meeting was called for last Friday night, and the Minister of Fisheries was called away. A certain number of the Select Committee were not present, and we did no business. Some informal discussion took place about the ships. I admit that I signed the first report, limiting the ships to 500 tons. I do not think I made any mistake in attaching my signature to that report, but if I did a wrong, I am ready to acknowledge it and to alter my position. I am not alone in changing my opinion with regard to matters before this House, and I do not consider it wise that any man should take the position that because he signs a report, and probably signs it without having before him all the necessary information to make investigation of the matter intelligent, that he should stick to the decision he then arrived at. Some gentlemen in this House have been in the same position before with the Weights and Measures Bill. When it was before the House, Mr. Devereaux made an amendment to that bill, and drew attention to the great wrong that was being done the fishermen of the Colony, and although members on the oth- side of the House were against the amendment, we considered it, and finding that the leaders on the other side of the House were against the amendment and believing that it would be a benefit to the fishermen concerned, we considered it desirable to refer it to a Select Committee, which was done. The Committee made a practical test of the gauge of oil, to prove the contention of members on this side that a certain loss was met in following the exact gauge of a kerosene oil or other barrel of that description, and found that 1½ gallons of oil was lost upon every kerosene cask so gauged. The Committee so dealt with this matter that they have saved to the fishermen of this colony $40 000 more on their cod oil, which amount they will make next year over and above what they made last year with the same catch It has been said that we should let the Florizel go out, but limit her catch to so many thousand seals. I don't see why we shouldn't do this. My whole interest in the seal fishery of this colony is bound up in seeing that the fishermen, or those who engage in that great industry, are comfortably treated whilst so engaged. I consider that if we cut out a class of ships of the Florizel and Bonaventure type of steel ships, that we

small lesse: very materially the comforts of our sealers. On this account I am more inclined to permit these vessels of the Florizel type to continue in the fisnery. Conditions are a great deal more comfortable on those ships than they are on the smaller ones. To restrict the Florizel and allow other ships to carry in what they like, seems to me peculiar Legislation look at the condition of the other ships as they prevailed this year. Take the Sable Island, when this ship burnt down the men had to live on deck; nothing was said about it, but that was because during the fishery the weather was fairly reasonable,and on that account the discomforts were not so great; together with that the men have made big bills, but the actual facts were that the men had to make room for the seals, and this is something which never would have happened with the larger ships, they have lots of room for crew and seals. Now I think we are going much too fast in regard to regulating this seal fishery, we ought to go carefully, for that reason I am inclined to reverse my former decision with regard to the 500 ton regulation and include the Florizel as under this amendment, for the reasons already explained.

MR. LLOYD—I may say that I was present on Friday night with the Minister. Little was done on Friday night last, but I know what was done. There was no member from the other Chamber present, but those who were there said they were prepared to stand by the bill as it was.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—The Minister of Fisheries was not there when I arrived, and I was asked to take the Chair. There was nothing done in a formal way, there was no formality about the whole matter; some of the members said they were prepared to stand by the report as it stood.

MR. LLOYD—I grant all that. There was nothing of a formal nature, but there was an absolute agreement that we should not change. The Minister was there too.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—I admit I was there.

MR. COAKER—Of course, I think the member has a right to change his opinion.

MR. LLOYD—I do not want to dispute the hon. member's right to change his mind, but I am not prepared to accept his statement of what took place. There were certainly no formal proceedings, but it was understood that the members would stand by the bill.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—That is your opinion.

MR. COAKER—I am very sorry to see the stand taken by the hon member for Ferryland, the Minister of Finance and Customs. He has spoken about the first meeting in connection with this matter. I was there and proposed this section. Mr. Cashin seconded my motion and signed the report of that Committee. If he cannot agree because the 500 was changed to 450, then the least he can do is to stand by the 500. If he does not do this, it will be no use to ask us to act on any more select committees. When we go to committee and bring in a recommendation, it is understood that the committee stand together. If any member is unwilling to agree he should say so. I know what happened at that third meeting as has been related by Dr. Lloyd. There was no formal motion, but it was agreed not to alter the bill. The report was presented to this house, and the Minister of Finance and Customs signed it. That report was that the committee would stand by the original report and recommendations. I can tell the Minister the reason 500 was changed to 450. It was because it was found that the Bellaventure, the Bonaventure and the Beothic would be admitted if the 500 ton limit was adopted, and so it was thought best to make it 450 to

exclude these ships. That is the reason. Even if the Minister cannot stand to this as it is, the least he can do is to support his original recommendation. We on this side must stand by the recommendations for we were asked by the people of the north engaged in this fishery to have steel ships excluded from prosecuting the fishery. 150 harbors sent petitions asking for this clause backed by 10,000 voters. I do not know why this debate has taken us so long this afternoon and yesterday to discuss because some want to send the Florizel to the ice and so favor Bowrings. There are many reasons why we should not allow her to go to the ice. If we allow her, the only one to go to the ice, what would be the result. Every son that Captain Kean had would be given a wooden ship. And why. The catch of the Florizel would be limited to 30 or 40 thousand, but the Captain would kill more than that. He would kill enough for his sons in the wooden ships. That is one of the reasons why the fishermen do not want the Florizel to prosecute the fishery. It will give Bowring and Kean a monopoly of the fishery. You have said here if you limit her catch to 30,000 that the owners would not be bothered sending her to the ice. Well that is all the same. Why not stop her altogether. Both seem to have the same effect and the clause would if carried give equal chances to all other ships and therefore fully encourage and satisfy the men and owners of wooden ships. The men up in the northern district want the steel ships stopped from sailing to the ice, and so do the men from Conception Bay. They say that if you allow them to go to the ice you will cause the wooden ships to be discouraged. You are doing a lot to try to help out Bowring's with this one ship, while at the same time you are discouraging ten or twelve others. If you are trying to be fair, and are going to be fair, then don't allow one steel ship to override the whole fleet and give Bowrings a monopoly of the industry.

It is not right that any matter like this should be looked at other than impartially. Mr. Munn came to my office and spent an hour discussing with me the benefits which must follow and the reasons why the Florizel should go to the ice; but he made no impression on my opinions in respect thereto. He could not convince me that the Florizel should go. I suppose he interviewed the hon. member from Placentia, and convinced him. I am surprised however to hear him speak as he has. The wooden ships would benefit greatly by this change, and I have no hesitation in saying that they stand 100 per cent higher in value to-day than they did last year owing to the withdrawal of steel ships. The most of the ships are being refitted. Those with old boilers are going to get new ones. I understand the Terra Nova is to go across to get new boilers. All this is the result of the passing out of steel ships. I do not think that there is any need of a discussion such as we have heard this evening. The committee has reported and its report ought to be adopted, and I think that it is only right for every member on that committee to stand together and show the country that they are men who will not easily be induced to change their views on matters of such vital importance.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Just a word or two, Mr. Chairman. I have very great sympathy for the member who has just spoken and feel that he is sincere in the motive which actuates him. He it was who brought in this bill last year and I supported the bill and every section of it and voted for it. It was only yesterday that I noticed this change in the bill.

I have not had the honor of a call from Mr. Munn or any one else. No one was speaking to me. I am viewing this matter entirely from my own standpoint, and not from the standpoint of anybody else, Mr. Munn or anybody from his office. I am doing what I think is proper to safeguard those who have invested in these large ships. A considerable amount has been said by the speakers in connection with this matter, and it has been suggested that the Florizel be allowed to go out and limit her to 30,000 seals. Now, in this connection I agree with my friend, Mr. Coaker, that with this limitation the owners would not be bothered to send her out unless there was no more tempting work offering. At the present time, with the considerable freight that there is to be shipped here, it would not be at all profitable for the owners to go to the expense of fitting her up for the ice fields unless the right existed to bring in any seals taken. There would be much more profit in the other business. I think we should look on this bill from the standpoint of the country, the industry, and at the same time not to confiscate capital. We should consider what appeals to us as reasonable men with intelligence and common sense. I think we ought to remember that we are here as repreSeentatives, and that our views ought to be whilst representative of the views of those who sent us here, at the same time of a character that can be justified.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS— Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to detain the committee at all, but feel that it is right for me to make a few remarks in connection with one or two matters which have come up in the course of this debate. I feel that I would be very contemptible if I did not stand up and explain my sentiments on this point. If the Florizel were not allowed to proceed to the ice it would mean a great financial loss to the country. The whole question seems to me to rest upon the point as to whether we shall permit the Florizel to proceed or not. The principle upon which I spoke last night was this, that if you are anxious to prevent steel ships entering into competition with others then you have a measure before you that will enable you to carry out this principle. I took the stand last night that you ought to prevent, in future, all steel ships of the Florizel type from prosecuting the industry, because it would be more in the interests of the country at large if we had smaller ships. Smaller ships mean more ships, and the more ships you have, the more money comes into the Colony, and the more men are engaged. On the other hand I contended last night if you are going to give the monopoly to steel ships the trade will be confined to a mere half dozen, and may not be owned by the people of this country at all, in which case the money would go to foreign capitalists; that was my stand, but I am always ready to listen to advice. I think the Premier's position on this question is a very nice one. He is always ready to give fatherly advice if both sides will take it, and he is generally very happy in his advice. I do not see eye to eye with him in this matter. I have not discussed the matter with him, nor did Mr. Munn call in and see me, which, of course, I think he ought to have done. I never saw any session of the Legislature yet, that met here for the purpose of passing or enacting laws for the benefit of the country, that did not have a slight altercation over sealing bills. Every session there seems to be a row. I have made enquiries among the sealers around town, and find that they are quite satisfied with the bill as it is. This

is not a party measure, and every man has the right to vote according to his own conscience. I would not vote for the amendment last night, and I will not vote for it now.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire at this present juncture to offer any lengthy observation in relation to the amendment that is now occupying the minds of the hon. members of this Assembly, but I merely wish to state for my own personal satisfaction, having regard to certain statements made by hon. members on the other side of the House, that I have neither seen Mr. Munn nor had any communication at all with the firm which he represents, for the last 4 or 5 months, and have in no wise been influenced by any one with regard to my views on this amendment. Therefore, I denounce those reflections that came across the floors of this House as false and untrue as far as I am concerned. My protestation against this 13 section was prompted by the consideration that arose in my mind of the extent to which the Florizel has enriched this country for so many years, and of the fact that this country is one hundred and forty thousand dollars richer by the Florizel's twenty days' work this spring in connection with this industry, and again how more than forty-five thousand dollars was this year distributed among the crew—fishermen of the Colony—owing to the fortune which it enjoyed in the seal fishery. Nor in the effecting of this benefit to the Colony, has the Florizel been detrimental to the interests of other steamers participating in the same work. The smaller ships enjoyed comparatively the same good fortune, and had the Florizel been absent the fishermen of the country would have been poorer to the extent of forty-five thousand dollars. The consideration of these facts affected me more than anything else in relation to this bill. There is innate in human nature that quality which we know as sentiment, and being influenced, as we all are, by this attribute we cannot come in here and carry out, woodenly and dispassionately, such drastic and far-reaching measures. It is but in the natural course of things that we should come in here with ideas born of our experience and reasoning, and consequently in order that this bill should receive fair play, it should be fully and carefully discussed. We must contemplate fully the fact that the owners of the Florizel rely upon the protection of our laws. Our laws have encouraged them in previous years to spend their capital upon the industries of this country, and how can we get men to come in here and invest capital if you do not lend them your protection. Any other attitude would be commercial retrogression, and what is more fatal than this to prosperity? Some of us surely remember the statements made in this House by a certain member now present that these wooden ships were but man traps and coffins. But to-day, however, these ships are most excellent and peculiarly adapted to the requirements of this industry, so he states. Two such contradictory statements are contrary to reason, and we cannot be convinced by two such opposite opinions when stated within such a limited period of time, nor has the echo of those statements published in a certain paper which protested against the fact that these steamers are allowed to proceed to the icefields, yet died away. I do not state this in any antagonistic manner, but I merely wish to show how dangerous it is for any hon. member to utter sentiments that would lead one to believe that he had not given the full and mature consideration which the importance of this subject warranted. The fishermen

are inclined to regard as true the words of the hon. members to whom they give such responsibilities as certain gentlemen in this House have assumed. If we retrograde in our methods we will annihilate this fishery, because the world and this country must go forward and unprogressive things will die. If you are content with these "man traps," as they have been called, the fishery itself shall degenerate surely and certainly into the same conditions as many of these steamers to-day. We have been told this evening that many of these steamers are going across the Atlantic in order to have certain repairs made. This is a revelation. We have been of the opinion that they all went out from here fully equipped and were considered first class, but in the light of this disclosure we are forced to admit we were wrong in our supposition. I have noticed a false tendency in some of the arguments of certain hon. members to regard these wooden ships as of improved value merely because the seals themselves have risen in price. But what reasoning is this? The steamers themselves are the same that hon. members have described in not too flattering terms but a few sessions ago. They have not changed in themselves. I would ask some of the men who were out at the seal fishery in these ships if conditions have changed much since those days when they were so bitterly complained of by the hon. member for Twillingate. We all thought, at the time he denounced these ships, that he spoke in all sincerity, nor is our conviction in his sincerity now likely to be assailed. He has done a great deal for the fishermen and a great deal for the sealers, but his efforts in the past no matter how successful do not give him the right to take upon himself the position of dictator. We must remember that the firm of Bowring is part and parcel with the comcial interests of this Colony, and we must not stultify their efforts in any way, nor should we effect any measure that would tend to penalize a man who has risen to the height of his profession, such as Captain Kean merely because he has been successful.

It is unfair to penalize him because he has been successful. What reason is there for any man on this side of the House or the other side of the House to penalize him because he has been more successful than his brother men. If any one of us were in London or New York and speaking of prominent Newfoundlanders,one of the chief men we would point out would be Captain Kean the late Commander of the Florizel who has brought in not only the largest number of seals but the heaviest cargo ever brought in. These things we ought to be proud of, and is it any reason then that having sons, that these sons ought have a little credit for themselves. They may have the same genius—not quite as much perhaps as their father, but they may have a part of it—and they ought to be given fair play and ought to be given the credit of loading their own ships independently of their father. We know that this thing has been going on for the past three or four years in relation to Captain Kean, in relation to the "Florizel," in relation to Bowring Bros, and in relation to the whole seal fishery, and the only good thing that has come out of it has been what the hon. member for Twillingate has done; but as I said before, the good that he has already done does not give him the right to undo it, and whilst we accept in good faith on this side of the House, and whilst the country appreciates certain things he has done, we are not prepared to forego a principle we accepted a few years ago in relation to the men and their condition and their accommodation and the protection

thrown around them in relation to having good, strong, number one steamers. I need not state here to this Committee the conditions—the revolting conditions—you can have in these small sealing steamers. There is no end of the suffering; and many is the man today that comes ashore out of these boats that has implanted in him an insidious disease of some kind which it is impossible to prevent owing to condition due to the smallness of the steamers and the largeness of the crews. It was to prevent such conditions that we had several measures introduced here last year, and in previous years, and most of them were introduced by the hon. member for Twillingate. They were readily accepted by this House and the whole country appreciated them, and are we today to stultify all that by accepting such a section as section 13 of the Bill now brought in by the Committee because that section included all that might be said to be important in relation to the seal fishery of this Colony? You talk of the olden times and of bringing them back, and of constructing wooden vessels. Now,even if you had the timber, how are you going to construct these vessels? You must have it full timbered, and that is a double set of timber right through, and when you have constructed these vessels, what use are they going to be after the seal fishery? In the olden times, they were very easy times, and a ship was laid up after the end of the voyage or went to the Labrador fishery, but who would employ one of these wooden vessels now? What chance would they have in the Bank fishery in competition with the light Lunenburg bankers, or the type that you are going to build at Catalina when you get your shipyard down there? You are not going to get men to operate them; you are not going to get men in the 20th century to do what men were satisfied to do in the beginning of the 19th. If our young men are of that type, Newfoundland shall remain the Island of historic misfortune that has been alluded to by so many great men during the last couple of centuries. We must progress and we must encourage our young men to take up every scientific means in relation to this fishery. We have been too long living in the past, and we have not sufficiently awakened to the future, and the only way to do this is to introduce scientific knowledge into our affairs. The question is not what we have been in the past; we should be able to apply what we have in the present, and we should be able to introduce scientific knowledge and scientific methods at present and for the future. Sir, it only requires courage to deal with these things. Our people have the brains and the intelligence and the acuteness and astuteness—all that go to make up a people that can make great progress, but you cannot attempt to make any progress if you introduce retrogressive methods into the fishery such as is attempted to be done under this section. Now, there has been talk about building these wooden steamers and introducing gasolene engines. These gasolene engines are at present by no means perfect, they may be at some future date, but that time has not yet come where they are dependable enough to be used in this seal fishery. Now anybody who knows anything of the history of this seal fishery knows that you cannot attempt to build schooners of 100 or 50 tons strong enough to resist the ice pack, because these schooners after the fishery is over would have to come into St. John's or Harbour Grace or whatever other part of the Colony they belonged to, and lie up and be of no use for any practical purpose for the remainder of the year. We have seen the wooden

steamers after the seal fishery is over, lying up in the harbour for 9, 10 or 11 months.

I have no desire to be contentious with regard to this matter, but I think that the men who have done so much for this country as the Bowrings, men who have done so much for the Empire, ought to have the utmost consideration in relation to anything that may affect them that may come up in this House; it is only fair to that large firm. They supply immense numbers of fishermen in this country; they are the firm that possesses the largest interest in the seal fishery, and such an attempt as was made last evening to interfere with capital to the extent of perhaps $200,000 needs a little more consideration than the few hours that were passed by that Committee in relation to this measure. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has already stated that that last meeting was a mere informality. Was there justice done to the subject before the Chair when the whole meeting was considered informal? Is it surprising then that certain members of this House after reading this Bill will get up and criticise it, when those that comprise the Committee itself will tell you that matters were conducted informally. It is my own opinion that there has been too much interference with this industry during the last 8 or 10 years. We have had some good legislation, to which I have already alluded, but there are many other regulations in relation to the seal fishery that are wrong in many ways, and which should not be regarded as an advantage to that fishery; and if it were possible for me here to make a suggestion and have that suggestion carried out, I would suggest to this House that it would be well to have a Committee and consider this whole subject in every sense, so that they may be able to bring in a luminous report at the next sitting of the Legislature. I am perfectly in accord, Mr. Chairman, with everything else that is in this Bill. It is a splendid Bill, and I commend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in relation thereto, as I have already done last evening. I have no desire to introduce any acrimony into this debate, and as I have dealt with those men that have been spoken of here for the last three or four or five sessions, and I know them as well as any individuals in this House at the present time, and I am prepared to get up here at any time and speak for the Northern fishermen, and feel as competent from my personal experience and knowledge of them to do so as any man in this House. That is the reason why although I have no particular interest in this industry, or the District I represent is not interested in this fishery, my sympathies and sentiments are with the people of the North. I am only too ready to give the hon. member for Twillingate due credit for what he has done in relation to these men in the past, and also here today. It must be remembered that Captain Kean is a person who has been the means of distributing amongst these very men more than $40,000 this year, or at the rate of $167 or $168 per man of his crew, and it is not fair then to oneself, or not fair to the country or to the Government or to the Opposition or to the people so largely and vitally interested in this industry that anyone should get up here and make statements that may not only affect such a man as Captain Kean, but the industry itself and the whole country.

MR. LLOYD—I have listened to the speech of the hon. gentleman, and I am sure that it would be very interesting to the owners of the "Florizel" and the men of the North. The sympathies of the hon. gentleman, he says, are with the men of the North, but I am afraid that the sympathies

of the men of the North are not with the hon. gentleman in the position which he has taken up, and these people would promptly disavow not only his sympathy, but also the expressions which he has used with regard to them this afternoon. Everything he has done is not in favour of the men of the North; he has not even been logical any more than has his leader. The Leader of the Government would not confiscate the capital in the "Florizel." It is right and proper to confiscate other capital of Bowring Brothers because in the very amendment proposed, and which the hon. member is supporting, the "Stephano" is excluded. And surely there is as much capital in the "Stephano" as in the "Florizel."

MR. DEVEREAUX—The "Stephano" was excluded by the firm.

MR. LLOYD—The hon. member says that the "Stephano" was excluded by the firm. When? Does the mere fact that Bowrings did not send the "Stephano" to the seal fishery last spring or the spring before take away from them their legal right to send her next spring? Have they done anything of their own action which would prevent them from sending the "Stephano" to the ice next spring or the spring after? And yet the Leader of the Government is prepared to confiscate that capital, and so is the mover of the motion, in spite of his talk about interference with capital. Where does the interference with capital come in? If it is right to confiscate capital in the case of the "Stephano," it is equally right to go a step farther and confiscate it in the case of the "Florizel". And then we have the pitiable story of penalizing Capt. Kean. What is there in the length and breadth of this Bill that refers to Captain Kean? Where is the penalty that is thrown upon Capt. Kean?

MR. DEVEREAUX—I was merely replying——

MR. LLOYD—You tried to convey the idea that some penalty was being imposed upon Captain Kean. There is nothing within the confines of this Bill that operates against Captain Kean. But there is a story told about Captain Kean of which I know something. I sat on the Commission that had to do with it and worked for many weeks in connection with it, and I want to tell you this, that but for the very matter that has been referred to here this afternoon—the intimacy at the seal fishery between Captain Kean and his sons—the Newfoundland disaster would never have occurred. As a matter of fact, if Abram Kean had not been in the "'Florizel," Wesley Kean would never have been in the "Newfoundland," to begin with. That has been admitted by the owners of the "Newfoundland." It is a distinct asset to the owners to have a son of Captain Kean in one of their ships because of the fact that Captain Kean is in the powerful "Florizel" and he can give his son a helping hand, cut him out if his ship happens to get jammed, and tell him where to go to get seals, and help him along generally; and the purpose of the amendment is to convert the seal fishery into a Captain Kean seal fishery. That is exactly what it comes to. Its purpose is not to do something in the interests of the country, but to create a Kean Close Sealfishery, so that Captain Kean can get ships for all his sons, and help them along at the fishery with his own powerful steamer. It is a pity that he has not got sons enough to go around, so that he could control the whole fishery. Now, Sir, our position is this: That if it is fair and proper to prevent the "Stephano" from going to the ice, it is not unfair to stop the "Florizel;" and to that position we will stand, and on it we will divide.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I wish to say a word in reply to a few

of the observations made by the hon. member for Placentia in connection with this matter. He introduced the name of Captain Kean. I don't know why it is, but everything that comes from this side of the House in connection with the seal fishery is attributed in some members opposite to animosity against Captain Kean. Now, no remarks that I have made since this matter has been before the House can be taken in that way. I stated a broad, square position: That I believe that if the "Florizel" is allowed to go to the seal fishery in command of Captain Kean, and if she is the only steel ship that is allowed to go, that all Captain Kean's sons who are looking for wooden ships will get them, because the owners will expect that the father will help out the sons. That very thing happened this year in the case of the "Erik."

I was told that the owners of the "Erik" would not have given Captain Kean's son a ship this year but for the fact that Captain Kean himself was going in the Florizel and would help out the son. And he did, because I know that on three or four occasions this year the Florizel went back on her journey, on one occasion nearly ten miles, and cut out the 'Erik' and took her in her wake. Well, there is no objection to that. It is very right and proper that a father should help out his son. But then you come forward and say that we are trying to penalize Captain Kean because he is a successful seal-killer. Now, Captain Kean is a successful seal-killer, for the reason that he has always had the best ship going out, and if he could not get seals under those conditions he would be no better than a fool. If he did not bring in all the seals that he has in the past he would be no better than a fool. Why, there are not five planters in Newfoundland who would not have done as well as he has done if they commanded the ships that he has commanded. This very spring Capt. Kean was out of the main patch four days, and he very nearly missed the seals altogether. If he had gone two or three miles further East he would have been clear of them for days; and as it was he wired Captain Barbour and asked him where the main patch was, after Captain Barbour had been in the seals four days. That will give the House an idea of what he knows about the business. He is not being penalized because he has been successful; he has been successful simply because he has always commanded the best ship. He is not one bit better than 150 other captains that sail in schooners in the Northern districts. As the Leader of the Opposition has already stated, had he not been in the Stephano in 1914, and his son in the Newfoundland there would not be 79 men in the ocean today or in their graves, and 21 other cripples unable to earn a twenty-cent piece with which to help themselves.

Don't talk to us about Captain Kean or you will get more than you bargain for. We have not said anything about him before; we have stood here now for three years and allowed you to make reflections and insinuations about the members on this side of the House and our attitude towards Captain Kean, but it won't be wise for you to refer to it again. But I will tell you this: I do hope that Captain Abraham Kean will live for two or three years longer, and then he will get all that is coming to him; because as surely as we sit here to-night, the day will come when Captain Kean will have to answer for his part in the Newfoundland disaster; and whether he goes to the Penitentiary or not, he will surely stand his trial. Now you may put that in your pipe and smoke it.

Then, the hon. member for Placentia says that I have gone back upon

what I have been advocating in this House for the last three years. I have gone back on nothing, not one iota of what I have been contending for, either in connection with the accommodation of the crews, the food, or any other improvement. We asked that the crews of the ships be reduced in order that the men might have better accommodation. There was a time when the Neptune took 300 men; this years she only had 195, and they had better accommodation than any crew ever had before in the Neptune. The same thing applied to the 'Blandford.' No wooden ships ever provided better accommodation or food than that found on board the "Neptune" and "Sam. Blandford" this season. Conditions are not any worse than they were before; on the contrary, they are very much better, because of our advocacy. We have gone back upon nothing that we have advocated here during the last three years. But why have we been spending four or five hours debating this clause, and why, last year, did we spend days and days over the Sealing Bill? Simply because a few men on the other side of the House want to get up and criticize things that they know nothing at all about.

I can tell the House that we have spent days and days discussing these things in our Convention. We have come from Conventions where all the men interested in this measure were represented; we discussed these matters for days; and we know what we are talking about when we come here. When we come in here and place a Bill on that table and ask you to adopt it, it is done after very mature consideration, and we don't want it criticized by men who don't know anything about it except what somebody has told them either in the lobbies or on the streets. We do not want to have any acrimonious debate on this measure, but I can assure the members on the other side that if they want it they can have it.

Then the hon. member stated that I said in this House that these wooden ships were floating coffins. Now, I challenge him to produce a single statement made by me in this House to that effect. It is incorrect.

MR. DEVEREAUX—A statement to that effect appeared in your paper.

MR. COAKER—I never made any such statement in this House, and I am not responsible for all that appears in the paper. I know that some of the ships that went out this year were not as good as I would like to see them, but Lloyds' surveyor went over all these ships and examined them, and said that they were alright. He is supposed to know his business, and if he said they were alright it is not for me to contradict him; but my opinion is that some of them were not alright. One ship was held in port because of my agitation last year and $30,000 spent on her this year. Another is being sent over to have new boilers put in her. Another had $15,000 expended in repairs on her last summer. Well you don't suppose that would be done unless it was necessary.

I do not think that there is any need of a discussion such as we have heard this evening. The Committee has reported, and its report ought to be adopted, and I think that it is only right for every member on that Committee to stand together and show the country that they are men who will not easly be induced to change their views on a matter of such vital importance.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Chairman, I shall only take the time of the Committee for a minute—sufficiently long to say that I heartily approve of every section of this Sealing Bill with the exception of the one now under discussion. My reasons for objecting to this section are possibly different from those held by other members.

They are that in view of the highly commendable action of the Bowring Brothers in refusing to sell their ships when they might have done so most advantageously, they are entitled to special consideration in this matter. That is one argument. Then, I am inclined to differ from hon. members in regards to the anticipated results of the exclusion of steel ships. I think that in the not very distant future we will have to rescind this legislation, because it is undeniable that you cannot to-day duplicate these wooden ships anywhere. Now, in the ordinary course of events, within the next 12 or 14 years, every one of these wooden ships will have passed off the register, and that means that you will no longer have a seal fishery unless you permit steel ships to prosecute it.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—This does not exclude steel ships.

MR. DOWNEY.—It practically does, because you will never find capital to construct steel ships of 450 tons to go into the prosecution of the seal fishery. Anybody conversant with the technicalities pertaining to the building of ships will admit this without any hesitation.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Insinuations have been thrown across this House this afternoon that the members on this side do not know what they are talking about. We are told by the hon. member for Twillingate that we cannot intelligently discuss fishery matters. He is very much mistaken in this idea. I am a fisherman's son and have been engaged at the fishery in various capacities and I think I am safe in saying that I have forgotten more about the fisheries of this country than either of the hon. Leaders of the Opposition ever knew. We are not here to champion Capt. Abraham Kean but I look upon Capt. Kean as one of the most successful fishermen in the Colony who by pluck and perseverance has taken a foremost place in the community. He started at the foot of the ladder and worked his way to the top by indomitable energy. Is not this the class of man deserving of praise and encouragement? We have not too many of the type of Capt. Kean, and I think it an outrage that his private character and business should be attacked at every opportunity because he refused to be browbeaten by a certain section of the community. Capt. Kean's sons may have met with disaster in their various avocations, but disaster and success are so closely intertwined in the perilous calling of our fishermen, that one is as likely to be met with as the other,and it is a good man's case to meet either. The man who meets disaster and overcomes it, is the man to be admired ,and Capt. Kean belongs to this class. Take the history of the Gloucester fisheries. How often has misfortune overtaken the fishermen from that port? The same is true of Lunenburg. In fact ,our own Bank fishery has been a record of disasters. When we consider this, do you think it fair, Mr. Chairman, that we should come here this evening and blame Capt. Kean because he has been unfortunate on one or other occasions. I say it is not. The Leader of the Opposition has thrown out the meanest insinuation that has been heard in this House for some time. He insinuates that Capt. Kean should not be permitted to prosecute the Sealfishery,because he, (Mr. L.) being connected with the Sealing Commission is in a position to know what Capt. Kean has done. Did not that Commission vindicate Capt. Kean? That being so ,why does the Leader of the Opposition intimate that he knows something about Capt. Kean that has not been published, and that

if known would prevent Capt. Kean going to the Sealfishery? That Commission was instructed to investigate all matters in connection with the Newfoundland disaster. It reported and the report vindicated Capt. Kean.

MR. LLOYD.—It did not.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—One of the principal arguments put up by the other side was that Capt. Kean's going in command of a large steamer would result in some of his sons getting large steamers also because he would be able to locate good positions for them and put them on the track of seals. Hon. gentlemen opposite in making this statement are unconsciously paying a very high tribute to Capt. Kean as a sealing master, in stating that not alone can he successfully command one steamer but that he can command two or three and locate positions to load them. If Capt. Kean can accomplish this, he is certainly our greatest sealing master, and this is the position in which hon members opposite place him. If Capt. Kean did give information to others, it is only what is usual amongst our fishermen. Do not Bank fishermen assist each other in this way? Why is it wrong to do it at the Sealfishery? It is not fair to this man nor consonant with justice that he should be slandered and vilified, and I can say with a knowledge of the facts that the charges made against Capt. Kean are not accepted by the fishermen of this Island. I have followed his career pretty closely and I am proud of his ,achievements as I am proud of the achievements of our many successful sealing captains ,the most of whom I count as my personal friends. I have been exasperated listening to some members on the other side talking on matters of which they have no knowledge. What does the Leader of the Opposition know about our codfishery? Does he know a squid from a sculpin? Does he know a caplin from a whale?

MR. LLOYD.—Do you know a wise man from a fool?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOM.—Yes, I have met the former; if you look into a mirror you will see the other. This House has come to something when a man who drifted in through the Narrows a few years ago comes in and dictates to us what we should do in regard to the fisheries of the Colony. Some of our old fishermen must turn in their graves to hear some of the remarks that have fallen from the Leader of the Opposition. I know there are many men opposite who know a good deal about the fisheries, some of them know more than I do. I consider Mr. Jennings, the hon. member for Twillingate, and Capt. Winsor should always be heard from on fishery questions, but they are too modest, and leave those matters, of which they are experts, to be handled by the Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Lloyd, who is a lawyer.

We were told that the member for Placentia and St. Mary's was not logical. His statements are quite logical. When you take that section of the bill and read in conjunction with it the utterances of certain portions of the Press for the last few years, do they not correspond with what is proposed in that section of the bill? I am not going to support that class of Legislation. The duties and responsibilities of Legislators are too serious to have them influenced or effected by personal animosities. This is not the place to ventilate personal spleen, and I shall not assent to such enactments, even if I have to assent to further consideration by the Select Committee, and my reason for changing the opinion I expressed in Committee, is that I discovered there unworthy motives actuating some of those who were forcing this section, and I am prepared

to accept judgment for my action, not from hon. gentlemen opposite, but from the electors of the Colony, and those of them who sent me to this House.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, we have had a speech from a man who prides himself on being a fisherman and the son of a fisherman and he has the good sense to tell me I do not know anything about the codfishery.

I will challenge him to point out when he ever heard me claim in this House or in the Press any knowledge of the fishery, or profess to have any knowledge of the fishery either this afternoon or at any other time. Therefore what is in the taunt of the hon. member except flippancy and blackguardism? I said blackguardism, and Mr. Speaker has called his attention to it. I will pause. I say it was blackguardly to attack the leader of the Opposition for something the leader of the Opposition has not done.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is your opinion; it is not mine.

MR. LLOYD.—I would be very sorry to have to hold the same opinion as the hon. member. The hon. gentleman talks about logic, and the logic that flows from a practical fisherman, and being the son of a fisherman. On Friday last I presume the experience and knowledge of the hon. member as a practical fisherman were as great as it is to-day.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Oh, no.

MR. LLOYD—Oh, no he has learned something since; he saw something wise that affects his opinion and makes him a better man; and therefore that knowledge must have come from someone on this side of the House. I say where are the logic and strength of the fishermen we have heard so much about as exemplified in the Honourable Minister of Finance, whose experience on Friday last led him to sign this report of the Select Committee on the Sealing Bill (reads report). Now, what happens after that? Why this, that the practical fisherman who on Friday gave his word on a certain subject, to-day discards it? On Friday last he gave his opinion through a report in this House, and the report was adopted by this House, and he discards his opinion to-day.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—It was not in this House.

MR. LLOYD—It was introduced, received and adopted in this House.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Tell the whole story.

MR. LLOYD—That is the whole story.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Oh no.

MR. LLOYD—A little more of that story was this: That Committee came here and that Committee on Friday last had to rise because the men who had put money in the sealing steamers made a representation, sent it in here, and it was passed along on the other side of the House.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—That is not true.

MR. LLOYD—It was and I saw it myself. I can give you the names of the men that were appended to that representation. It was shown to me on the floors of this House. That is what happened, if the hon. member wants to know what happened since. The representation from these capitalists has come in since. Now, we have had a tirade about Capt. Kean, and it has been stated that I attacked Capt. Kean after the Commissioners vindicated him. What vindication did they give of Capt. Kean? What vindication of Capt. Kean was there in the Report? None whatever. They reported on his negligence. Was that a vindication? A report of two Com-

missioners on his negligence. Is that a vindication? It was pointed out that I made a statement in reference to Capt. Kean. I repeat that statement. I said that if Capt. Kean was not in the Florizel in the Spring of 1912, that disaster would not have happened. The beginning of that disaster was a signal that was given from the Florizel to the Newfoundland. That was the beginning. That caused the disaster. That was the first step; and that signal was agreed upon before Abraham Kean left port. Those men would have never been sent out from the 'Newfoundland' and lost had it not been for instructions between Captain Kean and his son. That is what we don't want to happen again. Now, Sir, I refer to this simply in reply to what has been said by the Minister of Finance. He is an old hand at this game; he has done it often, and he has tried it again here this afternoon.

MR. MOULTON—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of saying a few words in connection with this matter. I want to correct an impression which has perhaps been given by some remarks which have been made in this House to-day. The Leader of the Opposition said that there was a document passed along this side of the House.

MR. LLOYD—No, not on that side of the House, but to a few members of the Select Committee. I know, because the document was afterwards handed to me by a member of the Government and a Minister of the Crown.

MR. MOULTON—I am prepared to say here that I never saw the document referred to by Mr. Lloyd, and that what I said here yesterday was said because I consider that the interests of those who have invested money in these steel ships should be safeguarded. I cannot see the necessity of all this debate. I have given this House my personal unbiased opinion, and nobody has had anything to do with me in that respect. I have heard nothing from Bowring Brothers or anybody else. I think this matter ought to be voted on and determined at once.

MR. DOWNEY—There was some mention made about a document being passed along this side of the House. I . . . . . .

MR. LLOYD—What I said was that there was a document on that side of the House in the possession of a Minister of the Crown. I saw the document in the hands of the Minister.

MR. DOWNEY—I accept the disavowal, and was just about to remark when the hon. member interrupted me, that I had never seen the paper to which he referred, nor had any ulterior motive led me to take the stand I did take.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word or two now that the atmosphere is becoming clearer. I believe in being frank, and I can say frankly that I do not know anything about the present bill in so far as seal fishing is concerned. I do not pretend to know anything, and told the House so yesterday. The hon. members will remember that I said yesterday that this was a very dangerous subject for laymen to handle, and as I see it from a layman's point of view, I see no reason why the amendment that is now suggested will in any way damage the fishery. I fail to see why one has to be a sealer to be able to see that 35,000 seals in the Florizel do not deplete the herd any more than 35,000 in the Neptune. When I spoke yesterday I had just heard of this amendment. I may say private members of the party a couple of days ago were discussing this matter in the clerk's office, and as far as I could see spoke along the

lines which they have spoken on to-day. I do not know that there is anybody here to-day getting any fee for supporting this amendment. I would like to know if there are any such fees going around, for there always seems to be some suspicion of a lawyer in connection with such matters such as this. Perhaps if I had known this I would not have rushed as I did too quickly, but I wish to assure the hon. member for Twillingate that I had no knowledge of this when I spoke as I did the other day. Like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I was only too willing to accept anything which had the object of preserving the sealfishery of Newfoundland, and there are some of us who are voting just because he said that. We have no knowledge, not sufficient direct interest in the subject to give this matter the attention it deserves. All we have is the assurance of the Minister of Marine that it is in the interests of the seal herd, and we will support it on that account. I have nothing personally to gain or lose in this connection, but am actuated entirely by the motives as put forward by the Minister. If any member in this House is able to show me that the object of this section is not the object as set forth and understood by me, then I will change my vote accordingly. If it can be shown to me that this amendment arose out of ulterior motives, then I will be glad to vote accordingly, but I think in dealing with a matter like this we ought to be very careful. The Bill asks that we stop all steel ships over 450 tons from prosecuting the fishery, and the amendment asks us to allow the steel ships to go, but to limit their catch. We do not know the whole industry sufficiently to make up our minds as to the best one of these to support, and consequently as far as we private members are concerned, we must take the advice of those that do know. I do not care what happens or what one is adopted, but I only hope that benefit will come to the sealers as a result of whatever one does pass.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman. In reply to the hon. member who has just sat down I would say this bill has the object of not only saving the herd, but of assuring fair competition in the prosecution of the seal fishery and also to make possible a more equal distribution of the wealth that flows from that industry. Now the amendment is against this very object and instead favors the giving to one firm virtually the monopoly of this industry. Why? If you allow this one ship to go to the ice you are giving that firm a special privilege at the expense of its competitors whose vessels are very much inferior in size and power and who, if this amendment passes, will not be allowed to engage a similar ship to compete against her. The amendment singling out the S.S. Florizel as the only over 450 tons that shall be allowed to prosecute the seal fishery the firm of Bowring Brothers are specially favored at the expense of the other firms who engage in that fishery. That is not the strongest reason for my opposition. What impels me more than anything else is the fact that it will have the probable effect of placing the greater part of the catch of seals into the three or four ships belonging to Bowrings employing six or seven hundred men,and leaving the lesser portion to the seven or eight vessels of the other firms employing 1500 men or more. It necessarily follows that the greater part of the wealth of the sealing industry will fall into the lap of one firm employing the fewer men, while all the other firms with the greater number of men employed will get the beggar's slice. You place the Bowring firm into the position of being able to say to the Captain of the Florizel—if they

so desire—Here you have the largest and most powerful ship at your command, all the other vessels are less powerful. You have a great advantage of not only being able to get the complement of seals you require but to be able to look after our other vessels and get them into the seals. There can be no doubt that such competition is most unfair and should not be tolerated by this House. Only such legislation should pass, that will place all who prosecute the seal fishery on a basis of equality before the law. It has been said by the Premier that the limiting of the catch of the Florizel to 35,000 seals will have the effect of preventing her going to the ice as such a quantity will not pay expenses. If that is so, why favor the amendment. Such an argument is only begging the question. To say that you are against the clause in its original form because of an injustice it might do to the owners of the Florizel and contend at the same time that you favor the limiting of her catch to 35,000 which will not pay is certainly inconsistent and a very illogical contention. I am not in favor of allowing this House to become a tool for the deriving of special favors, and trust it will uphold its dignity by turning down any such proposal. Why was this ship not employed at her proper business of carrying freight between New York, Halifax and St. John's. If the government had attended to its duty, it would have endeavoured to have that steamer engaged in relieving the congestion of freight at these places. Hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of goods are awaiting shipment at New York and Halifax for weeks past, goods that are very much needed by the people of this country and yet the people have to suffer because the government failed to do its duty in having the Florizel engaged in doing a work of such absolute necessity. I oppose the amendment and hope that the House will turn it down as it deserves. This is certainly very inconsistent. This clause is to be deleted for the benefit of one particular firm. I am not in favor of sending this ship to the ice at all. I think she can earn more by plying between this and Halifax and New York, and at the same time do more good. She is taken off because the firm wants to take the risk of getting a big trip, and as the result there are thousands of dollars worth of freight waiting at Halifax and New York to be shipped to this country. All this is being tied up because the government will not attend to its duty, and insist that the Florizel keep to the work and not go to the ice. I am unable to support this amendment because I think it is unfair to allow any steel ships to compete with these wooden ones, and I trust that the members of this House will see that justice is done in this connection.

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 motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again..

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

MR. LLOYD—Perhaps the Prime Minister might now be able to make his statement in connection with the Prohibition Election Petitions?

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —I thought to be able, but regret that I shall have to keep the hon. member waiting until to-morrow, when I will try to make a complete statement.

MR. COAKER—Perhaps the Colonial Secretary can tell us what ar-

rangements have been made about ships for the northern coast. It will be remembered he promised to let us know.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I immediately took this matter up with the different firms, who promised to let me know what could be done. Mr. Crosbie hopes to let me know in the morning what ship of his will be available, and outside of that I do not know what ships except the sealing steamers, will be available.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 19, 1916.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. COAKER—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Troytown asking that the sum of $120 be allocated for the purpose of erecting a shed on the coastal wharf at that place for the convenience of freight.

MR. HALFYARD—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Burnt Island and Joe Batts Arm in Fogo district asking that thirty dollars be allocated for the purpose of building a shelter house at Birchy Pond on Fogo Island, which the petitioners consider an absolute necessity for the people of that place as well as a great convenience for the people of the neighbouring settlements. Travellers and those who engage in woodcutting would feel the advantage of this allocation particularly. The house would be a place of shelter and in that bleak part of the district might be the means of saving life. The petition is influentially and largely signed. I beg that it be referred to the department of Public Works.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I beg to present a petition from the fishermen of Bay Bulls, asking that the dredge be sent there to dredge the upper end of the harbour. Bay Bulls is one of the principal harbours on the Southern Shore and in summer is a great resort for fishermen from all over the Island as well as outside the Island. There is a river running into the harbour and the silt and dirt is filling up the upper end of the harbour. I trust that the Government will see its way to have this request attended to during the coming year.

MR. HALFYARD—I beg to present a petition from the people of the Anglican Church of Fogo proper asking that the sum of two hundred dollars be allocated for the purpose of making a road to the new cemetery that has just been opened at that place. The petition is largely and influentially signed. I beg that it be referred to the department of Public Works.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

Rt. Hon the Prime Minister gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors."

QUESTIONS.

Mr. Stone gave notice of motion.

Mr. Halfyard gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Targett gave notice of question.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—I think I answered that last year; that part with reference to 1913-1914.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not think the Minister answered the part I am asking now.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES. I would like to look in the Journal of the House. I think I answered that question.

MR. LLOYD—Suppose the Minister did, what then.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—I do not think it should be asked again. I am always only too satisfied to oblige any member on the Opposition side of the House; and do all I can to give satisfactory answers to the questions asked me; but I would like a ruling of the Speaker on this matter. I have answered questions about the years 1912-1913 and 1914, and if I bring these questions down to the Clerks they will tell me that they have answered them last year or the year before. I think it is unnecessary and only means a loss of time for the House. If this question has not been answered I shall answer it, but if it has I shall not.

MR. LLOYD—There is no need for any heat over the matter, and while the Minister has been exceedingly satisfactory in answering questions I would point out to him that he is not the master of this House nor the master of his department as regards information asked for by this House.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—I would ask the leader of the Opposition to consider that I am not ignorant of these matters.

MR. LLOYD—I accept that, but I want to point out to the Minister that it was not becoming for him to say he would not do a certain thing.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I will appeal to the Speaker.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance and Customs to a question I asked on the 18th, question No. 2 on the order paper.

MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I do not know of any appointments.

MR. HALFYARD—The Minister does not know that any appointments have been made except under the Audit and Departmental Acts. Perhaps the Minister could tell me who appointed W. Roil, Marshall, Charles Renouf and others.

MINISTER OF FINANCE—I will get the information for you.

MR. MOORE—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. HALFYARD—May I draw the attention of the Colonial Secretary to question No. 1 on the order paper for April 18th which he promised to have to-day.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I did not promise it to-day. I told you it was in course of preparation. That question will take some time to prepare.

SAWMILLS BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 4, George V., Cap. 17, entitled "An Act Respecting the Operation of Saw Mills," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER. BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law Respecting the Exportation of Timber," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SEALFISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order and and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Seal Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, after all the talk of last evening I suppose that the atmosphere is pretty well clear of gas now and that I will be able to go ahead with my charge on this

sealing bill. I think every member of the House on both sides is well acquainted with clause 13 and also its proposed amendment and is ready to cast his vote either in favor or against. It is not necessary for me to say anything more. The time of the House was taken up yesterday by several discussions that took place from both sides. I hope there is a better feeling to-day and that the atmosphere is now clear.

MR. JENNINGS—Mr. Chairman, I had no intention to say anything in regard to this bill, but after hearing the Hon. Minister of Finance speak yesterday, when he made remarks somewhat in the nature of a challenge, I wish to make a few remarks. Of course I do not mean a challenge to mortal combat, because in that case I should have to make an apology or claim police protection; but I think it was something in this respect that the leaders on this side of the House who were speaking had not a great deal of knowledge of the question under discussion, but that some other parties down the row had more practical knowledge. I do not pretend to have a great deal of practical knowledge of the seal fishery as prosecuted by our sealing fleet, but I have had an opportunity of listening for hours to dozens of men who had practical experience and, my opinions regarding this industry have been largely influenced by what I have learned from those men. As far as I can understand, the bill before the House to-day is to safeguard and protect the men engaged in the seal fishery and, secondly, to protect the seal herd. Now with regard to the first part—the safeguarding of the men—I understand there are no two opinions. I have heard none expressed. All are unanimous in this regard; but as to the second part—and I might say a third which to a certain extent influences the second—the limiting of size of the ships—it has resulted in a great deal of debate perhaps not altogether to our credit. Now I have had a little experience with regard to the great change which has come over the sealing industry in the past 40 years. In my short lifetime the industry that was once such a boon to Notre Dame Bay has become a thing of the past. About 30 years ago men who did not possess a sealing gun in the district of Twillingate were hardly considered men at all. At any rate, they would not be considered first-class men; and a good many dollars or pounds were earned by men practised in the use of these guns shooting seals, and also many dollars were earned by men from the shore in hauling young seals; and now the only use for these guns is to lie up on the rack as reminders of old times. The sealing industry that was carried on in the early fall is a thing of the past. The nets that were then used are lying in stores anad eaten with dry-rot. The sealing industry as this was is a thing of the past and the chief factor in bringing about this is the introduction of steam in the sealing fishery. I think you will get this opinion from 90 per cent. of all the men in Twillingate who have been engaged in this industry and have watched the decline of the seal fishery year after year. Steam has come to stay. I do not think you will ever see the day when our seal herd will be protected against the steam fleet—steam will continue to be used in the prosecution of this fishery. But this clause in the bill to-day that has evoked so much discussion proposes to limit the size of those vessels engaged in the fishery. I think myself that it is right. We can all look back three or four years and remember the condition of things that obtained then. Why, there were not seals enough for the steamers going to the ice;

and the large ships had such a great advantage over the smaller ones that men scarcely though it worth while to go to the ice in small steamers when they had an opportunity of employment elsewhere. Owing to causes not foreseen then, the large steel fleet has been reduced to one ship; and I think myself that we are enabled to do so without hurting any of commercial interests of the country, that now is the best time to pass such laws and limit the size of the ships. I take it that under the conditions that this amendment seeks to bring about, it is not so much a question of what the Florizel would do regarding her own catch but the possibility of the effect her participation would have on the other ships sent by the firm that owns her. Some men think that it is not a fair proposition that those things should happen; but I have yet to learn of any commercial firm that is running its trade for charitable purposes. The first object is to make it pay; and there is nothing in the way of the firm possessing such a big ship making a combination amongst the captains employed by it, so that its ships would be looked after—the large ship would help them out, but the smaller ones of other owners would be helpless. Our seal herd is a limited one and it is no use to argue that if they did not get a voyage early they would get it later on. It is too late when the seals are cut up. As we all know the Florizel would have brought in more seals than she did but it did not pay her to stay out. For those reasons I am prepared to stand by the bill as it has come before the House to-day. There are many things that might be said in connection with the sealfishery. There is an unfair distribution of the catch. The crew goes out and they think they are very fortunate if they get $100 each. The captain gets four or five thousand dollars; and while he may be a good man, superior to anybody else going, it seems to me to be more than it should be, and to my mind it is not fair to the crew. But we are not dealing with these things. We are dealing with the question whether it is right to have ships over a certain size engage in the sealfishery—whether it is fair for the Florizel to take any part in the sealfishery. I consider it unfair and will support this bill as it is now before the House at the present time. On motion being put the amendment was carried.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. Now that the amendment has been carried, I presume that section 13 with the amendment will now be put to the vote. That being so I beg to move an amendment to the effect that no vessel of more than 450 tons shall be cleared for the Seal Fishery from any port of the Island except the port of St. John's and not before the 15th of March in any year. As you will see, the object of the amendment is to prevent the steel vessels leaving for two days after the wooden ones have gone and it will give the wooden ships a chance to compete.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman: Before the House goes any further with this matter, I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the report of the debate of yesterday in the "Mail and Advocate" to-day. I presume that this article has been written by the gentleman who has charge of the paper and who owns it, and I would like to know if we are to put up with such conduct from a member of the House towards another member of the House. It is not fair or just that a member of the House should go outside this House and write a false report of the debate in it. It is like sticking a man in the back. Why doesn't he say in the House what he wishes to say instead of going out

to some dark corner and writing such a report on the proceedings. With your permission, Sir, I will read the report to the Committee. (Hon. member here read the report of the Committee). Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any member of the House will disagree with me in calling the attention of the Committee to this report. This is the right place for gentlemen who are members of the House to debate any questions and say what they wish, and not go down in the dark hole of some office and write an untrue and unjust account of what takes place here. I defy any member here to say that Mr. Lloyd stated here yesterday that I was a blackguard. I do not remember hearing Mr. Lloyd making that statement.

MR. LLOYD—Well, I did say it and repeat it now.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I would ask to have those words taken down.

MR. LLOYD— I said then, and I say now that your conduct towards me was blackguardly.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Blackguardly conduct can only come from one who is a blackguard, and I ask those words be taken down and referred to the Speaker.

MR. COAKER—I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member began one attack. An attack upon me. He should take that back. He said that I wrote that article in the paper.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I move that the Speaker be recalled, and that these words be reported to him and that he ask the hon. member to take them back.

MR. CROSBIE—I second the motion.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that the hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Lloyd, had said of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the following words:—"Your conduct towards me yesterday was blackguardly."

MR. SPEAKER—I would ask the Leader of the Opposition whether he has been reported correctly.

MR. LLOYD—Yes, they are reported correctly. I said it yesterday, and I repeated it today at his invitation.

MR. SPEAKER—In that case there is only one thing for me to do, to rule that the words are unparliamentary, and to ask the hon. member to withdraw them.

MR. LLOYD—If that is your ruling, Sir. I take the words back.

MR. SPEAKER—The hon. member having withdrawn the words, the incident is now closed.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons resumed the Chair of Committee.

MR. COAKER—I beg to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Minister has charged me with writing that article, and I ask that that charge be taken back.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—A member who sits in this House ought to be independent enough to get up and make a charge here, and not go outside to make it in the press. Do you call it fair or just?

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I ask for your ruling. The hon. member has charged me with writing that article.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The fact of the matter is that the paper is supposed to be owned by Mr. Coaker, and what I say is that this report of the debate has been distorted by that paper. In that paper it is stated that Mr. Lloyd said that my actions were blackguardly.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I rise to a point of order. The Speaker has ruled that this incident is closed, and in that case the hon. member is not at liberty to refer to it again. The hon. member for

Twillingate has asked for your ruling upon the charge made by the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, and I ask for your ruling as Chairman of the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN—I did not hear any reference to the member for Twillingate. I have frequently heard members comment on the reports in newspapers. The Hon. Minister is quite at liberty to comment on it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—What I want to make clear is that this debate as taking place in this House has been distorted in the press by members of this House.

MR. COAKER—That is false. Who are the members of the House? Name them? I did not write that article. I wish I had.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—What I want to point out is that the hon. gentleman is supposed to be owner of that paper.

MR. COAKER—What you said was that I went down and wrote it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—What I say is that this paper distorted this debate. We have been used to this kind of journalism for the past few years, since certain members have come into this House. The whole country has been fed up with this scandal about Captain Kean. It has been served up at breakfast dinner and supper for three years. It is about time it was closed off. It is a dirty way to treat anyone.

MR. LLOYD—I ask for your ruling on those words, Sir. If there is no ruling on this point which I have raised, we will withdraw from the House and take steps in another manner. The hon. member has said that a member of this House has acted in a dirty manner towards another member.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Well, you can call it a clean manner, if you like. Is it a clean manner, after a debate is over, for a member of this House to misrepresent what has gone on in this House?

MR. COAKER—I have said that I did not write that article. If you will name any article in the paper, I will tell you whether I wrote it?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—But was it not in your paper?

MR. COAKER—No. It is not my paper.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—But it is controlled by you. You knew something about it. As you said before yourself, nothing goes into that paper without your consent. If you went into the office and said that such an article was not to go in, it would not go in.

MR. COAKER—It might or it might not. I have not time to attend to all the articles that go into that paper. I am too busy.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—If you did not want that article to go in it would not have gone in. You are President of that Company and control that paper. Do you mean to say that if Mr. Herder does not want an article to go in the Telegram, Mr. Lloyd would put it in.

MR. LLOYD—I may tell the Hon. Minister that I am the sole controller of everything that goes into that paper.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—But if Mr. Herder said he did not want an article to go in, what would you do?

MR. LLOYD—I'll tell you. Mr. Herder would not be such a fool as to do any such thing. I have been with Mr. Herder over 12 years, and he has never attempted to influence or control anything that I have done. I have the full and absolute control.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—But if he did put his foot down?

MR. LLOYD—I would not allow it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Then you would have to walk out.

MR. LLOYD—If Mr. Herder made any such suggestions, he would be breaking his express agreement with me. When he put me in charge he gave me specially to understand that I was to be in full control, and not Mr. Herder or any one else, and if such a thing happened that would be a breach of his agreement.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yes, that is just the same kind as any other agreement, but you would do what you were told all the same. However, to return to this paper. I say that the "Advocate" this evening contains a distorted account of the debate of last evening.

MR. COAKER—Will you tell us what happened?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—What happened was that you did not rise to the occasion when you were charged with being a party to taking 40,000 gallons of oil from the fishermen.

MR. COAKER—I ask for those words to be taken down.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Now don't interrupt me. If you had let me finish my sentence you would have heard me say according to the legislation we were about to pass. That is what I was going to say when you interrupted me.

MR. LLOYD—I ask those words to be referred to the Speaker. As Leader of the Opposition, I have a perfect right to, and I insist upon their being taken down and reported.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

During the discussion the Minister of Finance and Customs having used the words: "You did not rise to the occasion yesterday, when I charged you with being a party to taking 40,000 gallons of oil from the fishermen" as applying to Mr. Coaker, and Mr. Coaker has asked that the words be taken down and reported to Mr. Speaker.

The said words were reported to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker having asked the Minister of Finance and Customs whether in the use of the said words he had intended to charge wrong-doing, fraud, or dishonesty, to the hon. member, and being assured that there was no such intention, Mr. Speaker ruled that the words were not unparliamentary, and forthwith directed the Chairman to resume the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—What I was going on to say was that the hon. member for Twillingate did not rise to the occasion last evening when I stated that he was a party to taking 40,000 gallons of oil from the fishermen.

MR COAKER.—Forty thousand dollars worth, I think you said.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I said gallons.

MR. LLOYD.—I would ask that these words be taken down.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I will take them back. It saves time.

MR. COAKER.—I object to this style of debate. The Minister of Finance has done nothing but make a series of charges against hon. members in this House.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I wish to state this that the hon. member for Twillingate made no answer to the statement I made in this House last evening.

Now the reason why I made this statement is because he twitted me, saying that I went back on what I had done. I said it is a good man who can go back and say he has done wrong. It was pointed out by the hon. member for Placentia when the Weights and Measures Bill was going through that over 40,000 gallons of oil would be taken from the fishermen of this Island according to the catch of last year, if the Weights and Mea-

sures Bill went through in present form. When the amendment was proposed by Mr. Devereaux or when the objection was stated by Mr. Devereaux, the hon. member Mr. Coaker, rose in his seat on the other side and told us that it had been considered already in the F. P. U. Convention and that it would be hopeless to make any amendment.

MR. COAKER.—Oh no.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Words to that effect.

MR. COAKER.—I said that there was no way of getting any financial benefit.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—What was the result? Did not the Select Committee from this House investigate and came back with a signed report—you as one of its signatories—and did you not reverse your position. You got up and told this House that you were going to interfere with the trade of this Colony if your opinion was not considered. You said you had considered it in Convention and you decided that you were unable to make any move in that direction.

Now with regard to the Committee on this Sealing Bill; Dr. Lloyd moved that a select committee be appointed, and I seconded that motion. I remember I also signed the report of that committee and now I want to take back one statement. Any member has the right to reconsider when he has made a mistake. This is what I did and the result is here in the Mail and Advocate this evening. This paper charges that strings have been pulled and as a result I changed my decision. I deny it and say that that statement is incorrect. What I state here in this House and what I want to impress upon this committee is that the debates as they take place in this House are not fair because they do not end here. That debate was misrepresented outside in the Mail and Advocate, in this paper this evening. Entirely misrepresented. I read it to the Committee, and they know it. It is wrong in every particular. There is nothing gentlemanly about it from start to finish. It was a blackguard who wrote it whoever it was, and I would tell him so to his face.

(A person in the gallery, appearing to be a reporter for the Mail and Advocate here interrupted the proceedings, and upon the order of the Chairman was removed by the Sergeant at Arms.)

MR. LLOYD.—I ask for a ruling in this matter. I ask the House for a ruling.

MR .CHAIRMAN.—I have given my ruling. Noisy spectators are not allowed in this Assembly.

MR. LLOYD.—I know you have. I don't care a rap for your ruling. What I want is the ruling of the Committee. I want to know if they will receive your ruling.

The order of the Chairman that the person interrupting be removed, was sustained by the Committee by a vote of 18 to 12.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Mr. Chairman I was just going on to say when I was interrupted that I know the reason why that report of last evening's sitting was so written in this evening's paper. It was simply because I trod on the corns of the gentlemen on the other side of the House. That was the reason. There is no decency in it. There is no decency about it. This reason was quite apparent to every member of this House, and every spectator in this House. I got to my feet to justify myself. I have no desire to prolong this Committee unduly but I just want to make this statement, so that it can go before the country together with the reports of this session, and that statement is this. The reason why I was

attacked by a certain paper this afternoon was because I arose here yesterday afternoon and contradicted statements made from the other side. That was the sole reason. If I had kept my seat and not said a word when all this matter came up there would have been nothing said and I would have been a fine fellow. This course was open to me, but I was not prepared to take it. No matter what fair castigation any member hands over to me, I am prepared to stand here and strike back.

We have had during the past few days several references made here in this House to Captain Kean. This matter has been brought up year after year now for the past two or three years, and it is in my opinion about time to call halt. It is about time Sir, to call halt; if not for Captain Kean's sake then out of respect for the dead. In my opinion that accident was an act of God. I was told here that if Captain Kean had not gone in the Stephano, and Captain Kean's son in the other ship that loss would never have happened. That, Sir, is a ridiculous statement. What happened to the S.S. Greenland ten years before. We do not or did not hear anything about that loss. I repeat Sir, that this was in my opinion an act of God, and as such ought not be brought up from time to time as it has been in the past.

MR. COAKER.—I would like to know how long Newfoundland can be expected to stand when we have such happenings as we have had here to-day in this House.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—Blowhard!

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order. The member has called me a Blowhard. I ask that these words be taken down and the member asked to take them back.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—O, I'll take them back.

MR. COAKER.—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to indulge in the language that the hon. member opposite has indulged in this afternoon but do intend to say that if such is allowed to continue how long do you suppose that we are going to stand for it. How are we going to maintain our respect for the House and the chairman of Committees when we find both so disregarded. If this is going to continue, you will find that you are going to have more trouble than enough, for I can assure you that the members on this side have already had quite enough of this. The member misinterpreted my remarks, and quoted me as saying that we know more about the fishery than himself. If he will remember he will see that we made no reference whatever to him. What I did say was that there were members on the other side of this House who did not know anything about the sealing industry. I would ask the same questions now as I did then. What does the Prime Minister know about sealing? What does Mr. Emerson know about oil gauging? What does Mr. Bennett know about it? What does Mr. Moore know about it? What does Mr. Frank Morris know about it? What does Mr. Currie know about it? What does Mr. LeFeuvre know about it? What does Mr. Higgins know about it?

MR. HIGGINS.—I told the House once already I knew nothing about it.

MR. COAKER.—That was the position I took. I said there were men on the other side who did not know what they were talking about. They only know what they are told. They take what is said as true, and judge accordingly. We get up to explain our position and are accused of all sorts of things. What is to be gained by this sort of conduct? What is the object? Here we are trying to complete our business as rapidly as possible so

as to close the House next week, and we find sessions wasted over trivial matters that end in scenes that shame us. We can keep you here till the middle of July if we wished. We are just as anxious as you to close the House, but I do not intend to remain here and be bullied by anyone. I have been accused of writing that article. Now I have told this House that I did not know anything about this article. I had nothing whatever to do with that article. The Minister refers to me as being out on suspended sentence. I would tell him that this is a falsehood. The member makes half a dozen more unfounded remarks, and when called to order, takes them back, takes every remark that is taken up, back. Think of the position. Here we have a member of the Government, a member of nine years standing in the Executive Council, who has been in the House 20 years, who cannot make a few statments without having every now and again to take back some of them. Now that would not be very strange for some of us on this side of the House who are new to the business, but a man who has been in this Legislature for twenty years or more ought now to be getting used to parliamentary language. True as has been pointed out by the member the first to retract a statement was the Leader of the Opposition; but I would point out to him that the Leader of the Opposition was gentlemanly enough to repeat his remark to give him an opportunity to have it retracted. Without this repetition to oblige the hon. member the remark could never have been objected to. In my opinion the general attitude and conduct of the Minister of Finance and Customs entirely lacks that dignity which one would naturally expect to find in this Assembly. Now, with regard to the discussion on cod-oil, I would like to make a few remarks, which I think may give a little light on the matter. The subject was brought up, as I had before stated in this House, at the Conventions of the F. P. U. and was thrashed out there from time to time, and it was found that there was no way of arranging in order to add to the value of the oil. I have admitted in this House that the discrepancy in measurement exist, and that no other value than that which I have stated could be placed upon a ton of oil as gauged. I have not altered my opinion of the matter, and when you came and brought forward the report of the Committee, I stated, and I still state that the same idea was in my opinion long before any mention of the matter was made in this House. A cask of oil measures more than it gauges. We all know that, but how can we get out of the difficulty, and give the fishermen better value. Mr. Devereaux suggested that the oil should be weighed. That has been found to be impracticable. Mr. Moulton suggested that a couple of gallons more be added to the gauge, which suggestion was accepted by me. I was aware long before a Committee was thought of that the gauge measurement was inexact. When the merchant purchases a cask of oil, he knows pretty well how much oil there is more than the gauge, and he fixes his price per tun to cover the excess.

The accusations made by the Minister against me were absurd. I cannot alter the gauge. The F. P. U. is the sufferer of these conditions. We have lost a considerable sum by this system ,yet we have been accused of being a party to swindling the fishermen of twenty gallons per tun cod oil. We have been the losers, because we purchased 2,500 casks loose or by measure last year and sold the same by gauge, losing 4,000 gallons on the measure. I do not mind a member rising in this Assembly and making a

true statement and challenging me on any point but I do not think it is right that we should suffer from any unfair statement. When the Minister referred to cod oil the other evening, I did not consider that there was any occasion for me to reply, but of course the manner in which he has addressed the House this afternoon calls for a reply. I hope the member is satisfied.

An action has been taken against the Daily News for libel, and this matter will therefore be thrashed out before the Court. The Minister referred to the Newfoundland Disaster as an act of God. If the Stephano had not been in the vicinity of the Newfoundland and given the signal to the Newfoundland these men would never have perished. The crew left the Newfoundland to go to the Stephano, and were caught in the storm, and if ordinary precaution had been taken these men would never have lost their lives. It was not an act of God. The Greenland disaster may have been because everything that man could do was done. At any rate the circumstances are not parallel. In the Greenland disaster there was a lake of water between the men and the ship, although they were only half a mile away and that lake could not be crossed nor could the Greenland move towards the men, hence the disaster. Personally, I do not excuse even the Greenland disaster, and I would have insisted on the most thorough investigation in that matter had I then the place I now occupy. I am very sorry that the Minister of Finance and Customs so far forgot himself this afternoon because the whole debate has been something that we need not have had. The debate could have easily proceeded in a manner that would have been worthy of the first part of this session where we got along without any serious friction as was only right and proper A difference of opinion might have arisen but that does not necessitate the exhibition that we have had for the last couple of days. We can give as good as we get. We can give three shots in reply to everyone the hon. Minister sends across, and if you want to go on with it we are prepared but you will be sorry when it is over. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the common sense of the members of the House will insist upon the business of this House being conducted properly and according to parliamentary practice. I would ask the hon. members to take this into consideration. If you are worthy of the positions you occupy and the responsibilities that are thrust upon you you will not fail to agree with me on this point, and if members are satisfied to proceed in an orderly and dignified fashion we are prepared to aid them in their endeavours but if they insist upon allowing rowdyism to triumph, we can assure them that it won't be a onesided game.

MR. LLOYD.—I, too, Mr. Chairman, rise at this moment merely to take exception to the statement just made by the Minister of Finance and Customs, in relation to this disaster, and to repeat my statements made yesterday in regard to this matter. I rise now for the purpose of justifying to the full the statements I then made. I only have to remind the House that there was a difference of opinion in that Commission. I have before me the finding of two commissioners, the Chief Justice and the late Mr. Justice Emerson (Mr. Lloyd reads finding). That is a judgment of two Judges of the Supreme Court and is good enough for me.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I would like just to make a few statements in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Twillingate. His arguments in relation to

cod oil we have heard before in this House, and I think we have discussed the pros and cons pretty thoroughly. However, I do not think they are very logical. He has stated that his opinion in relation to this matter has not changed, and that when the committee a few days ago decided on one and a half gallons as being the recognized amount of oil exceeding the gauge, the Committee was merely putting into practice what he had thought all along. A man who has a cask of oil to sell will take it to the merchant who gives him the highest price, competition is the life of trade, and every man in the trade wants to buy his oil as cheaply as he can. There has never been any question raised about the over gauge. If these are the sentiments of the hon. member I am giving him credit for more sense than he has, because the hon. gentleman knows that every merchant sells his oil according to weight, at nine or nine and a quarter pounds to the gallon. If one merchant does not suit, the fisherman can go and get full value somewhere else, times have changed. Oil is not being sold by the gallon, at least in the section of the country I come from, because every small fisherman puts the oil in a cask if he does not sell liver for medicinal oil, and when he has enough to fill the cask he goes and sells it, not by the gallon as stated here, but by the cask.

I do not think that there were 1,000 gallons of oil purchased in the District of Ferryland by the gallon last year, and I am sure the Bank fishermen to the westward are not going to sell by the gallon; they sell by the cask. He tried to make out this afternoon that although his firm purchased oil last year they stood to lose because they purchased by the gallon and sold by the cask. Well, now, I do not know the condition of the North where they are doing business but I am speaking of the conditions from St. John's, west, and I firmly believe that there were not 1,000 gallons sold by the gallon in the District of Ferryland, and I am sure that the bankers to the westward are not going to sell by the gallon as they always sell by the cask. I cannot accept the argument he put up here this afternoon on that oil question, and I do not think the fishermen of the Colony will swallow it.

MR. COAKER.—You will find that out.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I may find it out but I am in that oil business and I know what I am talking about.

Now in reply to Dr. Lloyd. He talked a lot about 'ifs' and 'ands' and about the Stephano last evening ,and about the decision of the Supreme Court in reference to Capt. Kean. We have been told in the past that the man who sits on the bank always sees the most and knows the most and even playing checkers the man looking on sees double as much as the man moving. Now I say from my own common judgment that this accident was an act of God. All that happened was the act of God. We have been told that if the Newfoundland was not there, and if the Stephano was not there or if the foreboom did not go up, this would not have occurred.

MR. LLOYD.—That is a very plausible explanation, Mr. Chairman, but it happens to be absolutely futile, because if the hon. member had taken the trouble to listen to the findings of the Supreme Court he would find no 'ifs' and 'ands' at all. I am referring now to the deductions of the Commissioners that gave the matter in absolute terms without any 'ifs' and 'ands.'

MR. COAKER.—With reference to the statement of the Minister of Fi-

nance that if he sold 2,000 casks of oil he would get the gallon and a half on each cask, I wish to say that the oil we took last year we sold it according to the gauge we took it in at. I am not getting a gallon and a half on each cask and I don't know who is getting it. Where we took a cask last year at a gauge of 40 or 41 gallons that is now being surveyed, not by my servant but by the man who is buying the oil and the condition of sale is that the gauge I took it in at is the gauge they expect to buy it at. I absolutely declare that I did not get one single gallon more, or not one cent's worth more in connection with the measure of that oil than we bought it at. Now if that is not enough I don't know what the Minister wants to make it clearer. I hope he is satisfied.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—No, I am not.

MR. COAKER.—Well, if he is not satisfied I don't know what he wants to satisfy him.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Well, now, here is the position. If you had 2,000 casks oil to-morrow, I can show you how under the Weights and Measures Act passed the other day you can make 3,000 gallons of oil on that lot.

MR. COAKER.—We will not make it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—If you had 2,000 casks for sale last week after the Act was passed your position was that you would go down to the merchant on Water St. and ask him to buy that oil, and if he purchased that, you could have it gauged by his gauger and your gauger. After that oil was gauged you would be in a position according to that Act to go up to that merchant and say. "I want a gallon and a half allowance on every cask of oil you purchased to-day" That is the law passed here the other day Of course it is a different matter if you are offhanded enough to go down and just say "I have 2,000 casks of oil" for sale, and if you sell it for whatever you can get for it.

MR COAKER.—The Minister has brought in quite a few 'ifs' and 'ands' in that argument. I am sure there must be fifty or a hundred. I say now that he is wrong, and he is wrong because that Act does not come into force until July 1 ,1916. It is not in force until then. If I kept the oil over and did not sell it until July 1st I could then get that gallon and a half, but I would only get a reduced sum per gallon, and. further, I would not keep my oil until July 1st. I do not think that the Minister is half as dense as he makes himself out to be. I believe he can see this matter as clearly as I do. It is simply a matter where we cannot agree. He may think I am right but he says to himself, it will not do to agree with Coaker because we will be giving away our whole case over this oil business.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, as to that position, just one word. If the hon. gentleman keeps that oil until July 1st. and if he has that amount in his possession and sells it, and if he has 2.000 casks refined oil he will get an additional 3,000 gallons.

MR. COAKER.—There are a lot of 'ifs' in that too. I am not talking about cod liver oil; I am talking about the common cod oil, the rotted oil. If a man had 2.000 casks cod liver oil today he would sell that even if he was to get 3,000 gallons more in July, because he knows that in July oil is going to be less. I presume that the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs will not agree with me in this issue.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I will leave it to the members of the House.

MR. COAKER—If you leave it to the members of the House they will agree with me. I think you said the other day that you had sold 500 casks. Well, now. I have sold 2,500 or 3,000 and I think I may be taken to have had a little experience.

MR. GRIMES.—There is one thing in this discussion this afternoon that the Minister of Finance and Customs made very clear, and that is that neither the Government Press, nor the Minister himself, is to be taken seriously as to the quantity of oil that is saved by this amendment to the Weights and Measures Act. The Government has been claiming that they have saved 40,000 gallons to the fishermen; the Minister of Finance has stated this afternon that the Bank fishermen have never sold their oil but by the cask, and that the fishermen of Ferryland district never sold by the gallon. Well, Sir, wherein is it possible to save so many gallons of oil for the fishermen when the Bank fishermen and the fishermen of Ferryland have been selling their oil in this way. I think the Minister of Finance has cut down the figures considerably as to the amount saved to the fishermen of this country.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—What I said was that the hon. gentleman on the other side said that all the oil purchased by the Fishermen's Union last year was purchased by the gallon. That was his statement. Now I have been a fisherman for thirty years and my statement was that in Ferryland District last year I did not think that any more than 1,000 gallons of oil were sold by the single gallon; it was sold by the cask. A fisherman if he keeps his liver rots it and when he has enough to fill a cask he purchases a cask and fills it and sells it to the merchant or whoever buys it. If my hon. friend has 2,000 casks of oil which he purchased last year from the fishermen of this Island, he can now sell those 2,000 casks so as to make 3,000 gallons of oil more than he bought. That is my statement. I defy contradiction of that and if it is contradicted in the House, I am prepared to take my decision from outside the House.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Chairman: I made a statement here when the Weights and Measures Bill was before the House, that the whole catch of codfish last year was 1,200,000 qtls., and that from each quintal of fish caught there was got a gallon of oil. Averaging a loss of three gallons per cask means 320 tons, or the value of $46,000 lost to the fishermen. Now, if we take the judgment of the members who composed the Select Committee the other day and found that the loss on the cask would be a gallon and a half, that would bring the total of the price made last year, which I had figured at three gallons to the cask, at $46,000 down to $23,000. Now I think that the $23,000 is quite sufficient to justify the action of those who opposed that Bill and supported the amendment, and I assure the hon. member that if there is no additional money to be received by the fishermen he represents in this House, the men I have the honour to represent are very much in favour of the change which has taken place, and I have had scores of letters complimenting me on the stand I took. The fishermen, however, are not yet satisfied, and do not believe that a gallon and a half is sufficient allowance on a cask, and I believe that in the very near future we will have to come in here and adopt other legislation whereby a greater amount of oil will be allowed to the fishermen.

Now I do not agree with the hon. member when he says that the fisher-

men will not get any more money, that this amount of oil will not be paid for, and that when fixing the price of oil the fishermen will only get as much as if this had never passed. Now, I think that that is a peculiar statement for the hon. member to make. He represents a number of fishermen, and it is up to him to see that the merchant and the buyers do not wrong the fisherman. I think that is his duty, and I am surprised to hear him state that this $23,000 will not be given to the fishermen.

MR. LLOYD—I wish to move the adoption of an additional section providing for the punishment of captains or officers sending sealers on the ice in bad weather. I have set it out in full form. (Reads amending or additional section.)

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Is it an amendment of section 3?

MR. LLOYD—No. I am reading it as a substantially separate section. If it meets with the approval of the House it can be incorporated in section 3. This bill at present only imposes a penalty when a sealer is sent on the ice at night. There is no penalty or no provision in case sealers are sent on the ice by day when the weather is unfit for them to be on the ice. I move the adoption of this section which provides for that. I have tried to make myself clear on the matter. It is practically the gist of the lessons learned in 1914. If that meets with the assent of the House, I suggest that we reconsider section 3 and add words that would have that effect.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—What is the penalty?

MR. LLOYD—It is not a penalty in the real sense; it is a matter in the discretion of the Court.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—If a man is sent on the ice by the master and does not return, but remains on the ice—what effect will your section have?

MR. LLOYD—It would come into effect if there was no lawful excuse for the man's being sent out.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—How are you going to prove it?

MR. LLOYD—A charge would be laid against the master or officer in the ordinary way and evidence adduced in support.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—If a man went out and remained out; if he was sent out in the day time and remained out after dark through no fault of the master, and there was an action taken against the master, what then?

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—There is a section already providing for that.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman: There is just one point that occurs to me. I agree with the amendment; but when I heard it read it suggested to my mind the qustion: what is going to be the deciding factor as to the state of the weather? If I remember the amendment rightly, it provides against the men being sent out on the ice if the weather is unfit—or words to that effect. Has the hon. Leader of the Opposition any way of getting over that difficulty? What occurs to me is that it practically means that you encourage some of the difficulties that have had to be contended against of recent years, if you do not provide some specific means of proving the state of the weather. Suppose there is an amalgamation amongst the men—they refuse to go on the ice and set up the condition of the weather as an excuse—within whose discretion are you going to leave the decision as to what the state of the weather really is?

MR. LLOYD—This matter can only arise on a trial and the judges would decide on the evidence as to the

state of the weather. It is surely no excuse for refusing to adopt the section to say that some men may amalgamate and decide to stay on board or decide to turn back giving the weather as their reason. It must be remembered that in 1914 a number of men did so conspire and saved themselves.

MR. HIGGINS—It is because of that very case that my suggestion is made. If one judges from the evidence in the enquiry following the 1914 disaster, there was a decided conflict of opinion on the question as to the state of the weather. That very case brings my attention to this point. I am going to support the amendment, but I would like to know whether there is a possibility of meeting my suggestion.

MR. LLOYD—It must have been borne in upon anyone who followed the evidence in that case that no great deal of attention was paid to the barometer on board the ship. But a remarkable feature of the occurrence was this: that reliable barometers all over the Island were unmistakable as to what was going to happen. Now, it might be—I am not suggesting it, I am only pointing it out as a matter for the consideration of the owners—it might be well for the owners to take advantage of means of getting information from St. John's and Toronto as to what the weather forecasts are. Now there is no disposition, I feel, to receive any suggestion. May I ask, do they get weather reports now? Three years ago there was quite a decided hostility to rceiving these reports.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—We receive weather reports now, and they are sent out.

MR. LLOYD—I am very glad to find that these reports are sent out. With these reports and their barometers the captains can very easily come to a decision.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—The advice from Toronto only applies to Newfoundland.

MR. LLOYD—I do not agree with that. I think if you follow the weather glass you will find that the decisions on which the reports are based are not confined to any small locality.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: There is one thing, a very important matter left out of this bill. That is to make provision for giving the men their proportion of the seals to share where they wish. We have seen this year that there is competition in buying seals. Now, I think, that if the men had the right to sell the seals they would often get a much larger price. We saw that this year.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—They have got that right now, unless they sign an agreement to the contrary.

HON. MR. CROSBIE—I have never seen it in the articles of any ship.

MR. COAKER—I would move that this section be added. (Reads amendment). This has the effect of giving the men their share to dispose of as they wish.

MR. HIGGINS—I would ask for information how the share would be arrived at. I sympathize with the movement, but don't quite see how you are going to divide up the trip. Are you going to take it seal for seal or pound for pound, or how?

MR. COAKER—The best way would be to divide them up as they are landed. Even if the proportions were not exact they would be exact enough for all practical purposes, and an adjustment made when the cargo was finalized.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The trouble comes in trying to divide them. You get old seals and young seals. The owners are to get two thirds, and the men one third. Now it is going to be a hard problem to so divide these as to avoid trouble. The

young ones are the desirable ones, and there will be trouble as to who will take the others.

MR. COAKER—I think they could take them turn about. Land 200 for the owners and 100 for the men, and continue so doing until all the seals are discharged.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I believe this is a matter which will right itself. I think when the men come down to consider the additional expense and trouble, that they will not follow it up further. It is no harm to have the section there, however, and I think that whenever it is needed, it will right itself.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill with some amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Tuesday, April 25th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 25th, 1916.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. STONE—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bellevue, Trinity District, who ask that the present system of mail service at that place should be improved. The people at that place receive their mails twice a week only, as the third mail which leaves St. John's reaches as far as Chance Cove where it has to remain for two days until the Courier receives the mail from St. John's. The petitioners desire that the Government should give this petition every consideration, and that a more satisfactory arrangement should be arrived at between the two settlements. The petition is influentially and largely signed by James Murphy, Chairman of the Road Board, and many others of that place. I beg that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. STONE—I beg leave to present another petition from the inhabitants of Bellevue on the subject of a road. The petitioners ask that the sum of $500 be allocated for the purpose of repairing a road at that place. I would ask the Government to give this petition every consideration, and beg that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. TARGETT—I beg leave to support the prayer of this petition.

MR. TARGETT—I beg leave to present a petition from New Chelsea on the subject of a Magistrate for the South Side of Trinity Bay.

PROHIBITION BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill, "An Act respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors," was introduced and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a statement of all moneys sent by his Department to the District of Placentia and St. Mary's. for the years 1913, 1914, 1915, the names of the persons receiving the grants, and the amount of each allocation.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES—This is being prepared.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if any amounts were paid to persons in connection with the publication of the Casualty lists of the First Newfoundland Regiment; if so, to give names and amounts paid by each person.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— In reply to the hon. member, I beg to state that no payments have been made to persons in connection with this matter.

MR. STONE asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs if the present Sub-Collector at the Port of Placentia is engaged in any other work than that for which he is paid by the Department; if so, the nature of such work.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— No appointment has been made.

MR. STONE asked the Minister of Public Works for a statement showing what moneys were sent by his Department to the District of Placentia and St. Mary's during the years 1913, 1914 and 1915; the names to whom the money was sent, and the amount of money sent to each person.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS— The answer to this question is in course of preparation.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all moneys sent to Fogo District on Surplus Trust Account for the years 1910. 1911, 1912, 1913 and 1914; also copies of the returns of all moneys spent in connection with the building of the new public wharf at Fogo from 1912 to date.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS— The answer is in course of preparation. The last portion of this question has nothing whatever to do with my Department.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of all moneys sent to Fogo District on Surplus Trust Account for the years 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913 and 1914.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— This is being prepared.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs if Captain Marshall was allowed his salary when absent from the Colony in command of the S. S. Lady Sybil, and if the said Captain Marshall is now in the employ of the Customs, if permission was given the said Captain Marshall to assume command of the "Lady Sybil," and by whom granted.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— Captain Marshall was not allowed his salary. He is still in the employ of Customs. Permission was given him by Department.

MR. TARGETT asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if the Chief Censor has been paid anything for his services; and if so, what amount.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— In reply to the hon. member I may state that there has been no remuneration paid to the Censor.

VICTORIA ROAD BOARD ENQUIRY.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker: I beg to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance.

It is quite within the memory of this House that during the last session of the Legislature I gave notice of motion that I would move for the appointment of a Select Committee to consider certain alleged irregularities in the expenditure of public moneys at Victoria Village and vicinity as per letter of Authority dated May 16th, 1914, and July 22nd, 1913.

Also in the expenditure of Public Mones from Caybonear to New Perlican as per letters of Authority, dated May 6th, 1914, and May 21st, 1913.

Also in the expenditure of Public Moneys on account of Special Works in the District of Carbonear as per letter of Authority dated May 12th, 1913.

The Premier, Sir E. P. Morris, pointed out at the time that the Legislature would close within a week,

and the time was therefore inopportune for a Select Committee to make an investigation and report to the House during the Session, but if I would withdraw the motion that he, the Premier, would instruct the Auditor General to proceed to Carbonear and there enquire into the expenditures of public moneys. Accordingly I withdrew my motion and it did not appear on the order paper.

The Auditor General, Mr. Berteau, was therefore about to proceed to Carbonear shortly after the close of the Legislature of 1915, but it was learned that many of the men who could assist in giving evidence, etc., at the enquiry had left their homes for a summer's work at Sydney, Cape Breton, consequently the investigation was not held till the month of February of this year, when the men had returned to their homes for the winter.

The report of the investigation held by the Auditor-General together with the evidence taken have been laid on the table of the House, and upon my perusal of the same, in my opinion, I feel that I would be shirking my responsibility as a Representative of the people and unworthy of the respect and support of those who elected me to a seat in this Legislature if I should neglect to bring to the attention of this House and to the Public the result of that enquiry.

Therefore for the benefit of the members of this House who have not seen this report I purpose to read the report of the Auditor General, the affidavits and sworn statements of the various witnesses.

THE AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

26 February, 1916.

Sir,—

Agreeably with your request and in fulfillment of your promise to Mr. Halfyard, M.H.A., made during the last session of the Legislature that I should proceed to Carbonear and there enquire into the following expenditures of public moneys, viz:—

Expenditure by Edward J. Clarke on account of Local Roads in Victoria Village and vicinity thereof as per Letter of Authority, dated May 16th, 1914, allocating $200 for this service.

Expenditure by Edward J. Clarke on account of Local Roads in Victoria Village and vicinity thereof as per Letter of Authority dated July 22nd, 1913, allocating $114 for this service.

Expenditure by Edward J. Clarke on account of Main Road from Carbonear to New Perlican as per Letter of Authority dated May 16th, 1914, allocating $200 for this service.

Expenditure by Edward J. Clarke on account of Main Road from Carbonear to New Perlican as per Letter of Authority dated May 21st, 1913, allocating $300 for this service.

Expenditure by Edward J. Clarke on account of Special Works in the District of Carbonear on Special Work, viz: for the construction of a well at the Neck and roads in Victoria Village as per Letter of Authority dated May 12th, 1913, allocating $150 for this service.

I visited Carbonear in the early part of the present month and held the enquiry. The delay in holding the investigation was due to the absence, at Sydney, of nearly all the witnesses, who did not return until late in December or in January.

In connection with the enquiry I have the honour to report as follows, viz:—

There was no evidence adduced which would tend to show that the Chairman has been guilty of appropriating to his own benefit any of the public moneys entrusted to him.

There was, however, sufficient evidence to show that he was to some extent indirectly a party to what is, in my opinion, a grave misuse of pub-

lic moneys allocated for special purposes.

It is necessary that I should call attention to a case in which the Chairman, apparently, paid a labourer for one day's work which he, (the labourer,) says he did not perform. In his evidence Robert W. Clarke says:

"Mr. Clarke (the Chairman) paid me for one day's work I did not work for. Didn't tell me why he paid me the extra money. I hadn't time to work out the extra day's work as I was going to Sydney. I knew I was taking more money than I earned but made no objection."

This is the only case in the evidence given in which the Chairman gave an order for the payment of money for work which he had apparently apportioned but which had not been done. As the Chairman (who was present during whole examination) raised no objections to this statement, I am of opinion that he believed the witness had worked two days. The irregular method, if method it can be called, employed in accounting for the work, the absence of regular Inspector's payrolls, the intermittent inspection and the absence of the Chairman, all render the making of a mistake such as this possible and even probable. So far as the evidence shows, he did not contribute directly in giving out the work payment for which entailed the misuse of public funds. He was however a party to this irregularity in as much as he paid these men (in some instances, directly; in others, by orders on Mr. Nicholas Powell, who had made advances in goods to the men), he entered the men's name on the Public Works sheet and he signed the certificates required by these returns although he did not set the men to work and, apparently, did not know in many instances, if they had done the work for which he was paying. He does not appear to have fuly realized the responsibility attached to his position.

A consideration of the evidence given established clearly the following, viz:—

1. The Chairman and members of the Road Board have clearly failed to appreciate, in its fullest extent, the duty which they, holding a public trust, owe to the public. The Chairman paid over public moneys without personally acquainting himself as to whether the work for which payment was made ,was performed. He paid for work which he did not authorize. He certified returns for work done of which he knew nothing. This was due to some extent to much of the work having been authorized and performed during his absence. But he could have informed himself by applying to the men who had worked and, in any case his inspectors could have given him some information. These latter appear to have performed their duties in a very perfunctory manner.

2. Public moneys were misused. Allocations were made for a definite purpose, i.e. repair of main line and local roads and the construction of a well. To apply these moneys to the purpose of poor relief and repair and construction of roads partly, if not entirely, on private property, is clearly irregular. Evidence to the contrary notwithstanding, there exists in my mind no doubt that much work was done for private benefit.

3. The undue interference by unauthorized individuals in the expenditure of public moneys.

No person other than the Chairman of the Road Board had any authority to send anyone to work, to advance money on account of such work, or to direct payment therefor, whether completed or not. The plea that the Chairman was absent and that the difficulty of obtaining a competent person to accept that position was insuperable,

deserves some consideration. It seems to me, however, that failing the Chairman, some other member of the Board, or the Board acting in Commission, should have undertaken the work.

4. The construction of the well ("at the Neck") was ordered by the member for the District and the liability for payment therefor was incurred both before the Public Works Department had authorized the work and had made allocation for the service. The intervention of the member for the District in the matter was distinctly irregular. He could recommend the Public Works Department to authorize the construction of this well, but his recommendation should not have post-dated the completion of the work which he, personally, had authorized. His action is a clear breach of Rule 10 of the Orders-in-Council made under the provisions of the Audit Act. This rule, which has all the force of law, reads as follows: "Expenditure under Legislative votes may be authorized by the head of a Department on account of appropriations managed by his Department, so soon as he has been notified by the Treasury Board as to the votes assigned to his Department, but he shall not operate in any way on such appropriations until such notification has been transmitted to him, and a letter of credit has been issued in his favour. Nor shall he expend, during the first six months of any year, a sum greater than two-thirds of the appropriation under open vote. Provided further that no person or persons other than the Governor-in-Council or the head of a Department (so far as the votes managed by his Department are concerned), shall have the power to authorize the undertaking of any work or the incurring of any expenditure upon any appropriation accounts. Votes which are by statute placed under the control of the Governor-in-Council shall not be operated upon until specifically allocated by Order-in-Council and placed by such order under the management of a Departmental head."

Mr .Goodison, in his evidence, when asked what right he had to authorize the construction of this well, says: "I understand I have no legal right to authorize such public expenditure, I have followed the custom of the Country in this respect."

With regard to this reply, I have to say that no plea of expediency (as to assuming the direction of road matters in the absence of a Chairman) or of the impoverished condition of the people (as to authorizing advance on work to be done, to people in want) or of custom, should be allowed to hold good against the well recognized principle that those officials only who are responsible to the Legislature should be permitted to dispose of the public moneys entrusted to their care by act of that Body.

These then are the principal points brought out by the enquiry. There are others of minor importance which a desire to be as brief and concise as possible has led me to pass by. Those given are, however, sufficient to show (if my conclusions are correct) that the allocations which are the subject of this enquiry have not been managed with that strict regard to the requirements of the Public Service and of the Audit Acts which should govern the action of the persons responsible for their management.

In conclusion I desire to draw attention to the evidence and affidavit of the witness George Peckham.

In his affidavit (T.P.I.) he says he did not perform any work on a well or any road on the Neck for the $10.66 he is alleged to have received as per return sheet dated May 12th, 1913, for an allocation of $150.00. That he was not asked by any person to do any work whatsoever for the said sum. In

his evidence he also says he did no work for the $10.00 and admits he signed a receipt for this money. The receipt (J.R.G.F.) is as follows: "Received from Nicholas Powell the sum of Ten Dollars, Special Roads, to repair road near my house. Sgd. George Peckham. Victoria Village, April 21st, 1913."

It is quite clear that this man and others of the witnesses obtained money on the promise to do certain work which they did not do. They certainly should be made work out the value of the advances given them. I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

Sgd. F. C. BERTEAU.

Comptroller and Auditor General.
The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

SWORN AFFIDAVITS.

I, George Edward White, of Victoria Village, Newfoundland, Laborer, make oath and say as follows:

(1) That I received an order from Mr. J. R. Goodison upon Mr. N. Powell of Victoria Village for the sum of Two Dollars.

(2) That I received value for said order at Mr. Powell's store.

(3) That I never performed any labour for the sum of Two Dollars which appears opposite my name upon the Government Return Sheet, dated July 22nd, 1913, for an allocation of $114.00.

(4) And that I was never asked to perform any labour for said sum appearing opposite my name upon said Return Sheet.

Sworn by the said George Edward White at Victoria Village, on the 15th day of May, 1915, this affidavit having been first read over to the deponent who seemed perfectly to understand the same, and who made his mark thereto in my presence.

Before me, His
GEORGE X WHITE.
LEONARD ASH Mark.
Commissioner.

I, Archibald Newman of Victoria Village, Newfoundland, Fisherman, make oath and say as follows:—

(1) That I never entered into any contract for the sum of Two Dollars as alleged on the Government Return Sheet of Victoria Village, dated May 16th, 1914, for an allocation of $200.00.

(2) That I never performed any work whatsoever for said sum alleged to have been paid me according to the said Return Sheet.

(3) And that I did not sign my name, nor make my mark or order anybody to do so for me upon said Return Sheet.

Sworn by the said Archibald Newman at Victoria Village, on the 15th day of May, 1915, this affidavit having been first read over to the deponent, who seemed perfectly to understand the same, and who made his mark thereto in my presence.

Before me, His
ARCHIBALD X NEWMAN.
LEONARD ASH, Mark.
Commissioner.

I, George Peckham, of Victoria Village, Newfoundland, Fisherman, make oath and say as follows:—

(1) That I received from Mr. N. Powell at his store in the Spring of 1913 a sum of Ten Dollars at the instance of a telephone order from Mr. J. R. Goodison.

(2) That I did not perform any work on a well or any road on the Neck, as is alleged on the Government Return Sheet dated May 12, 1913, for an allocation of $150.00.

(3) That I did not sign my name, nor make my mark, nor authorize

any person to do so for me upon said Government Return Sheet.

(4) That I was not asked by any person to do any work whatsoever for the said sum given me by the said Mr. J. R. Goodison through said Mr. N. Powell.

Sworn by the said George Peckham at Victoria Village, on the 22nd day of May ,1915.

Before me,

Sgd. GEORGE PECKHAM.

LEONARD ASH, Commissioner.

EDWARD J. CLARKE (Sworn)—I went away sometime in the spring of 1913. I was working with the Carbonear Electric Company at the Poles while away, the method used was this: The men would apply to Mr. Goodison for work. He would put them to work, direct Mr. Powell to advance their payments and I would pay Mr. Powell for these advances when the money came.

Mr. Powell would pay them in either cash or goods. Mr. Goodison and Mr. Powell did the work between them whilst I was away. With regard to Arch. Newman, now in Sydney, I paid Mr. Nicholas Powell two dollars for him on May 16th, 1914. I also paid through Mr. Powell the men who worked on the roads under the instructions of Mr. Goodison. The note I gave George E. White to Mr. Powell was for two dollars and fifty cents. The usual warning that my evidence may be used against me in the event of further proceedings was given to me before I volunteered the above evidence.

EDWARD J. CLARK.

THEODORE PENNEY (Sworn).—I desire to put in the following affidavits relating to the pending enquiry.

Exhibit No. 1.—Affidavit of George Peckham, Victoria Village, dated 22nd May, 1915, sworn before Leonard Ash, Commissioner, marked T.P.I.

Exhibit No. 2.—Affidavit of Arch. Newman, Victoria Village, dated 15th May, 1915, sworn before Leonard Ash, Commissioner marked T. P. 2.

Exhibit No. 3.—Affidavit of Geo. Ed. White, Victoria Village, dated 15th May, 1915, sworn before Leonard Ash, Commissioner marked T. P. 3.

I received the above affidavits directly from the persons who made them; I was present when they were sworn to and signed.

THEODORE PENNY.

WM. THOS. PENNY (Sworn).—This man's name appears on the returns as Thomas Penney.—F.C.B.

Cannot read or write. I remember doing some work on the main line, Carbonear, New Perlican in the spring of 1913. Do not remember how many days. I cannot remember the exact times at which I did the work, because I am employed on the roads at irregular and uncertain intervals; a short time on each employment. I have earned as high as twenty dollars a year and as low as one dollar and a quarter. For the last three years, I would have earned about fifteen dollars for the whole time. Mr. Clarke always puts me to work since he has been Chairman and he always paid me. I never did any work that he didn't pay me for, nor get any money for which I did not work.

His

WM. THOS. X PENNEY.

Mark.

The above being read over and explained signed by Marksman in presence of

F .C. BRIEN.

EDWARD BURKE (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. In the spring of 1913, I cannot remember whether I worked. I can't remember any par-

ticular dates, but I worked off and on on the roads each year during the last three or four years, I would have earned about five dollars a year on an average. Mr. Clarke put me to work and Mr. Clarke paid me.

The above being read over and explained, signed by marksman in presence of,

F. C. BRIEN, His
Witness. EDWARD X BURKE.
Mark.

JOHN PYE (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. I remember doing two days work on the Carbonear, New Perlican Road in 1913 and I was paid two dollars fifty for it by Mr. Clarke. The following year on the same road I did one day's work for which I was paid by Mr. Clarke one dollar and twenty-five. In the month of March, 1914, I was paid six dollars by Mr. Nicholas Powell. Mr. Goodison by note delivered by me and my wife authorized the payment of that six dollars. Mr. Powell paid me in goods from his store. I built the bridge for which this $6 is payment in the fall of 1913, in the month of November. I was paid for it in March following. I went to Mr. Goodison told him the bridge was bad and he told me to go ahead and fix it. Nobody inspected the bridge upon completion to my knowledge. I found my own timber and nails and that six dollars was in payment for the labor and material. To my knowledge, Mr. Clarke knew nothing whatever of this matter. There is another John Pye, but I am the man who had to do with the six dollar payment referred to.

The above being read over and explained, signed by marksman in presence of,

F. C. BRIEN, His
Witness, JOHN X PYE.
Mark.

WILLIAM ASH (Sworn)—Cannot read or write of any account. Am a member of Victoria Village Road Board, have been since 1908. There was no regular summonsing of the Board, but when money was received we got together and discussed how best to spend it. I had nothing to do with the paying out of the money. I did not inspect all of the roads in 1913 to the best of my knowledge. I may have inspected the work done in the spring of 1914. When I was home and the men at work I used to inspect the work two and three times a day sometimes. But I was frequently away to the Power House and could not then inspect the roads. In other words, there was no regular continuous inspection of the roads by me while the men were working. I worked personally on the roads in 1914, don't remember how many days I worked, received five dollars for this personal work. I also worked in 1913, don't remember how many days nor do I remember exactly how much I got for it. If the amount given on statement "D" is for ten dollars, then that must be the amount I received as far as I can recollect. I signed every return (so far as I know) for work which I inspected during 1913 and 1914.

Did you satisfy yourself that every thing on the returns which you signed as Inspector and Member of the Road Board was correct before you signed them? I couldn't answer if everything on the returns were correct, but I satisfied myself that as far, as I know, the returns was correct and that good value had been received for the money expended. I had no suspicion that there was anything wrong with those returns and as far as I know there is nothing wrong with them and that I swear to.

The above having been read over

and explained, is signed by marksman in presence of,

F. C. BRIEN, His
Witness WILLIAM X ASH.
MARK

EDWARD CLARKE of ABEL (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. Was appointed a member Victoria Village Road Board some time in summer of 1914. I have inspected work since my appointment but never inspected road work before that appointment. I was never called upon to inspect work which was done before. I became a member of the Road Board since my appointment. I have signed returns but for what date this work was done I couldn't say, nor could I identify the return. I signed it without taking any special notice, I did not know what was on it as I couldn't read nor write.

The above having been read over and explained, is signed by marksman in presence of

F. C. BRIEN, His
EDWARD X CLARKE of ABEL.
Witness Mark

EPHRAIM PECKHAM (Sworn)—Cannot read and write. I worked one day by order Edward J. Clarke on the Carbonear, New Perlican Road in the spring of 1914. I was paid one dollar and a quarter for this work by Edward Clarke, I was also paid 10 dollars (ten dollars) but do not remember exactly when. I don't think it was in 1913. I did a certain amount of work on the road going up to my house. I applied to Mr. Goodison for money, he said I should have to do something for it and I considered the work I did represented the value of the money. I cannot say that it exactly did because there was no one there to inspect it. Mr. Nicholas Powell paid me the money, some in cash and some in goods. I took no order from Mr. Goodison to Mr. Powell for payment. I got paid before the work was done. I had nothing to do whatever with Mr. Clarke in this matter When I asked Mr. Goodison for the money, there were other people present, I do not know their business with him. I didn't hear him make any remark. He said something but I don't like to say because I am not sure.

The above being read over and explained, signed by marksman in presence of,

F. C. BRIEN, His
EPHRAIM X PECKHAM.
Witness Mark

WILLIS J. COLE (Sworn)—Can read and write. Can't remember if I got any work on the Main Line of road Carbonear, New Perlican, in the spring of 1914. On second thought, I think I did get some work and was paid for it. I do not remember how long or how much I got for it, but I think I got some work from Mr. Clarke.

I think it was in the spring of 1913 that I got a contract to do some work around my own house to the Salmon Cove Valley Road. Some of this work was outside my gate, and some inside. The amount of the contract was twenty dollars and I was paid twenty dollars in goods by Mr. Nicholas Powell. Mr. Goodison gave me the contract. I don't know if Mr. Goodison gave me an order on Mr. Powell or not, but I think I have some recollection of Mr. Goodison's telling Mr. Powell that I had this contract and to let me have something on account of it from time to time. I went to Mr. Goodison and asked him for the work, because I wanted the work done as an improvement to the place. I was a little in want but not extremely. I think I told Mr. Clarke that I had that contract but I am not sure. Mr. Clarke did not give me the contract. I am not aware if there was anyone else with Mr. Goodison when I asked him for that work.

Sgd. WILLIS J. COLE.

RICHARD PENNEY (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. In 1914 I fixed the road from the main road to my door. It was a contract job. I also dug a well which is included in this contract I was paid eight dollars by Mr. Clarke for this job. He gave me a note to Mr. Powell for some of it and cash for the rest. I got the money at different times. I was put to work by Mr. Clarke. That is all the money I got for road work that year. There are three Richard Penneys.

The above being read over and explained, signed by marksman in presence of

F. C. BRIEN, His
RICHARD X PENNEY.
Witness Mark

NICHOLAS CLARKE (Sworn)—Can read and write. Am not sure whether I worked on the main line of road Carbonear to New Perlican in the spring of 1914. Think I did and got paid for what I did. Sometime in the spring of either 1913 or 1914 I had a contract for work on the roads in the neighborhood of Victoria Village. Mr. Goodison made the contract with me for thirty dollars. It was for the land and for the digging of a public well. Didn't see anyone inspect the well when finished but I did it and did it faithfully. Mr. Clarke paid me the money. Did not take any instructions to Mr. Clarke to get the money. He took my word for it. He paid me in cash. With regard to the inspection, the inspector, Mr. Ash, gets his water from that well and he must therefore know how the work was done.

NICHOLAS CLARKE

GEORGE E. WHITE (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. I worked on Carbonear-New Perlican road two days in the spring of 1914. Was paid for same in cash by Mr. Ed. Clarke. To the best of my knowledge I did not do any work of any sort for the government in 1914 except the above. I was told, though to go to work but, not being able to go, James Cole took my place. Mr. Clarke gave me a note in 1914 to go to Mr. Powell. First of all I took a note from Mr. Powell to Mr. Clarke and it was then Mr. Clarke gave me a note to Mr. Powell for two dollars which I took up in goods. I went to Mr. Powell and asked him to let me have a gallon of molasses and a pound of tea and he asked me if I had tried to get work from Mr. Clarke on the roads. I said "No" and he (Mr. Powell) gave me the note to Mr. Clarke above mentioned. I never worked out that two dollars, nor was never sent to. I looked upon the money as relief. Mr. Clarke did not tell me that I would have to work out that two dollars when he gave me that note to Mr. Powell. I cleaned out what they call the Double Brook the previous winter. Then I went to Mr. Goodison and asked him if I could get paid for it, and he gave me a note to Mr. Powell, who paid me at that time either one dollar fifty or two dollars. This is not the same as the note Mr. Clarke gave me to Mr. Powell for which I did no work.

The above having been read over and explained, signed by marksman in presence of

F. C. BRIEN, His
GEORGE X WHITE.
Witness Mark

JOHN M. WHITE (Sworn)—Cannot read or write very well. I remember working one day on Peck's Brook fixing the bridge in 1913. Was paid one dollar and quarter by Mr. Clarke. I don't think I could have worked in 1914 on the roads, because I had my legs broken in the fall of 1913 at Sydney. I don't remember getting any money from Mr. Clarke in 1914. Just as I could walk after my accident I got some help from Mr. Goodison, the

member. He gave me a note to Mr. Powell for four dollars. He also gave my wife a note for six dollars. My wife and I took it up in eatables. I did no work then nor since for that ten dollars. I could not speak for my wife. I did not know what it was given me for. When I went to Mr. Goodison I asked him to help me as I wanted some relief. I did not know where the money came from and I have not been asked to do any work for it.

The above having been read over and explained, is signed by the marksman in the presence of,

F. C. BRIEN His
JOHN M. X WHITE.
Witness Mark

ROBERT COLE (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. Remember working on the Carbonear to New Perlican road in the spring of 1914. Don't remember how many days I worked. Mr. Clarke paid me for the work I did on the Old Man's Marsh. Don't know how much, but think it was about four dollars and one-half. I also worked the same year on the Local Roads of Victoria Village. I swear I only worked one day. I was paid one dollar and a quarter for that by Mr. Clarke. I also received four dollars for work I did in making a turn off to the road to my house and partly in my own yard. I was paid for this by Mr. Powell on an order from Mr. Goodison by telephone. I asked Mr. Goodison for help as I was in need of food, a drop of molasses and cash and I used the cash in buying oil and other things for the house in different places.

The above having been read over and explained, is signed by marksman in presence of

F. C. BRIEN, His
ROBERT X COLE.
Witness. Mark.

SAMUEL WAREHAM (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. I am Samuel Wareham, Sr., I worked at a well under Mr. Clarke's directions but I do not remember the date. I may have worked five or six days. I received fifteen dollars for work on the well. Some of the money was for work and some for the removal of a fence on my land which was used for the well. For work, land and removal of fence I got fifteen dollars. I was paid by Mr. Nicholas Powell. I did not get this money from Mr. Clarke.

I worked on the roads in Victoria Village in 1914. Do not know how long I worked or how much I was paid, but I worked and got money, I think it was thirteen, or fourteen or fifteen dollars. Mr. Clarke paid me this money. See statement "B." I do not remember working on the roads since them. I did not receive any money since then.

The above having been read over and explained, signed by marksman in presence of

F. C. BRIEN, His
SAMUEL X WAREHAM.
Witness Mark

MOSES VATERS (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. I remember working on a well at the Neck in the spring of 1913. I worked four days and earned five dollars, which was paid me by Nicholas Powell in goods. Some in goods and perhaps some in cash. I worked two days on the roads under Mr. Clarke for which he, personally paid me in cash. This payment had nothing to do with a note for $2 on Mr. Nicholas Powell drawn up by Mr. Goodison in favor of my wife. My wife told me it was to get something for her Xmas. I never did a stroke of work to pay for that and I wasn't asked to do so.

The above having been read over and explained, is signed by marksman in presence of,

F. C. BRIEN, His
MOSES X VATERS.
Witness. Mark.

RICHARD DEAN (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. I worked on the Victoria Village roads in the spring of 1914, as soon as the frost was out of the ground. Worked, I think, about two days and one-half. Think I was paid five dollars. Do not remember the rate per day. I wouldn't be sure I worked no longer because it was a job on my own road, which was a bye road passing by my house. I do not think I was paid more than I earned. I can safely say I did not get something for nothing. I often earned more in less time.

The above having been read over and explained, is signed by marksman in presence of,

F. C. BRIEN, His
RICHARD X DEAN.
Witness. Mark.

GEORGE PECKHAM (Sworn)—Can write. On May 16, 1914, I worked one day on Carbonear to New Perlican Road. My signature is on return sheet for $1.25. In May 1913 I did not work at the construction of a well at Victoria Village. If my name appears on the Return sheet marked "A" as having worked on the construction of a well at the Neck it is not correct. I received ten dollars which appears on said return sheet, but did no work. The ten dollars was not promised me for any thing particular, but I went and got it from Nicholas Powell. Mr. Goodison promised he would do something for me and it was on this promise I went to Mr. Goodison, who telephoned Powell to know if there was any money on hand. Mr. Goodison then told me to go to Nicholas Powell and get ten dollars. I did not see Mr. Clarke in this connection at all.

At the interview with Mr. Goodison, Mr. Goodison said: "Boys, if this was known on me, what would become of me." I received ten dollars without working for it. I signed a receipt for the money. This ten dollars I received was in either 1911 or 1912.

GEORGE PECKHAM.

LIONEL BALDWIN (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. I worked on Victoria Village Roads somewhere about May, 1914. Worked one day and was paid for that work one dollar and a quarter by Mr. Clarke. I think I was paid in cash. This is all the road work I did in 1914. (See Statement "B.") In addition to that I was paid for digging a ditch the sum of five dollars. I dug this ditch for my own advantage and for the benefit of the road, but I did it without any authority, and then I went to Mr. Powell and asked him if I could be paid for it. He paid me. I know Mr. Ash, the Inspector, told him afterwards that the work was satisfactory. I received payment in goods. Mr. Clarke did not pay me. Mr. Clarke was Chairman of Road Board at that time. People were in the habit of going to Mr. Goodison, so I heard, to get paid for work done, but I wouldn't go, so I went to Mr. Powell and asked him if I couldn't get paid for it and he told me "Yes" and paid me. This is all the work I did on roads.

The above having been read and explained, is signed by marksman in presence of

F. C. BRIEN,
His
Sgd. LIONEL X BALDWIN,
Mark.

HENRY SUTTON (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. I took a contract to do some work on roads in Victoria Village in the spring of 1914. Mr. Goodison made the contract with me through Mr. Powell. The amount of contract was twenty dollars (Statement "B.") I got contract early in spring and as soon as frost got out of ground began work. I was paid twenty dollars by Mr. Powell for this con-

tract. I wasn't paid in cash. I took it up in goods. Mr. Clarke had nothing to do with this contract. I had another contract, the year before, I think. I know I did not get two contracts in one year. The second contract was fifteen dollars (Statement "D.") Mr. Goodison also made this contract through Mr Powell. Mr. Powell paid me this contract in goods. No dealings with Mr. Clarke either in this contract. To my knowledge nobody inspected my work when performed. No complaints about it that I know of. I know Mr. Clarke was Chairman of Victoria Village Road Board. It didn't appear strange to me that he did not give me that contract in place of Mr. Goodison or Mr. Powell. I asked Mr. Goodison for these contracts. Thought it was no use going to Chairman because I knew I wouldn't get them. I never applied to the Chairman at all.

The above having been read and explained is signed by marksman in presence of

F. C. BRIEN,

His
Sgd. HENRY X SUTTON,
Mark.

ROBERT W. CLARKE, (Sworn)—Cannot read or write. I worked on the roads, but cannot remember the exact time. Ed. Clarke employed me, I cannot say how long I worked. I was paid for that work. I got about six dollars, I think. Mr. Clarke paid me in cash for my road work. He paid me one day's work I did not work for. Didn't tell me why he paid me the extra money. and I hadn't time to work out the extra day's work as I was going to Sydney. I knew I was taking more money than I earned, but I made no objection. I gave a receipt for the money I received. I signed my name on the note which I took to Mr. Powell for the day's work which I didn't do, but for which I was paid. Mr. Powell paid me in goods on the last mentioned note.

The above having been read over and explained, is signed by marksman in presence of

F. C. BRIEN,

His
Sgd. ROBERT W. X CLARKE.
Mark

ELIJAH SLADE (Sworn)—Can read and write. Yes, I worked at the construction of a well at the Neck in Victoria Village in 1913. I cannot say for sure how long I worked, it may be two days or there about. I cannot remember receiving any more than two dollars and fifty cents. I may have got three dollars and a quarter and cannot remember. I may have done a little more work on the roads but cannot remember. I was paid for all the work I did. I did not receive any money for alleged work which I did not do.

Sgd. ELIJAH SLADE.

SAMUEL WESTCOTT (Sworn)—Can read and write a little. I was a member of the Victoria Village Road Board in 1913 and 1914. I did not attend meeting of that Board. Never had anything to do with the giving of work on the roads. The Chairman always gave out the work, he generally let me know when it was being given out. I never worked on the roads whilst I was a member of the Board. I was foreman on the work. There was more than one foreman, but no particular one. I was not foreman on all the work done on the roads, as I usually go away about the 15th or 20th of May. As foreman I received $1.50 per day. I have received less than that per day but not in 1913 or 1914. On statement "C" I notice that I am down for $1.25 per day. The reason for that is the shortage in rate is made up in the hours stated in the time. I was always paid a "globe"

amount which was divided by $1.25, the result being the number of days shown on the sheet. Mr. Westcott shown the several returns under enquiry. His attention was drawn to his signature as marksman and explanation asked ,states that he gave authority to the Chairman to sign his name to all returns in his absence, I cannot of my own knowledge certify to the correctness of the returns under enquiry. I cannot say I ever saw any of these returns before.

The above having been read over and explained, is hereby signed by the marksman in presence of

F. C. BRIEN,

His

Sgd. SAMUEL X WESTCOTT,

Mark

ANNANIAS ANTLE (Sworn)—Cannot read nor write. I may have received one dollar from Mr. Powell for driving him to the "Neck well" in 1913. I do not remember receiving any money for road work in Victoria Village in the year 1914. I would not know if my boy received any. My boy's name is Leonard Antle. I do not remember having a contract to do any work in 1914. I did not receive any money for a contract that year as far as I can remember but I received fifteen dollars for digging a well that year. Mr. Powell paid me this money. I have no receipt of any kind for this amount. I gave value in labor for all the money I received from Mr. Powell.

The above having been read and explained, signed by marksman in presence of

F. C. BRIEN,

His

Sgd. ANNANIAS X ANTLE,

Mark.

NICHOLAS POWELL, (Sworn)—I am a Merchant and live in Victoria. I hold no position on the Victoria Road Board. Yes, I have acted as a sort of intermediary between Mr. Goodison and the Chairman of the Victoria Road Board in paying persons road money. I would pay in either cash or goods and would obtain repayment from Mr. Clarke. The same plan was sometimes used by Mr. Clarke. I have accepted road money in payment of accounts due me. I have put men to work on the roads. Sometimes I was asked by the Chairman to tell such a man to go to work; other times Mr. Goodison would phone or send me a note to put men to work on the roads. If Mr. Goodison sent me a note to pay a man who was going to work, I would pay him. But I never in these cases assumed responsibility for his doing so. I had no occasion to bill Mr. Clarke for these payments, as, when the Government money came along, he generally enquired as to the amount of indebtedness incurred by these advances on Government account, and I would give him the names and amounts. This list included the persons whom Mr. Goodison told me were to go to work on the roads. With regard to these last individuals I would ask them if they had worked. I paid a man called George Peckham $10; Mr. Goodison phoned me to do so; Mr. Clarke repaid me this $10. I did not send George Peckham to work, nor did I ask him if he had done the work, I simply paid him and he signed a receipt which reads like this: "Received from Nicholas Powell the sum of $10 for which I agree to repair my road." That was the sense of the receipt if not the exact words. The expression "my road" in the receipt meant repairs to a road leading from the main road to Peckham's house. The receipt was a guarantee that he would do the work. I don't remember the exact date of this. I think it was sometime in the Spring of 1913. The case of Peckham is a typical one. The other payments were made in much the same way. The practice of advancing money on account of the roads for

work done had prevailed for several years as between myself and the Chairman of the Road Board; but with regard to the member for the District, it has only extended over a period covering the last three or four years. I have never personally or jointly with Mr. Goodison, had complete charge of the roads in Victoria Village in the absence of Mr. Clarke. I have never authorized on my own responsibility the expenditure of road money during the years 1913 and 1914. I have told two or three men to go to work and that I would see the Chairman and get him to endorse my recommendation, and in these cases I did so. We were without a Chairman for three or four months after the death of Mr. Burke. During this time if the road wanted repairing, the men applied to Mr. Goodison. He would send or phone me to advance them money to pay for work, which it was understood between these men and Mr. Goodison they would perform. This has reference to some of the money that was expended on the sheets under investigation.

With regard to the Well at the Neck, some of the people on the Neck have to go 1 or 1¼ miles for water. At the time I promised to do my best to get them a well. I spoke to Mr. Goodison about the well. He said go ahead with it; he would get the money for me. I called a meeting of the Victoria people interested in this well for the purpose of selecting a site. A site was decided upon and I think the two foremen were appointed by the meeting. I put the work in charge of these foremen. I think their names were Samuel Wareham and Benjamin Deer. I did not want to have anything to do with the Road Board and upon receipt of $150 allocation from the Board of Works, I passed it over to Mr. Edward Clarke in accordance with instructions from that Department. The well was dug before the money came from the Public Works Department and I told anyone who wanted their money to come up and I would pay them. The money was paid in cash and goods; most of it in goods. When Mr. Clarke got the money he paid me. The $10 paid George Peckham was a balance left over from the well. There being no funds at the time to pay Peckham, and as the grant was special money, I thought it was just as well for Mr. Clarke to charge it to that grant.

Exhibit "A" passed to Mr. Powell.

The heading of this Exhibit which is the return on which George Peckham's payment was charged read as follows: "Expended by Ed. J. Clarke on account of Special Works in the District of Carbonear for Special Works for construction of well at the Neck and roads at Victoria Village, under letter of authority, dated 12th May, 1913, allocating $150 for this service". The word "roads" covers the $10 charged to this sheet on account of George Packham, because as I said in my evidence above, he was to use it for "repairs of a road leading from the Main Road to his own house."

Exhibit "A" passed to Mr. Powell.

Do you remember the amount of George E. White's note which he took to you from me?

The amount was two dollars and fifty.

Did I pay you two dollars for Arch. Newman?

Yes.

I hereby certify that the above is correct to the best of my knowledge.

Sgd. NICHOLAS POWELL.

JOHN R. GOODISON (Sworn—I am an Accountant. There was no Chairman of the Road Board at Victoria Village in the spring of 1913. About the end of May, 1913, I recommended Edward Clarke to be a member of that Board, and I presume he was elected Chairman. The former

Chairman had died about New Year. My being Member of House of Assembly for Carbonear would account for the recommendation. Owing to the continual movement of the inhabitants to and from the Sydneys and other places it is extremely difficult to secure a qualified Chairman, i.e.—a person who can read and write and be present continually during the whole year. I had considerable trouble to get a man who would fulfil these conditions. I tried to get the service of either Messrs. George or Nicholas Powell,—the former had been Chairman for many years—but both declined.

While Mr. Clarke, was absent from the Village, I had arranged for Mr. Nicholas Powell to perform, unofficially, his duties as Chairman. He had acted in the same way during the hiatus occurring between the death of the late Chairman, Mr. Burke, and the appointment of Mr. Clarke. I could not tell who set the men to work during this unofficial employment of Mr. Powell outside of some authorizations I made personally. In the very few instances in which I acted, I usually telephoned Mr. Powell a recommendation that such and such a man be given work. The understanding was that the payee would go to work and thus pay subsequently for such advance by working it out.

I know George Peckham. Sometime previous to May, 1913, he asked me for some work. He told me the road to which he had to get to his house was knee-deep in mud. It wanted repairing and filling in. I know from personal knowledge that the road was in a poor state. I do not think any part of this road is private, except maybe the inner part. It is open to and used by the public anyway. Geo. Peckham's brother was present when he asked for money for this road. I told them I would give $10 each, and telephoned Powell there and then the recommendation. I do not know whether George Peckham did the work, but his brother came to me subsequently and told me that he had done his own share, but had not been half paid for his work. I certainly did not make use of any expression at my interview with the Peckhams, which would lead them or anybody else to infer that I was doing what was not right. I positively swear that I did not say: "Boys, if this was known, what would become of me." I am positive that the money paid George Peckham was for some particular work, in fact the work I indicated above in my evidence, and in support thereof I put in Peckham's receipt to Powell marked Exhibit "J. R. G. F."

(Exhibit "J. R. G. 'F.'" shown witness. His attention drawn to endorsation.)

The endorsation is in the handwriting of Mr. Nicholas Powell.

At the close of the Peckham interview, I told them to fix up the road to suit themselves and then they would not have any cause to grumble about it afterwards. During our conversation just referred to, Mr. George Peckham mentioned a claim he had against the Government for clothes alleged by him to have been detained when he was put in the Smallpox Detention Hospital at St. John's a year or two previous when he was a sealer in the "Newfoundland." He claimed $25.00, but Dr. Campbell reported he was better supplied on leaving the Institution than when he came in, and the Colonial Secretary refused to recogize his claim. I may say, further, that later in the year I declined to advance him $10 to go to Sydney. This last summer he again approached me for a special grant alleging poor circumstances, but I again refused.

I have no recollection of a man called Sutton applying for road work in the spring of 1914, but it may be so. I have no distinct recollection of

Moses Vaters' wife getting a note from me to Mr. Powell in 1913. If I gave such an order it would be regarded as poor relief. The times were bad in the village in 1914 and were getting bad in 1913 owing to the curtailment of work in Bell Island and the Sydneys. Under these conditions it was necessary to help, not only them, but others in the Village to what really was Poor Relief.

With regard to the payment of $2.50 to Arch. Newman, I authorized the advance to him for a couple of days' work. This was a case of extreme destitution also. He told me his wife was very ill; nothing in the house to eat. children hungry. I saw the Relieving Officer at Carbonear, Mr. Noel, and got a little help from him. Then I authorized the advance for a couple of days' work. Whether he got it or not I can't say. I telephoned the order to Mr. Powell, and I have no doubt but he got the money.

I cannot recollect if I gave an order to Robt. Cole on Mr. Powell.

I authorized an order of $4 and $6 to Jno. M. White and his wife, respectively, on Mr. Powell. This man was in great distress at the time. His two legs were broken and was unable to work them. But I understood he would work it out during the summer months. I do not know if he did. I did not keep track of any of these men afterwards and the fact that they had not worked was not brought to my notice. Had such been done, we could easily have corrected it. I hear now, for the first time, that this work was not done.

Yes I made a $30 contract with Nicholas Clarke for work on the road and well. The whole thing was on private property, but the well was to be thrown open to the public and considered as public property. This had been done.

I cannot recollect giving an order for the employment of William J. Cole. If he swears it is so, very likely I did. I had so many applications, I cannot recall them.

Yes, in November, 1913, I sent a man called John Pye to the Chairman, who was then home, recommending his employment at the building of a bridge. I also recommended the payment, but this payment, to the best of my knowledge, was not asked for until some considerable time afterwards. I can't say when exactly. This was a public bridge.

Yes I authorized George Edward White to clear what is known as the Double Brook in the winter of 1913. Either George Edward or his father came to see about it. I am not sure whether they came to me after the work was done. If they did, I would telephone the Chairman, if he were home, or if not, to Mr. Powell to pay them if the work was done.

In all the orders given for work to the individuals indicated or any others concerned in this enquiry, the work was done on public property. I must qualify this statement. Lots of these roads connect the main roads with the houses of these people, but they are to all intents and purposes public roads in that they are not fenced. In no case have I ever given an order with the understanding or even the possibility that the work was to be done on private property, solely as private property.

Without a specific case being given, I am unable to say if I ever gave an order for the payment of any individual connected in any way with the present enquiry, for work done without official authority by that individual. I do not know of any at the present time. In the case of these orders, as far as I know, the work for them had never been touched when the applicants came to me.

As to the "modus operandi" of getting Special Grants for the Victoria Village Road Board. The Special

Grant is more or less subject to the Member's recommendation.

Yes, I obtained from the Public Works Department in 1913 $150 for the construction of a well at the Neck and roads in Victoria Village. I am not sure whether I applied for this allocation before the work was done or after. The chances are that I did not apply for the money until after the work was done, I would not like to say definitely as I cannot recollect. I authorized the construction of this well. I understand I have no legal right to authorize such public expenditures. I have followed the customs of the country in this respect.

Sgd. JOHN R. GOODISON.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have performed my duty in bringing this matter to the attention of the Government, and I trust that as we are supposed to be within a few days of the closing of the House that the Government will take up the matter immediately and dispose of it without any further delay.

There is a suspicion in the minds of certain people that some parties are guilty of grave irregularities in the spending of Public moneys. And this has been substantiated by the Auditor-General's Report, the affidavits and sworn statements I have read this evening.

I trust that an opportunity will be given for all interested to explain their actions and if guilty of any wrong they will have to suffer the consequences of their misuse of Public moneys.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker: I rise to support the motion for adjournment to enable this House to discuss the very serious and important matter submitted by the hon. member for Fogo. Dealing as it does with certain alleged misconduct on the part of the hon. member for Carbonear who holds the highest position this House can offer, with evidence that gives credence to the alleged irregularities, it certainly calls for some action on the part of this House to rid the suspicion that has gone abroad among the people that law makers can become law breakers and be upheld by this House in so doing.

What has the hon. member done? According to the Report of the Auditor-General he has committed a breach of Rule 10 of the Orders in Council made under the provisions of the Audit Act, which Rule has all the force of law. In other words, the hon. member gave orders for certain work to be done and did not get any authority from the Public Works Department. He took the law into his own hands; he usurped the powers of the Public Works Department, and of the Road Board who are the sole authorities in the matter to relieve certain pressing needs which obtained at Victoria Village. He admits his action was not proper but pleads that he followed the custom of the Country in this respect.

What does the Auditor-General say of this plea: "With regard to this I have to say that no plea of expediency (as to assuming the direction of road matters in the absence of a Chairman) or of the impoverished condition of the people (as to authorizing advance on work to be done to people in want) or of custom should be allowed to hold good against the well recognized principle that those officials only who are responsible to the Legislature should be permitted to dispose of the public money entrusted to their care by act of that body."

These are the words of the Auditor-General, and they should not be treated lightly by this House. In acting as he did, the hon. member did not improve matters so far as proper expenditure is concerned. According to the testimony read by the hon. member for Fogo, we find $10 given to a

man for the digging of a well he never dug. Two and five dollars to men for work they never performed and so on.

Now what are we going to do? What action should we take? We should show to the country that we are determined to jealously guard the interests of the people by the proper protection of their monys to the extent of having them properly expended; that we are going to uphold and respect the laws we have created, and if any wrong has been done, that justice will be meted out, whether it affects a member of the House or anyone outside of the House. I therefore second the motion for adjournment.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker: As this is a matter of such grave importance I think that it is in our interest as members of this House, who have charge of its dignity, to say what action we propose to take. The report of the Auditor General is one which reflects very seriously upon the conduct of a member of this House; and I think that it is only due to that member that he should have an opportunity of making such explanation as may be able to rid him of the serious effect it may have upon him as a member of this Assembly. Now, in listening to the report of the Auditor General I find that the member who represents the district of Carbonear in his evidence states that he knew what he was doing was not legal, but that he was doing something that was the custom of the country. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I who have had long connection with this Parliament, have never known any such custom to exist. There may be exceptional cases, but I know of no such custom. I know that as far as I personally was concerned that I have never felt that I was authorized to make an allocation of public moneys except through the Minister presiding over the Department through which I wanted to make the allocation. It is a matter of such serious import that this House should take it into consideration and deliberate over the evidence and affidavits as well as the report of the Auditor General.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: I would suggest that the Rt. Hon. the Leader of the Government move the House into Committee with a view to affording the member for Carbonear the opportunity of giving what explanation he deems fit in this matter. There can be no question of the gravity of the evidence or of the findings of the Auditor-General, the guardian of the expenditure of public money according to law. The charge is that a breach of the law has been committed. More than that, it was committed by a member of this House and a member who holds an exalted position in the House, and secondly that folks outside of the road board and outside of that member meddled with the administration of public works, and meddled in a most offensive way—importing into the spending of public money the truck system, that has been condemned by this House, because this money appears to have been given out in truck through an agent who was not an agent of the Road Board and had no authority to meddle with the expenditure of the money. It is due to the dignity of this House that the member accused should have an opportunity to put forward his case. Therefore I suggest the Leader of the Government, who is Leader of this House, afford that member an opportunity of explaining.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: I suggest that we go on with the regular business of the day, and come back, when that is finished, to this matter. Before we rise to-day I will deal with that.

The motion was deferred.

MARRIAGE FACILITY 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 Facilitate Marriages between British Subjects residents in Newfoundland and British Subjects Resident in the United Kingdom," without amendment.

LOCAL AFFAIRS 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 the Act 6 George V, Cap. 18, entitled 'An Act respecting the Administration of Local Affairs,'" without amendment.

SHIPBUILDING 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 the Act 8, Edward VII, Cap. 8, entitled 'An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding,'" without amendment.

EDUCATION 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 and Consolidate the Law relating to Education," with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: So that the House may know exactly what the effect of these amendments is I should like to point them out briefly. The first deals with section 6. That section treats of the functions and powers of the Board of Education in relation to suspension of grants to Boards which fail to send in their accounts. Then this clause was added to the original bill: "Unless the Governor in Council otherwise decides"; and the Legislative Council thinks these words might be stricken out, leaving it entirely to the Superintendents of Education to decline to make any further payments until regular accounts are furnished. At present if a conflict arises between the School Board and the proper superintendents as regards the sending in of accounts and other papers, there is an appeal to the Governor-in-Council. It is proposed now that the matter should be final as between these two until the account is sent in.

There is another small amendment to sub-section (x) in this same section, by which it is provided that a fatherless child shall be entitled to free education in any public school, except where the person undertaking the support is able to pay the fees without embarrassment. I see no serious objection in that.

The next amendment is to section 30, and deals with the Council of Higher Education. It was suggested when this Bill was before the House that it would be well to have the Government Analyst on that Council. It is composed of 31 members, embracing the different Superintendents of Education, their assistants and the Headmasters of the Colleges. The balance are appointed by the Government in Council. Now, it was proposed that the Government Analyst be ex officio a member, but the Legislative Council thinks this may be undesirable, inasmuch as he may not always know anything about the func-

tions of the Council. Of course as far as Mr. Davies is concerned an exception might be made in his case, inas much as he might be appointed an ordinary member. He would be a very desirable man, as he has already had considerable experience there.

The next is a proposal to increase the quorum from 7 to 11. The Legislative Council thought that in a body of 31 the quorum ought at least to be 11, as a guarantee that important business would have fullest consideration. I presume there is no objection to that.

The next amendment is in sub-section 1 of section 23. That is, as to the duties, powers and functions of the Council of Higher Education. Now it is proposed to add to this, "provided that on and after July 1st, 1916, in no case shall any candidate be allowed to sit for any examination under the age of 12 years." Evidently this is to settle the question of having children sitting too early for examinations. I do not fully support the idea of making this a part of the education Act, because if there is anything for which the Council does exist, it is to settle this matter. If the Council is not competent, and if its proper function is not this, I do not see what it is for. I think it is trespassing on their work, and believe that they are the authorities to settle a question like this. These are the only amendments. They are not serious or vital, and I think if desirable we may as well consider them.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: I do not think that the amendments are very objectionable. The last might be a matter of doubtful wisdom on the part of any Legislature. This I think ought to be in the power of the Council of Higher Education, as it is a professional matter exclusively. There it would be treated by men accustomed to it. I do not think it is at all necessary here. As a matter of fact I think there is no danger, or never was any danger of a case like this occurring, and I think a step like this is a meddlesome principle for the Legislature to adopt, as it is dealing with a matter which ought to be treated by the Council itself. If they cannot settle this they might as well be out of existence. The amendments were ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

SEALFISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to the Order of the Day, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting 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.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: Before making any remarks on the Budget, I would like to enquire why we have not yet,had, though we are practically at the end of the session, the Customs returns distributed. They are usually distributed before the Budget is delivered, and we cannot comment upon the Budget without having these before us. As we are now at the closing days of the session it would be only right to have these here at hand.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE—I can have them sent up immediately.

MR. LLOYD—That would do. It is very unfortunate being without them,

because they need considerable study. Now, Sir, in reference to the Resolutions now before the House, I do not purpose to make any extensive remarks, but wish to indicate certain lines of thought which came to me while the Minister was delivering his speech, and since. We are now dealing with certain resolutions, in so far as to extra means of raising revenue. That is proper business. But it turns out that that proper business is of a very trifling nature. The resolutions placed before the House do not call for much extended comment, in as much as they do not affect Ways and Means to any extent. For some weeks past we have been considering what are known as estimates; that is, properly, the expenditure of the different departments for the forthcoming year; and within a day or two we will be called on to pass a bill to appropriate funds to pay for this public service, and when that Act is passed, then the Auditor General will give to the different departments concerned authority to spend these sums of money. To-day we have a different mission. We were dealing then with the authority to spend public monies. To-day we are dealing with the manner of getting money which is to be so spent.

Now, I have said that this, our business to-day, is of a largely trifling character, in as much as we are not asked to make any changes as to the ways and means for raising moneys. Some considerable number of years past, I tnink about eighteen, probably about twenty years ago, the custom of raising money was different from what it is to-day. Then it was by annual bill. To-day the means of raising money is provided by permanent Act, so that the Minister had authority to raise money by duties, by the permanent Act; and did not need to come to this House year by year, but only when he wished to have a change made. The changes asked for here are small items, and there is therefore no need to deal with them at any length. There is some change in connection with hoop iron, and with reference to wireless telegraphy and other matters which do not make much difference to the pocket of the Finance Minister. Taking that matter down, it really comes to this: that the Finance Minister coming here is certain and satisfied that enough money can be obtained by the present taxation to pay our way. He is satisfied that the present rates and machinery are sufficient as far as he knows at present. All this brings us to the question, Why is this? The Minister himself reminded us that at the end of the last fiscal year, June 30th, we did not have anything like the fortunate position that we have to-day; and for this the country, the Government and the Finance Minister ought to be congratulated. We must commend the fact that the finances are much better than this time last year, and the fact that we are really in a good financial position. We are all pleased that we are able to pay our bills with the ways and means at the disposal of the Minister.

Last year, unfortunately, although the tariff was high we were not in this position. It will be remembered that there had been very large increases at the previous session. There had been large increases made in 1914, just after the commencement of the War. It was then found necessary by the Government, in view of the dislocation of the trade at that time, to further increase them. The members will also remember that in the month of March, before the war, finances were not in anything like the healthy condition that they are in to-day, and it was found necessary then to take the matter in hand and bring before the coun-

try large proposals for raising extra money. That was largely due to the fact that the year before, in the winter of 1913, in the early part of the year, Budget proposals had been made which took off the means of raising money to the extent, if I remember correctly, of $380,000 per year.

Now that proved financially unfortunate, for the following year the Finance Minister had to come in here with very stringent proposals, for the purpose of making up six hundred and fifty thousand dollars to meet the occasion.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —That was not to meet the shortage, the shortage was only two hundred thousand.

MR. LLOYD—The fact remains. The proposals of the Minister meant the lessening of the revenue to somewhere in the neighbourhood of three hundred and eighty thousand dollars a year. I repeat that in the session of 1914 the Finance Minister had to devise ways and means to meet the proposals he had to cover this shortage which meant a lessening of the revenue to the extent of three hundred and eighty thousand dollars. The following year he came in and asked for an increase of six hundred and fifty thousand. In spite of all the turning and twisting about of this fact which I leave to my hon. friend opposite I say that was a tremendous increase in ways and means of getting money out of the people. That was not all. The Minister expected, very properly so, that by the end of the next fiscal year, June 30th, of last year, that the finances of this Colony would be in a flourishing condition. So much so, that under the resolutions to which I am alluding, which can be found in the Finance Act of that year, he gave power to himself and the Governor in Council to provide a means of lessening the taxation should the Government coffers be overflowing, but unfortunately his anticipations did not turn out correct. There was an extraordinary dislocation of trade. The finances of the commercial world were crippled Exchange was upset, and everything was at a standstill, and Newfoundland suffered in consequence. So that instead of the Minister being able to take off anything in the way of a sur-tax, he was obliged to come in here in September and ask this House for more ways and means of raising extra money. These ways and means are still in the hands of the Minister. At the end of that year, June 30th, the financial position was bad. To quote the Minister, the expenditure exceeded the revenue by something like three quarters of a million dollars which he had in lieu of the anticipated surplus. There was no means of lessening the sur-tax, because the Minister found himself so much out. I am not blaming the Minister or the Government altogether, because this was due largely and mainly, though not altogether, to the war. The Minister came in here last year, and asked for additional ways and means, and it is with these additional ways and means that he has been financing the current year. He has, therefore, had the advantage in meeting the expenditure of three great increases in the means of taxation; the additional ways and means of the early 1914 session, of the September 1914 session, of the session of 1915, which ways and means have proved sufficient to meet the current expenditures to-day. The Minister is, I think, justified in his anticipation, that by the end of June 30th, he will be able to show a clean sheet. I sincerely hope he will. We must remember that this has been brought about by increase in machinery of taxation. During the first part of the war it was an actual fact that the stocks in trade of the business of the

country was very largely exhausted, and as far as has been possible the stores have had to be restocked during the present year, and he has had the advantage of the re-stocking of what was an extraordinary depletion. The re-stocking has been under the circumstances most favourable to the exchequer, but unfavourable to the pockets of the consumers, because it has been a notorious fact that particularly in the way of fabrics there has been a large increase in the invoice cost of these goods, and our system of taxation is such that when the unfortunate consumer has to pay twice as much to the manufacturer on the invoice of his goods, he has also to pay twice as much in taxes. That is due to the system of ad valorem taxation. The revenue has increased during the past year, not only from this increased ways and means of taxation, but also from increase of the invoiced cost of goods brought in from abroad, and the increase on the ad valorum duties. The people have been fortuately able to meet these increased duties. The Minister stated in his speech that he had anticipated the same response in this coming year. I suppose this is likely, as there is no hope while the war lasts that the invoice price of goods will fall, and there is every possibility of the revenue being much the same. I do not propose to criticize the figures that the Minister has given, in his anticipations in connection with the loss of liquor duties. Suffice it to say that he estimates that when things have righted themselves, the purchasing power of the people will be greater and that only a temporary loss will be sustained. For the purpose of my argument, I accept his estimate of a net annual loss of $230,000. If that is so, next year we will have to figure on an absolute loss of say half of that, $115,000.00. Now, as a Prohibition Act will bring, I understand, the importation of intoxicants to a close at the end of the year there must be six months of the year to come in which no revenue will be derived from the importation of liquor. Even if there is an immediate recovery in other ways, as the Minister anticipates during that six months, there will be a loss of $115,000. I am not absolutely convinced that the hon. member's figures are at all reliable. I have no doubt that he is satisfied with them himself and I am prepared to take his figures and take the net loss to the forthcoming year on the revenue at $115,000. Now the Minister tells us that he anticipates the death duties will bring another hundred thousand dollars. The Minister does not disclose what his anticipations were for getting at this sum. I do not know how he arrived at it. Probably he has some sound reason for it. I noticed that the Auditor General stated that the first year the death duties were $9,000, and for the current year $8,000, but I assume that having two big estates before the Minister which he anticipates will not give death duties until next year, and therefore not taking them into account on the current year's expenditure, and these two estates being exceedingly large he has good reasons for assuming that by the death of two big commercial men that took place some twelve months ago he will have $100,000 to his credit next year. So far so good. He now says that he anticipates a further $150,000 from the export of pit props between July 1st next and December 31st when, if my memory serves me right, the export of pit props ceases. So far as I can learn from enquiry, I am informed that the Minister's estimate is conservative and he has not exaggerated what is likely to happen. There is a likelihood of receiving between July

1st and December 31st. some $150,000 from the export of these pit props. Now then, taking away the $115,000 that he anticipates losing on account of the non-importation of alcoholic liquors after January 1st. and add to his estimate of pit props revenue the return from death duties, the Minister should have to his credit on that showing—and that is his own showing —some $4,271,000. He told us when we were going through ways and means that his expenditure would be $4,165,000 and therefore the Minister is calculating, although he did not tell us so, on a surplus of $100,000 next year. That is on June 30th, 1917.

Well now if that is so it is remarkable that we have these resolutions on the table as they are if the Minister can figure on a hundred thousand dollar surplus—and I have taken nothing but his own figures—why should we have such feeble resolutions? I would further draw your attention Sir, to a source of revenue that has not been tapped and which it is not proposed to tap in these resolutions. The matter has been dealt with outside this House and has been dealt with in this House. It was dealt with by one of the members for Burin in his open remarks at the commencement of this session. Why have not war profits been taxed as they have been in the British Isles? Why have war profits not been taxed as they have been taxed from the commencement of the war in Canada? I may say, "Echo answers why?" It is a notorious fact that there is no clearer example of war profits than has taken place within our own knowledge in our own country during the past six months or so when extraordinary profits have been made by taking from the trade of this Colony steamers that were in use here and selling them to the Russian Government—clearly a war profit—and an extraordinarily big war profit at that, and yet the Minister ignores them and at the same time keeps on this extraordinary three-fold system of extorting from the people the taxation that was introduced in the sessions of March 1914, September 1914 and the early part of last year. That is where I differ from the Minister and where I differ from his colleagues that he should ignore such an extraordinary responsive means of raising revenue and not take the opportunity to relieve the country at large of this extraordinary taxation that has been imposed on it. Sir, there has been extraordinary taxation throughout the whole British Dominions but that is not sufficient justification for us. We are trying to do our part but we are not called upon on account of the war to bear an extraordinary financial burden. We are not attempting to do what Australia and Canada are doing. What we are doing is merely fitting out our soldiers with a suit of clothes and boots and paying their wages. The other big colonies are bearing not only that but the total cost of the warfare in which their own troops are concerned. They have to fit out their soldiers with rifles, guns, munitions, transports, medical corps and everything connected with them is being borne by the Colony sending them. We are not called upon to bear that burden. That is taken off from us by the British Government and therefore there is no need for the extraordinary taxation to be imposed here that has been imposed elsewhere and I hoped to see the Minister when introducing this Budget take the opportunity of relieving taxation when he had that opportunity. Now, Sir, I pointed out when I began my remarks that they would be brief. What I have said I think I have tried to make clear and it represents the attitude of this side of the House.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, just one or two words in reply to the Leader of the Opposition. I have listened to that gentleman and I think the Government is to be congratulated ,according to his statements this afternoon, on the financial statement brought into this House by me a few days ago. In fact, he has not made any exception to any part of that financial statement. He stated, in a sense, that his remarks were to be very flattering.

MR. LLOYD.—I did not. I stated your resolutions were trifling.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—And that your remarks would be the same.

MR. LLOYD.—Surely my remarks were intended to cover what I intended to say and when I disclaim any such intention it ought to be sufficient for the hon. member .

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Certainly. He said he is satisfied to hear that we were not increasing taxation the coming year. Well, our position was simply this, that going back the past twelve or eighteen months since the outbreak of the war and viewing the conditions since the war, conditions, I may say, that nobody in this country could foresee came up during that period. Take eighteen months ago when we met in this House for the war session. Nobody then could foresee what the war would mean to this Colony. We were told in this House about deficits that would arise before we next met in this House and we were told that from people supposed to know in the House, leaders in the House. Well now, what has been the result? The result was that their calculations were altogether astray but when those calculations were handed out by these members of the House at that time I was inclined to believe myself that they were right. I quote this to show how little we knew what was going to happen in the past eighteen months since the outbreak of the war. Now that is one principal reason why I did not come down here to ask more duty from the Colony because we may be in a position twelve months from now or nine months from now to come into this House and say that the duties at present are sufficient to square our bills. It is enough for us to go over the ground carefully and not put any more taxation on than is absolutely necessary. The hon. gentleman stated that two years ago or eighteen months ago we had put on duties to cover $600,000 but the shortage two years ago was only $200,000 as stated by the Premier in reply to the hon gentleman this afternoon.

When the war started, eighteen months ago, and for a few months before, there was trade depression not alone in Newfoundland and Canada but in the United States and the Old Country It was felt everywhere, and after the outbreak of the war, when we put on taxation, we were up against this position: That the merchants, the business men of the country, decided to stop the importation of all goods except food-stuffs. For the nine months of the war food-stuffs were practically the only goods imported into this Colony by the business people. Blue ruin was painted throughout the land—not from this House but from the Opposition Press of the country. But what happened? Within the past twelve months we find that the fishermen of Newfoundland have placed to their credit in the various savings banks of the Island $1,000,000; and it must be remembered that that amount does not cover all their profit earnings, because there is an enormous amount of money held in the private homes of the fishermen throughout the Island. Well, after nine months of the war, after the peo-

ple had got renewed confidence, they began to spend their money, and to-day we are in the position of not being able to get sufficient tonnage to bring the amount of goods ordered by our business people quickly enough to supply the demand. When I stated that we should go carefully, that was the right and proper course for us to take, but now we find that our financial position is reversed and that our increased revenue for the last year, according to the receipts for nine months and the Auditor General's estimate for the balance of the fiscal year, will turn us over $1,000,000. Within the past few weeks the statement was made in this House that the revenue of this Colony—the amount of taxes placed on the people of this country to date—would turn in, owing to the increased prosperity, within the next eighteen months, over $5,000,000. That statement was made from the other side of the House. Well, I am not prepared to take as bright an outlook as that of the revenue, but I am prepared to accept a proportionate part of that, and that proportionate part I am prepared to add to the Estimate placed before the House within the last few days.

We were asked this afternoon why we did not tax war profits. My answer is that, directly I do not know of any war profits in this country. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon that several steamers were sold within the last year for war purposes, and that enormous profits were made on the sale of these steamers. Now, let us take the Act passed in Canada a few days ago for the taxation of war profits and apply it to these ships, and what do we find? These ships have been employed in the commercial business of this country for the past ten years, and is the Leader of the Opposition prepared to state that during that time they have been making profits?

MR. LLOYD.—I am not dealing with that.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—You mentioned it this afternoon. You referred to the ships that were sold by the trade a few weeks ago.

MR. LLOYD.—Yes.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Well, that is what I am talking about. These ships have been engaged in the trade of this Colony for the past ten or twelve years, and is the Leader of the Opposition in a position to state to-day that these ships have paid their bills year after year?

MR. LLOYD.—I don't want to make it.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—You have thrown out to the country the statement that these ships were sold at an enormous profit. How can you make that statement without knowing the facts?

MR. LLOYD—It is up to you to enquire and find out.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I want to go slowly. It is all very well to come down here and make a broad statement to the country through the reporter's box, and have people say: Mr. So-and-So made such a statement in the House, and if that suggestion were carried out the country would be able to collect such an amount of money. Well,now, I ask you to go into the facts before you make any statement and find out if these ships have been sold at an enormous profit. Have these ships in the past ten years been making profits? Suppose you find that each and every one of those ships has had a deficit in their accounts at the end of each year for a number of years past? They appear to have been sold at enormous profits on the face of it,

but if the accounts were balanced—as would be done if an Act were brought into force similar to the one passed in Canada—we might not be able to collect a dollar; the owners might be able to show us that not over 10 per cent. was obtained on the sale of these snips. Now, I am not saying that that is correct, but I do say that before the Hon. Leader of the Opposition makes any such statement as he has made this afternoon, he should make sure of the facts; he ought to take into consideration that during the last ten years these ships might have dropped hundreds and hundreds of dollars, and that while they appear to have been sold at a profit of 100 per cent., still we as a Government might not be in a position to go down and collect a war tax. That is the position. It is very easy to make a statement.

MR. LLOYD—It is easier to carry it out.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Not as easy as to make it. The hon. gentleman contradicted himself this afternoon in two arguments, in as much as he said that we were increasing the duties on ad valorem goods coming into this country. I admit that. We are collecting more today on ad valorem articles than we were a year ago or eighteen months ago, but on the other hand, if we are doing that are we not collecting a war tax, because that is the cause of the increase?

MR. LLOYD—Why do you exempt these men, then?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I am not. The answer to that is that we are in a position to pay our bills today. If we are not in a position to pay our bills at the end of January we can come in and collect these profits, just as they are today in Canada. That is the answer.

MR. LLOYD—It will be too late when the horse is sold.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is nonsense. The horse is as much sold now as it will be a year from now. They are collecting in Canada for two years back. There are one or two other items, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman referred to. The first is the estimate of $150,000 for pit props for the coming year. Well, we know that at the present moment there are over 200,000 cords of pit props cut in the Colony. We also know that not 50,000 cords of that wood will be taken out of the Colony before the 30th June, and we assume that the whole 200,000 cords will be exported before the 30th June, 1917.

MR. LLOYD—December 31st?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—No.

MR. LLOYD—That was my impression I may be wrong, but I think you had better look it up. I was looking at it this morning.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I have got further information that may not be known to the hon. member at the present time. Then, isn't it reasonable to estimate that all the pit props cut in Newfoundland today will be exported? Do you think they are going to be left on the banks?

MR. LLOYD—I understood your estimate was conservative.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—You question the $150,000?

MR. LLOYD—Surely the hon. member knows what a conservative estimate is. I will explain it: It means well within the mark.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I want you to remember what will probably happen within the next twelve months. Do you think that the men who have been cutting pit props during the last twelve months are going to sit down during the next twelve and not cut any? I

wil' tell you now that another 100,000 cords will be cut, and if they do the same work as this year, 200,000 cords will be cut. Now, add that 200,000 that may be cut next year to the 150,000 that we won't export before the 30th June—what about that for an estimate? Isn't that a conservative estimate?

MR. LLOYD—Certainly not. The Hon. Minister doesn't know what "conservative" means.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Possibly. But you were a schoolmaster and may be able to tell me.

MR. LLOYD—So was the Premier of Australia, and so was the Premier of Newfoundland.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Now for the $100,000 estimate on Estate Duties. Up to the present time we have not received more than nine or ten thousand dollars from this source.

MR. LLOYD—Eight thousand is your estimate up to the 30th of June. Nothing up to March 31st.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is correct. But the reason why we are in that position is known to the House, and to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. For the past few months cases have been pending in Court in reference to one or two large estates, and it is only a few days since the decision of the Court was handed down.

Now we come to the $115,000 he mentions. My answer to that is that we will not be short of any duties up to the end of December next, up to 1917. Then for the coming six months we are in this position: if we find that it is absolutely necessary for us to come in here and put on more duties, and that we are going behind or going ahead, we can come in here in January next, open this House, and adjust the revenue of the Colony for the next six months.

MR. LLOYD—How can you find that out in January?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—When?

MR. LLOYD—In January—that is not the time to find it out.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—After January liquor is locked out. Can we not count our cash and find out where we are?—we have to meet shipments—but shipments are closed off at that date. We will know on the 31st day of December where we stand as far as the liquor is concerned, because after that date importation will cease; and if we are behind then it is easy for us to come in and open the House and adjust the revenue for the next six months. We do not need an estimate. We are up against the real thing because we will know what we have collected on liquor and what we will need for the next six months—at the 31st day of December next. Cannot we come in and adjust the revenue so as to give us enough money up to the 30th June? That is my argument. I do not know that there are any other statements made by the hon. gentlemen that I have not explained.

MR CLIFT—Mr. Chairman: Having followed the Leader of the Opposition in his observations upon the Budget Speech and also the reply of the Minister, I fail to see in what respect the Minister has answered the arguments of the Leader of the Opposition. Dr. Lloyd in speaking of the sources of revenue which might have been availed of, referred to the taxation upon war profits that were realized on certain ships that were sold, and suggested that those might be a means by which the Minister could have increased his revenue rather than continue to impose taxation upon necessary articles of consumption.

The Minister has not to my mind at all answered the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition; but he begins his observations by congratulating himself upon the fact that the Leader of the Opposition had not any fault whatever to find in his Budget Speech. Well, Sir, so far as the figures of the Speech are concerned, it is unfortunately too true that a good many of them are correct—unfortunately too true that they are correct—and that we have such a large expenditure of public money to vote in this committee. We have to vote to-day say $4,000,000—a larger expenditure than was ever voted in one year's public service in this House of Assembly before. I do not think there is anything in that upon which the Minister can be congratulated. If you have to make that large expenditure of $4,100,000 then you have on the other hand to impose taxation to cover it; and it does not come well from the Minister to boast about his Budget. It would have been better had he been able to come down to this House with reduced estimates and give us a cheaper public service and a consequent reduction in our public expenditure. I do not think, Sir, he is to be congratulated at all upon his Budget Speech. He begins his observations by saying—having spoken of previous conditions existing in the country—(quotes from Speech). Now, Sir, how has the pendulum swung back?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—From a deficit.

MR. CLIFT—What does the Minister mean by a swinging back of the pendulum? Does he mean that we are in a better state of prosperity to-day as a Colony than we were ever before? Does he mean that we have got back to a state of revenue and expenditure which is normal? If by that expression he means that we have got back to normal conditions, then I will agree with him to some extent that the pendulum has swung back,and that we are in a state in which we would desire to be as far as our finances are concerned. But is that a fact? What has made this pendulum swing back? It was the imposition of extraordinary taxation that was imposed in this Legislature in the war session of 1914, and in the sessions which have been held since then—the imposition of extraordinary taxation imposed to meet certain conditions; and when these conditions have passed away, and when the Minister will be able to get back to normal conditions, when the Minister will be able to reduce this extraordinary taxation that has been imposed then, Sir, and not till then, will he be able to come in here and say with truth that the "pendulum has swung back." That is my interpretation of the swinging back of the pendulum; and he cannot congratulate himself upon a rosy state of affairs when he has to collect his duties in the manner in which they are being collected at the present time. Extraordinary duties are now levied upon the people for a particular purpose and through a condition of affairs which is unusual, but not until, as I said before, we get back to normal state of taxation and then be able to meet our expenditure, can it be truthfully said that the pendulum as he calls it. has swung back. Now, I did not intend, Mr. Chairman, to make any observation, because I do not know there is very much to be said but I do want to say to the Minister that it is very pleasing, very pleasing indeed, to know that he has come down with a budget, I think for the first time, in which he has not made any reference whatever to his predecessors in office.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I did. I mentioned about that $170,000.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—A sore point.

MR. CLIFT—Did you? Well, I am very glad you did not forget it.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—You were evidently expecting it.

MR. CLIFT—I was expecting it, because it was there every year, and I was quite disappointed to find that it was not there this year. Now, Sir, you would think from the way the Minister has referred to the little deficit that was left behind in the Bond administration that we were responsible for and had committed one of the greatest crimes in the calendar of the administration of public affairs.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Oh no.

MR. CLIFT—This over-expenditure of public money which they had to cover by means of a loan bill was terrible. The Bond administration went out and left nearly $200,000 of a debt behind them; and the Minister had to come in here with a loan bill to cover it. Well now, Mr. Chairman, is not that a remarkable state of affairs? Nearly every year, himself, since then, in fact every year since then, the Minister has overexpended his estimates. He has overexpended his estimates during the last seven or eight years by something in excess of a million and a half dollars. Every year he comes in here with his estimates, asks for a certain sum of money, says that is enough to carry him through the year, and notwithstanding his estimates he comes in with a supplemental supply every year; and these supplemental supplies during the time that he has been in office have amounted in all to a sum of over a million and a half dollars. Now if the Minister would tell us that he is going to do something to keep down expenditure and assure us that he will not be coming in here next year with supplemental supply, then he might be telling us something upon which we would be able to congratulate him and congratulate him readily when at the end of that time he had been able to carry out what he said. But never once in all his estimates has the Minister ever been within his amounts.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I have very little fault to find with the criticism of the hon. member who has just sat down. There are, however, one or two statements he has made which I would like to set right. He said that I came down here boasting in connection with my Budget Speech. I do not think I boasted about it. I merely pointed out that it was not a large amount, and I congratulated the House upon this fact. We have not as yet been brought face to face with the crisis so harped upon by the hon. member, but when the time arrives, I think this Government, if it is in power, will grapple with that situation in the same able and competent manner in which it has overcome so many difficulties in the past. I said the pendulum has swung back. We are all aware of the depression in the financial world that reigned throughout America and the United Kingdom. It was that that affected the pendulum. The same thing happened in Canada as here. No fault can be found with the Government. The prices were low, and the markets bad. We are only the machinery of the instruments. When we were faced with difficult times, we were told in this House that one-fifth of the fishermen would be paupers in a year, and that they would be put on the pauper's list. We have heard all about the blue ruin that stared us in the face, but what actually happened was that less than twenty thousand dollars of pauper relief was paid by this Colony after twelve months

before the pendulum swung back. When war broke out Bell Island closed down, and two thousand men had to go elsewhere to seek employment On the West Coast a thousand men were put out of employment. Everybody was prepared for dark days, but over eight months have elapsed and with renewed confidence we see that the pendulum has swung the other way and we have collected over a million dollars. Now it has swung the right way. I am told that I am always referring to the deficit of the Bond Government, but I objected to this deficit because I could not see that one dollar in the way of improvements providing comforts for the fishermen of the Colony had ever been spent. Bond's government collected the money, spent it, and made no effort to better the condition of the people throughout the Island. How many lighthouses and fog alarms do we owe to that administration. How many miles of railroad do we owe to them? What was done for the people for the eight years Bond was in? When we came in we faced a deficit of $170,000. and the next year we had a surplus of $420,000. Yet, we were told that if Morris became Premier of the country it meant blue ruin. I defy any member to say that we have not done more for the fishermen than any other government, and no one knows this better than the Hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. CLIFT—Every year if I mistake not, the Minister of Finance and Customs has had to ask for supplemental supply, and this Mr. Speaker is the crime that was committed by his predecessors. This wonderful deficit has been magnified, and dilated upon, and the Minister has repeated it so continuously that he believes now that some crime of a terrible nature was committed by his predecessors. I was afraid he had omitted this in his Budget Speech. I am glad to see he has not forgotten it. One of these days somebody will be able to remind him of the many little supplementary supply bills he has brought in, and remind him that he has been short so much every year for the last six or seven years to such an extent that the aggregate shortages amount to one and a half million dollars. I think the Minister has very little to congratulate himself upon in this Budget Speech. As he has tabled it so it will go through, and we will have to grin and bear it. It is only natural to expect during the present war conditions that there must of necessity be extra burdens placed upon us. This country has to congratulate itself upon the fact that up to the present we have had so few calls made upon us to respond financially to the requirements of the Empire,but one of these days we may be sure we shall be called upon to contribute to the burdens we shall of necessity have to bear because of the war, and it behoves us now to get ready for that day. We have not yet felt the war in this country, but that time is coming when we may expect to participate in the distress which inevitably follows in the train of war. This war has been raging twenty months, and some 3000 or 4000 of our men are engaged in it. It is our duty to provide for them and their dependents It is a terrible thing to think that not one effort in the way of getting ready to meet this emergency has yet been made. We have been spending money as if times were normal. Our estimates are increasing every year instead of decreasing, yet the Finance Minister comes down here and tells us that the "pendulum has swung back." I cannot agree with him.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—The speech made by the learned leader of the Opposition states nothing,

except that we should have made provision in connection with tax on profits made on the sale of steamers by certain firms in this Colony. That was the gravest charge he had to make. Beyond that he had nothing to say. There was no other criticism.

MR. CLIFT—If you want criticism we can give you all you want.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—I am not prepared to admit all you say against the Government, I can assure you, without at least trying to answer you, effectively.

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.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up, entitled respectively: "An Act to Amend the Law relating to the Herring Fishery," and "An Act Respecting Companies, Payment of Whose Capital Stock, or of Interest thereon is guaranteed by the Government," without amendment.

TRAWLING 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 for the Protection of Persons Engaged in Trawl Fishing," with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to intrduce a Bill to Regulate the censorship of moving pictures.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Thursday ask leave to 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 to-morrow, Wednesday, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 26th, 1916.

The House met at three 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 Little River and other parts of the Codroy Valley, asking that this House will enact a law or have the Game and Inland Fishery Board enforce a rule, making the employment of a regularly licensed guide obligatory upon the many visiting sportsmen who frequent the rivers of that section. These sportsmen have not all had experience in fishing salmon rivers and are unacquainted with the unwritten etiquette that every salmon fishing sportsman knows to be essential to the full enjoyment thereof. They rush along the rivers thrashing all the pools, indiscriminately, in such a manner that they neither secure fish for themselves nor permit others to do so. The reputation of our streams is thus liable to suffer and unless steps are taken to remedy these matters the considerable amount of money annually expended by those visiting sportsmen will be lost to the people. The guides are de facto agents of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board and are acquainted with these

rules and would enforce them. I beg to support the prayer of this petition and refer it to the Department to which it relates.

MR. CURRIE—In your behalf, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the mercantile firms and citizens of the town of Carbonear, praying that this House may grant to the Carbonear Volunteer Fire Brigade an amount of money to secure the equipment necessary for the thorough efficiency of that corps. It will be remembered that during the past winter a disastrous fire occurred in the Western section of that town, which but for the heroic endeavours of the fire brigade, would probably have wiped out a large section. I give my very hearty support to the prayer of the petition because I believe every encouragement should be given to the establishment of such fire brigades generally in the outports. There are many places—some in the District I have the honour to represent—where the houses are very congested and the slightest fire might assume proportions that would cause terrible havoc. The value of such a brigade at such a time cannot be over-estimated. I would ask that this petition be received and referred to the proper department and I trust it will receive the consideration it merits.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the members of the Road Board and other citizens of Point May in the District of Burin asking that the sum of one hundred dollars be allocated for the extension of a road to connect with some houses in this section. The matter is one worthy of every consideration by the Department, and I have no doubt that Mr. Bonia, the Road Inspector, who will be in that neighbourhood in the course of a few days, will give it his attention. I have every great pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. LE FEUVRE—I beg to support the prayer of this petition.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition. The petition is from the Newfoundland Brewery ,the Bennett Brewing Co. Ltd., and the Lindberg Brewing Co., Ltd. This petition Sir, sets out that by reason of the legislation passed by this House in its last session, prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, the petitioners will after the end of the year be deprived of carrying on a business which they have lawfully carried on for a period of some forty years, and if they are compelled to close down that business by reason of the legislation, that they will be put to considerable financial loss, and for that loss they humbly petition this House to take into consideration the matter of granting compensation. Before I would make any further remarks upon this subject, I would ask that the Clerk read this petition to the House.

The Clerk read the petition, as follows:

To The Honourable The House of Assembly of Newfoundland:

The Petition of the NEWFOUNDLAND BREWERY, LIMITED, the BENNETT BREWING COMPANY, LIMITED, and the LINDBERG BREWING COMPANY, LIMITED, of St. John's, Newfondland, humbly sheweth as follows:—

Your petitioners desire to bring to the notice of your Honourable House certain facts and circumstances in relation to the businesses at present carried on by them in this city, which businesses must in accordance with the recent decision of the Legislature be brought to an end at the conclusion of the present year; and they respectfully ask whether in view of the circumstances below set forth your Honourable House will be pleased to consider the question of com-

pensating them, at least to some small extent, for the losses and hardships which they are about to suffer.

Your Petitioners have for some forty years past been engaged in the business of brewing beer, and have invested therein a considerable amount of capital. The business in which your Petitioners are engaged was, at the time of the original investment, one recognized by law and public opinion as a proper and reputable one, and there did not at that time exist that tendency of legislation and public feeling against it which has of late years manifested itself and which is evidenced by the result of the plebiscite held in November last. Those persons who invested their money in this business some forty years ago did so to supply a legitimate public demand; and your Petitioners submit that their business has during the whole course of their existence been conducted in a respectable and law-abiding manner.

They feel that the trade in beer, in which they are engaged, is not, and in this Colony never has been responsible to any great extent for those evils of which temperance advocates have complained. But little intemperance has in this Colony been attributable to beer; and the recognition of this even among those opposed to alcoholic liquors in any form is evidenced by the fact that in the first set of resolutions submitted to your Honourable House last year it was proposed to permit the manufacture of beer to continue.

It may, perhaps, be said that anyone who invested money in this business did so with his eyes open. That may have applied to the original investor, although as has been pointed out, investment in this business forty years ago was not on the same footing as an investment in recent years would have been. But since the time when these establishments were started, a large proportion of the shares in them have passed to parties other than the original investors. For instance, in the case of one of the brewery Companies, it is a fact that more than one-half the shares are now held by women, by estates of deceased persons for the benefit of their families, or by comparatively poor men to whom the loss of a few hundred dollars is a serious matter; again, we have one or two conspicuous cases where persons employed in and about the brewing business are also shareholders, and thus see both their employment and their savings at once swept away. The peculiar hardship of such cases cannot but appeal to you.

Your Petitioners venture to emphasize the fact that in extinguishing the industry the Legislature is not merely taking from a few prosperous shareholders an investment which they can well afford to lose. On the contrary, as has already been stated, at least half the total investments in these three companies to-day is owned by persons to whom its loss will mean very serious hardship and deprivation.

Your Petitioners respectfully ask whether your Honourable House will consider the question of affording them some compensation from the public funds, in consideration of the fact that their investments have been destroyed at the demand of the public. Your Petitioners desire to make it clear that they have not in mind any extravagant or unreasonable demand, or any claim in consideration of future business. They ask only for compensation for their net loss of capital actually invested in machinery and plant, and for the depreciation in the value of premises; this would be in the neighbourhood of $30,000 in all, an amount comparatively small among our public expenditures, but which would mean a great deal to the small-

er class of shareholders and to those special cases of persons employed in the business above referred to. The actual amount to be paid would, of course, be determined in some suitable way; the above figure is mentioned in order to make it clear that your Petitioners desire to exhibit all possible moderation, though having to shoulder a substantial loss even if some measure of compensation is granted.

And Your Petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray, etc.

Dated the 19th day of April, 1916.

The Newfoundland Brewery, Ltd.,
J. V. O'Dea, Secretary.

The Bennett Brewing Co'y, Ltd.,
J. Rowe, for Secretary.

The Lindberg Brewing Co'y, Ltd.,
J. F. Lindberg, Manager.

In presenting this petition for the consideration of the House, I recognise that the petitioners in asking that a sum of money be granted to them in compensation for their alleged loss must in the first place look to the Treasury before any vote of money can be considered in this House. In reading over the various allegations set out in the petition why compensation should be granted I feel that I cannot subscribe to some of the reasons given by the petitioners. It is on behalf of those who have or rather will have their property rendered useless if a certain law comes into effect that it involves a principle of compensation for what may be regarded as vested rights. This principle seems to me to be the only question this House will have to consider. It is not a question as to who is affected by reason of the closing down of these several businesses, whether it affects widows or orphans or any other class of people, but it is a question as to whether it is right or wrong to grant compensation at all or not. The principle of compensation to those who have property expropriated by the Government is a well-known one in this House. If this Legislature passes a law providing for the construction of a railroad, simultaneously with that law there is provided machinery to create a Board of arbitrators to assess the damages that may be done to private individuals by reason of having their lands taken for the general public good. Likewise it is a well-known principle that if, for instance, a house becomes infected with some disease and becomes a menace to the community, the authorities or the Legislature may order it to be destroyed, and it follows almost as a rule that compensation will be granted to the parties interested. Now here is a case where this Legislature will put out of business at the end of this year three brewing companies, and which Companies have been carrying on their legitimate business for a long period of some forty or fifty years, and we have to consider whether we are justified in closing down these several businesses or not. You say to these people that after a certain period of time you will prohibit the manufacturing or brewing of beer, and thereby you render practically useless all the plant and machinery and other requisites of the Company, in other words, you practically confiscate the property of the Company. All this involves a principle that will be very far-reaching and one which will have to be extended to other persons interested in the liquor business. We will have to consider those who will be put out of business when this Act comes into force, and it may involve a large expenditure of money by way of compensation. We must not, however, be deterred from duty by reason of the magnitude of the amount of money that may be involved. We are here

to do what we believe to be justice. If we deem it to be right and proper in the public interest to close these several businesses and thus practically confiscate the property of every man who has been living out of the sale of intoxicating liquor, we ought to be prepared at least to consider the matter of compensation for losses arising thereby. While I am presenting this petition I wish to say I am doing so as a matter of duty, and because I have been asked so to do by reputable citizens. I will not go so far at this present moment as to express what my individual opinion may be upon the subject, but it is a subject that may be far-reaching in its effect and one which I think should be considered by this Legislature. If by reason of our having put these people out of business we have caused them to suffer a certain loss or damage, how far should we go in the way of granting compensation for losses sustained? If we deprive people of what may be regarded as their lawful rights, we ought to be ready to give due consideration to their case when they claim compensation. At this present moment I am only prepared to go so far as to say that in determining how I shall vote, should the matter be brought down in a more tangible form, I shall be guided only by those principles which have been regarded by Legislatures in like matters. I cannot allow myself to be influenced by some of the allegations made in this petition. It is not a question of widows or orphans suffering or any one class of persons, but a question as to whether any compensation should be granted in this matter or not.. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that this petition be received by the House and referred to the Colonial Secretary for the consideration of the Government.

MR. DWYER—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition. I think it is a great hardship to those Companies to be shut down. They have contributed largely in duties to the revenue. They also paid a large license fee, and if they have to shut up they will lose the whole thing. I give this petition my hearty support that some compensation be given the parties interested.

MR. STONE—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Ireland's Eye, in the District of Trinity, asking for telegraph communication between Ireland's Eye and the mainland. It is a well-known fact that Ireland's Eye is an isolated place and sometimes for four or five weeks of the year the people of that settlement are unable to get in touch with anybody, even those living within a short distance of them. It would require, according to the petition, about one mile of cable to reach across to Thoroughfare, and then eight or nine miles of wire to connect with Britannia Cove. I trust that the Government in the near future will see its way clear to grant the request of the petition. I know that at the present time it is very hard to give petitioners all they are asking for, but upon this particular petition and seeing the need for the telegraph office at Ireland's Eye I think the Government should give the prayer of the petition every consideration. I would ask that it be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Speaker: I give the petition my very hearty support.

The Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of His Excellency the Governor as Chairman of the Patriotic Association of Newfoundland.

VICTORIA ROAD BOARD ENQUIRY.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Before proceeding with the regular subject on the Order Paper, I would like to draw the attention of the House to

the fact that last evening the Leader of the Opposition invited my attention to a matter that had been discussed early in the session by the member for Fogo, in relation to an enquiry by the Auditor General concerning the expenditure of monies in the District of Carbonear. It will be remembered that last session, rather late in the session, just on the closing days of the session, the member for Fogo drew the attention of the House to this matter, and as he stated yesterday very correctly I suggested to him that as the session was then about to close and as the facts could be more conveniently elicited by the Auditor General, that if he would give me the particulars I would have the Auditor-General proceed to Carbonear and hold a regular sworn enquiry and make a report. It was only just before the session opened that the Auditor General was able to complete that report, and I tabled it I think in the first week of the present session. It was suggested yesterday by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that as the matter referred to in the report was one dealing with the expenditure of public monies, with which this House is specially charged, it might be desirable if the House considered that report as read here yesterday in Committee. Personally I am quite sure that no one in the House would object to further discussion or enquiry in Committee, and I am quite satisfied that the member for the District himself where the expenditure took place, would be the very last to refuse the fullest enquiry, and under these circumstances and if the House still desires to, I personally have no objection to the House going into Committee to consider the matter. When we are in Committee I shall be ready to give my opinion in relation to the whole enquiry and to the report and what it discloses. It will be remembered that there were certain findings by the Auditor General in relation to certain monies that were paid certain residents of Carbonear for work that was not performed. It is the intention of the Government to instruct either the refunding of that money or to insist that work be done for it. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the House now resolve itself into Committee to make further enquiry and report on this matter.

On motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Report of the Auditor General's enquiry into the expenditure of Road Monies in the District of Carbonear.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GOODISON—Mr. Chairman: With regard to the matter which Mr. Halfyard brought to the attention of the House yesterday, I have very little to say more than was said in the evidence which he read to this House, —the evidence which I gave to the Auditor General on oath at Carbonear. When the Auditor General came to Carbonear I volunteered to give him all the information I could, and I told him that I courted the fullest enquiry into the whole matter. I do not think I need tell this House that personally I have had absolutely nothing whatever to do with the handling of any monies which have been expended. Not one cent of any description has ever gone through my hands in connection with District expenditures during the time I have been a member for Carbonear. What I did I thought was within my jurisdiction and within my authority, and it was only just before the Auditor General came over that one of the sections of the Act was called to my attention, which led me to say to him that I knew that legally I had no standing in

the matter. But I know the method which has governed the expenditures in the various districts for many years. I know that constituents of all members imagine that the member for the district has control of the monies which are appropriated to that District more or less. My constituents came to me with that belief, that I could recommend the expenditure of various grants and that I had control of these monies to a certain extent; and I know very well that that has been the understanding at least with Government members ever since I have known anything of politics in Newfoundland. As I said at the beginning, I have very little to add to my sworn evidence given before the Auditor General, and if the members of this House who have to deal with constituents and have to make grants to satisfy those constituents in the best interest of the public, find that I have erred, I leave myself entirely in their hands with the confident assurance that they will do me justice.

After about five minutes no member saying anything,

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman. I suggest that the Committee rise.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. Before the Committee rises I beg to move that it Be Resolved that this Committee of the Whole House having heard the statement of Mr. Goodison, the member for Carbonear, regrets that the Honourable Member has expressed no regret or contrition for the conduct which has been condemned in a report on the expenditure of public moneys in Victoria Village, in the district of Carbonear; And Be it Resolved Further that the Committee can no longer hold him in that confidence which the continuance of his tenure of the office of Speaker should command.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman. I must certainly object most strongly to any such resolution being adopted and I shall certainly vote against it. There is nothing before this House which would justify any such resolution. I think that the Hon. member for Carbonear has shown that he appreciates the very best traditions of this Legislature by the manly way in which he has acted in relation to this matter from the very start. The very publicity of his act is the best answer to any suggestion that there was the slightest wrong doing. At the most, an irregularity is the highest notch to which such a transaction as has been referred to by the Auditor General should be raised. When the matter was brought before the House last year by the Hon. member for Fogo, I immediately agreed to the fullest enquiry and the fullest investigation, and by one who, it will be admitted, was probably as competent as anyone having regard to the nature of the transaction. We have had the evidence before us and we have had a report, and I am quite satisfied that nothing beyond a mere irregularity can be ascribed to the hon. member. Further, I want to endorse what he has said here this evening, and what he has also suggested in his evidence before the Auditor General. That what he has done has been the custom for the last fifty years by, a very large majority of the members of this House. I don't want to say for a moment that there is any law authorizing definitely and specifically such dealings between constituents and representatives, but this is a case in which the most that can be said is that the hon. member travelled outside his jurisdiction. If it were a question of his participating in any of the profits or any of the advantages flowing from the work directly or indirectly—if he were getting anything

from the supplies that were to be bought—if the moneys were going into his store—if he had any direct or indirect interest—it might be different; but I say that the most, the very most that can be said is that the transaction was irregular, and probably arose from the promptings of a desire on the part of the hon. member to do what he could for those who solicited his services. That is an important point to consider, and I think that the honourable and open way in which the hon. member has acted here this evening, as well as when giving his sworn statement to the Auditor General should suggest to every member of this Committee that we ought not do anything or say anything, or put ourselves in any way on record in such a manner as to throw a doubt on the bona fides of his act in this matter. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I shall object, in so far as I can object by my vote to this resolution being adopted.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Chairman. I regard this as a most regrettable occurrence, one of the most regrettable that I can remember since my association with this Legislature. I have listened with some surprise to the explanation given by the Speaker in answer to the report of the Auditor General in reference to the enquiry made by him in the matter of the expenditure of certain moneys in the district of Carbonear. I am surprised that the hon. member should repeat before this Committee what he stated in his evidence before the Auditor General, namely, that what he had done was in accordance with the custom of the country. I have had a seat in this Legislature now, representing the district of Twillingate, for some sixteen years, and before that I occupied a seat for another district for four years, and I have had otherwise association with this Legislature, and I cannot recall any instance where it has ever been alleged or ever been shown that such a custom existed—a custom whereby a member of this House, of his own mere motion, would give an order to the Chairman of a Road Board authorizing him to expend a sum of money upon public works. I don't know of a single case, during my association with political life, in which that was done. I know that I have never done it. I know that if I ever have had occasion to make application for money to be expended upon public works, that the only way in which I ever endeavored to obtain money was by making an application to the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for an allocation, but as for a member giving an order direct to the Chairman of a Road Board for the expenditure of road money, I have yet to learn that such a custom has been in vogue. I regret very much indeed that the Speaker has not thought it fit to express to this House his regret for having done what he has done, or what he admitted he had done in his evidence before the Auditor General, and to have made some pronouncement to the House which would make it clear that members did not have that right, and that such a custom does not exist.

If we admit as legislators, as members of this House, that such a custom has been in vogue, then we are admitting that we have been transgressing the law in this particular; that we have been violating a law which we have solemnly made here for the purpose of protecting the public interests in the expenditure of public money. I say it is regrettable that such an occurrence has taken place, and it is equally regrettable that some steps have not been taken by the member who was interested, or by the leader of the House to lay down emphatically what the law is in this matter and to condemn the prac-

tice that the Speaker says has been the custom of the country. I cannot admit that such a custom has ever been in vogue,and if it is the custom for other honourable members to so expend public moneys, then the sooner that custom is done away with the better for this legislature and for this country.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— I would like to add one or two words to the discussion this evening. I have been a member of this House for twenty-four years, and in listening to the criticism of the actions of Mr. Goodison, the hon. member for Carbonear, and the report of the Auditor General into alleged irregularities in the expenditure of public moneys at Victoria Village as set out in the affidavits from certain residents of that section, have come to the conclusion that it is a tempest in a teapot. When I was elected to this Legislature, I remember there was a special grant of $2,000 voted each session to be applied equally throughout the various districts for special purposes matters that would not come directly to the notice of the Public Works Department until notified by the members that allocations out of this fund were made by us, and the work performed, which the Board of Works acknowledged and paid. This was a usual custom, and had been in vogue long before I came to this House,and was customary in my district by those who represented it long before my election for the district and I would challenge any member of this House to find anything wrong with such expenditure. It was difficult to know every need that may arise or to so allocate monies voted for specific purposes to cover such emergencies as may from time to time arise, and by special grant alone could we deal with it; in no other way, to my mind, could conditions such as Mr. Goodison was up against, be handled, except in the manner in which he did. It has been shown, to the satisfaction of the Committee, that Mr. Goodison was ordering the completion of certain works to meet a condition of poverty in his district; men in very needy circumstances had represented to him that they were in absolute poverty, and it being impossible to communicate fully with the Department of Public Works, he took it upon himself that those people be given employment. Mr. Goodison admits the irregularity of his action, but he very properly defends it on the ground that it was a customary thing to do, and precedents could be shown for it, not alone in his district, but in every district in the Island. The hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Clift, appears shocked that any such conduct on the part of Hon. members should be condoned. The hon. member says that for sixteen years, whilst he held his seat in this House, he has never been guilty of such conduct, but I may be permitted to point out to him that Mr. Goodison's case is very different from his. The Hon. member for Carbonear lives in the heart of his district, every throb of hunger is felt by him, his constituents are continually in touch with him, and air their grievances with him in person. Mr. Clift does not come in touch with his constituents in Twillingate except once in four years, and should any one from Twillingate visit the City, it is probably one who is in comfortable circumstances, and who makes no demand on him. Mr. Goodison's position is similar to my own. I have often done just as the Hon. member for Carbonear has done, relieved the poor, not by applying to the Poor Commissioner for pauper relief, which our people detest, but in getting them employment on roads and public works, and when the case is urgent, in instructing that this work be proceeded with, pending official instruc-

tions from the Public Works Department. This is all of which Mr. Goodison has been found guilty. He has pleaded guilty to relieving conditions of distress which were so urgent that they demanded immediate attention, and because he refuses to apologize to this Committee, we are asked to censure him by supporting the resolution of the Leader of the Opposition. I speak for myself when I say that I should be very sorry to be a party to any such proceeding. I am here this evening to uphold the member for Carbonear in what he has done: I have very strong doubts as to whether he is even guilty of an irregularity as a member of this House in giving orders, he does not do so as an accredited Minister of the Crown, but as a private individual, and this should be his private affair, and if similarly urgent conditions called for it, I hope he may do the self same thing. This is my opinion, and I shall vote accordingly.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, in view of the atmosphere that has been created by senior members, perhaps it will be novel to have this debate participated in by juniors. I do not know who is responsible for the custom referred to or where it comes from, but if any honourable member will go down to my office any day in the year he will find it fairly well filled with constituents who come there not because it happens to be something novel to have such assistance rendered them but because it has been customary for them to come and ask such help; they come as I have no doubt they came to my friend and colleague, Mr. Dwyer, and our late colleague, the now respected Mr. Justice Kent; and their reason is that they are living in the same district as their members and anything in the nature of needed public assistance which they think there is a possibility of getting, is naturally solicited by them through the member who is living amongst them—they come to him as a matter of course. And I want to say further that honourable members in the House have a good mark in me if this kind of conduct is going to lead to censure, because I can be censured for it every day I get out of bed. What kind of a member would he be who when approached by a needy constituent say from Biscayan Cove, near Cape St. Francis, or some other outlying district, who had travelled all the way to town looking for help, in the way of some necessary public road or marine work; and if the road inspector or marine inspector were not to be found, would say, "you had better go home and come out again about it." Has that been the conduct of the senior member for St. John's East—Mr. Dwyer? If it had been his conduct, or that of his former colleague—Judge Kent—is it likely that they would have been representing the district all these years? Would not the member immediately get busy and himself get the Board of Works Office to authorize the work, and in an urgent case, if the proper officials were not available there, would he not be likely in good faith and in the interests of his constituents to authorize the work to go on and report this the next day to the proper authority? Are not these conditions the penalty of living in the same district with one's constituents? Is not this the position to-day in Mr. Goodison's case—as honourable members will see—that what has happened to the Speaker is that he has been living amongst his people and, naturally, he has become the person to whom they appeal in every little thing of a public character. Now what are we asked by the Opposition to do? We are asked to put on record our condemnation of the Speaker in words to the effect that we regret—if my

memory of the resolution serves me—he has not expressed his regret for this conduct. Well, I do not know, according to my lights, that the Speaker has done anything so terrible that we ought to expect him to come in abjectly and crave pardon. He has taken a course to-day which is the course of an honourable man who has done no crime, who simply says, "Gentlemen, I have technically violated the Act. I have, it is true, done something for which I can be censured. I leave myself in your hands with the feeling that you as members of this House will deal with the incident as it deserves to be dealt with." Now surely, Mr. Chairman, this House does not believe there is anything at all in the statements referred to. I heard them last evening until I discovered that one affidavit was a repetition of another. I have scanned the report to-day—I have read it inside out–I have tried to strain it against the Speaker, and what does it amount to? It amounts to this: that he has done something for which both myself and Mr. Dwyer say we can be equally censured every day—rendering relief when necessity required. Technically we say he is wrong, but we say that it is in that sense that the Auditor General reports as he does. The report then explains what the Orders in Council are. I subscribe to the proposition that it is a breach of the words of the Act, but it is not the kind of a breach I submit when we have the evidence in front of us here, when we have the sworn statement here, when we have the Speaker of this House—and he is well known to us—leave the matter in our hands, which would make us go to the extent of telling him he should get down and kiss our feet; and because he did not get down to that degree of regret that we think the case warranted that he should be censured. Do you think it warrants any more from him than he has done? Has he not come and admitted the fact and says, "it is true I did violate the provisions of the Act, but what I did was done by me in good faith, done by me because that has been the custom, as I understand it, the custom that I found there." And I can say that I, at least, had handed on to me some such custom,and I am very much afraid that the custom will be passed on by me to someone else in a year's time. And I say that all of us are in this position that whatever we did, was done in the interests of those we are representing. Surely a member who is living amongst his constituents must naturally be expected to be daily subjected to demands not experienced by members who live far away from their districts. I feel sure that the explanation as given by Mr. Goodison will satisfy the Committee that what was done by him does not justify us in passing on him a want of confidence vote—a vote of want of confidence, for this is what it amounts to. The adoption of this resolution means placing on record our condemnation of his conduct, and why? The hon. members opposite say he was not sufficiently repentant. I do not see in this whole business anything from start to finish which should cause the Speaker of this House to make an abject apology and grovel in the dust. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that the Speaker was a party to anything of a serious character. He has done as every member of this House probably would under similar circumstances, and though it may be a theoretical breach of the law, yet as a matter of fact it is but the carrying out of a custom, an improper one if you will, but a custom that has been followed solely for the benefit of his constituents.

MR. MORRIS—Mr. Chairman, this matter I think has resolved itself in-

to a question of law versus custom The law says a member shall not give authority for, or identify himself with, the expenditure of the public monies of his district. Such authority and expenditure can only be done through the Department of Public Works. Now to the legal minds it will be known that where a custom has been established in particular cases, it has been upheld by the courts in some instances, and the law has had to take a second place. That is the position his Honor, the Speaker would be in, if a question such as this came up for hearing before the Supreme Court. If the custom were proven,the Court may acquit him of any wrongdoing or breach of the law.

MR. LLOYD—That is remarkable law.

MR. MORRIS—It may be remarkable law, perhaps, as a general principle, but in some cases where custom is established, it over-rides the law. If it is the custom of the country, and I gather from the debate that it has been the admitted custom of members in the past to exercise the right to authorize the expenditure on urgent public works, and in some cases of necessity, portions of the special grant,—then the hon. member for Carbonear has only followed a well established custom. It is some twenty-six years now since I first had the honour of a seat in this House, being returned for the first time in 1889. We had then what was known as "The Special Grant." It was entirely a members' grant, being absolutely controlled by members who gave the necessary authority for its expenditure, and instructed the Board of Works to make payments to the different parties authorized, after the work had been performed.I know that then it was an ordinary matter for the representative of the people to give their constituents instructions to do work in the nature of digging wells, building public wharves or public roads, and the instructions so given, was the only authority required by the Board of Works in order to pay the money when the work was performed, and the bill presented. After the work was given out, and the votes passed the Legislature, the members would have a special grant of $2,000 allotted to their respective districts, and this was the rule of procedure in these days. There may have been exceptions, but they only proved the rule. I know personally when I first represented Hr. Main district. in many cases the expenditure of money was authorized before the vote passed the Legislature, and it was on the member's authority solely that public work was given out, in sections,where the necessity of employment to help the needy, was imperative. In these distressing days, it was an ordinary thing for stalwart men to travel from Hr. Main to Holyrood to St. John's looking for a job of work, to enable them to procure food for their families, naturally they would turn to their member (for they had no one else to apply to), and on his recommendation and authority would receive an order for provisions on some business man in St. John's or in the district and the amount of the advances would be earned by the recipient of the order on roads, bridges or some other work in his locality. Later on when the work was done, these orders would be presented and an amount allocated by the member for their payment at the Board of Works Now in this case of the Speaker, he is closely associated with the people he represents, knowing their wants and necessities, and he is looked upon by them as the right and proper person to assist them in their time of need. He has had, no doubt, even before representing the district in Parliament. intimate association with district matters in the days, when Carbonear was

so well represented by the late Hon. John Rorke, and was fully aware of the practices which then prevailed, regarding the expenditure of public monies, and no doubt had experience in carrying out this self-same practice, which is now so bitterly complained of by the gentlemen of the Opposition The Hon. John Rorke was considered an honest man, and a scrupulous one, and why should not his example be a trustworthy one and likely to be followed by his successor, believing he was doing no wrong. I have also in mind, in relation to the conduct of district matters in the past, men of high public and private life, men like the late Sir William Whiteway, Sir Joseph Little, Hons. R.J. Kent, A.M. McKay and others. Men, who, in those days thought it was no wrong to allocate public monies in this way, when necessary to furnish employment to their distressed and needy constituents. If, therefore, the Speaker committed a wrong by giving authority for this work, in my opinion, it was certainly unintentionally, and does not justify the vote of censure, that has been proposed here this afternoon. I do not think there is anything in the facts presented to justify such a vote. The Speaker has come before the House, and placed himself unreservedly in our hands, simply claiming that, if he has erred, he has done so, believing he was acting properly, and within the scope of his duty as a representative, that he was was following a custom prevailing for years in the district and covering cases in the past under similar circumstances. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I feel certain we are not justified in passing this vote of censure on the Hon. Member for Carbonear, for that is simply what the resolution before the Committee amounts to in effect. It says, we can have no further confidence in the Hon .Member, who we must not forget is also Speaker of this House Now I would invite the members on the other side who can go back in memory to those days,when members interested themselves in District matters in just the same way as the Speaker has, and they did so in accordance with the custom prevailing at the time. I can understand that this breach of the law appears to be quite a serious matter when contemplated by the younger members from their viewpoint. But those of us who remember past conditions, when authority for public work could be given by the member for the District without violation of the law, can appreciate the difference. In these days, we had conditions existing in nearly every district, which made it imperative for members to do this sort of work, and so help their needy constituents. Now as I have said before, Mr. Chairman, if the Hon. Member for Carbonear erred in giving out this work on his own authority to assist the poor of his district, in my opinion he erred on the right side. I do not wish it to be inferred from this that the law has not been broken by the Hon. Member. but the circumstances were such as to make the action of the member, if not strictly within the law, certainly he can claim he had the weight of custom behind him for a justification. personally, as he had nothing to gain in procuring work for distressed constituents, he was only doing what he considered his duty. I shall therefore have to record my vote against this resolution.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Mr. Chairman: After hearing the statement of the hon. member for Carbonear, I have no hesitation whatever in voting against the motion of the Leader of the Opposition which can only have for its object a vote of censure. That conclusion is easily arrived at,

if we analyse the charges made against that gentleman. If the hon. member is guilty in the manner in which hon. members on the other side of the House would make us believe, I can only say that many other members of this body are in the same category. There seems to be no question whatever that had the hon. member first gone to the Department of Public Works, and authorized the expenditure of the moneys,there would have been nothing wrong in his actions, but his offence seems to be that he told the people to go ahead with the work when he was approached at Carbonear. The whole fact of the matter is that, strictly speaking, no member of this House has any authority whatever to authorize the expenditure of public moneys. Mr. Goodison did so, because he was under the impression that he was doing no wrong, and that he was following out a custom which had prevailed in this country since the days of responsible government. Whenever I visited the District which I have now the honour of representing , or when I visited Burgeo District between 1900 and 1904, I invariably authorized certain public works to be done such as repairs to landing places, bridges, or wharves, when it was pointed out to me by the Boards that the work was urgent, and that immediate repairs would save money. Why did I do this? Simply for the reason that I knew that it was customary for every hon. member to do the same thing. I do not uphold or advocate such a system, for I consider that it would be far better for the constituencies and the members if the members had no voice in the distribution or the manner of spending the public money. The conditions in this country are such that a great many of the people are under the impression that the member is all-powerful, and has an unlimited amount of public money at his command to do with as he deems best.

It would certainly be better for the members and for all concerned if voted moneys were expended by responsible bodies without regard to the interference or control of the representative of a people. The Main Line grants are generally voted in such a manner that the members have no control over them, but it is very different in the case of the Special Grant. It is only a few years since that two thousand dollar grant already referred to was in vogue. Will anyone say that that grant was not collared by the member and spent in his District as he thought fit? Mr. Goodison may have erred in first ordering the work to be done without consulting the Board of Works Department but I feel absolutely clear in my mind that at the time he did it, he did not consider that he was doing wrong; but that he was merely following out a custom. We are now asked to censure the Speaker for doing that which he believed was in his province, and in the province of every hon. member. It is surely not contended that he benefited to the extent of one cent by this transaction. Under these circumstances, I would think twice before censuring the hon. member on such trumped-up charges, and it would have to be very clearly brought home and proved that some wrong was intentionally committed by that hon. member before I would be a party to recording my vote in the direction of passing upon him a vote of censure.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: No one regrets more than I the turn this debate has taken this evening, for I was in hope that when we went into Committee the matter would be closed within a few minutes. I anticipated that the Speaker would acknowledge his absolute and unmistakable wrong-doing, and that he

would express his regret therefor, and no one on this side of the House would have had any desire to push this matter to its extremity. We have no desire to go farther than duty compels us. Now, we have had special pleading for his conduct, we have been told of custom, and we have some remarkable law laid down, law that the Supreme Court would never dream of countenancing. I doubt if that sort of law will be tolerated even in the Central District Court when my friend gets there. Who ever heard of such a statement that custom prevailed over the dictates of this Legislature. If the hon. member did not say this, this is what he said in effect.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—I did not say that.

MR. LLOYD—It is an absurd statement to say that we can make laws in this Legislature, and yet permit customs contradictory to their stipulations to remain in full force and validity. We must remember that a large number of members of this House were unseated on one occasion for very much the same thing. The Supreme Court on that occasion did not recognize that custom prevailed over law, and certain members were unseated, yet this self same thing is defended this afternoon in the House, and we cannot allow it to pass unprotested. We will not allow the Speaker to stand up here in his place in Committee of this House without protest, and vindicate such iniquitous conduct. I do not see how his words can be construed in any other sense than this. We are not prepared to stand here on this side of the House and allow other member of the House to accuse us of being parties to the same breach of the very spirit of this Chamber. This Chamber having control of the expenditure of money appoints ways and means by which that money should be expended and it has been provided that it shall be by Government Departments and local bodies- appointed by the Governor in Council with the authority of this House. I was astounded when I read the other day in the report of the Auditor General that any such custom could be pleaded. I sat in this House from 1904 to 1908 on the Government side, and I know something of what was done on that side of the House. I never heard of any such custom. There was never one cent spent in my District except by a requisition signed by the member and sent to the Department, as provided by the Audit Act in the ordinary process of law and it is the first time that I have heard any member of this House ever state that he has been guilty of such practises five hundred times. If that is so, he ought to be ashamed of himself, and the House ashamed of him, and it is because of this very shamelessness that we have to take the stand we take in this House at the present time. It is about time that this custom should be discontinued and this House should take a firm stand against allowing the Speaker to come here and justify his actions, having the support of two Ministers of the Crown, both senior members. What is this House for? Mr. Goodison's actions have been spoken of as a trifle. It has been going on for years. Here we have the case of money that has been given out by the agents of that member who is not even a member of the Road Board. After being paid, in some cases work was performed, in other cases work was not performed, and yet we are asked to come in here and pass it over as an Act justified by custom. We are dealing with a case in which the member usurps the powers of the Road Board. We are not dealing with special grants, but this member has taken upon himself

the duties not only of the Minister of Public Works, but of a Road Board. He has been spending public moneys without reference to anyone but himself, and sometimes through his Agent. As long as such conduct continues to be vindicated I shall protest and protest vigorously.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker: I share the regret that was expressed by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the attitude that the Speaker, member for Carbonear, has adopted in this matter. I regret that he did not come in here and express his regret for his improper conduct. When we came here this afternoon we thought this matter would be settled in a few minutes, but we never anticipated that the Government would back him up, and there is no other course open for us, Mr. Chairman, as members of this House, having respect to the laws of the land, but to adopt our present attitude. I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, when he states that day by day people come into his office and ask that this or that thing should be done in connection with District matters, but that does not give him the right to expend money in the fashion that the Speaker has been guilty of.

MR. HIGGINS—What I said was this: that I well understood Mr. Goodison's conduct on account of these demands.

MR. COAKER—But that does not give the member the right that Mr. Goodison has assumed. Have we the right, because we are members of the House, to go to our District and give twenty or thirty dollars in truck for work, and then take no further interest, and not even see that the work is done? That is not what should be done by an hon. member of this House. We have taken our duties here seriously and we have believed that we had to obey the laws, and when we make them here we ought to have them carried out. Why, I am astonished to see the hon. members on the other side getting up and justifying such conduct as has been revealed in the report of the Auditor General. The hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's went as far as to say that custom prevailed over law.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—In some cases only.

MR. COAKER—You did not say that. Suppose you make a law in connection with the seal fishery that no man is to take seals before the 15th of March, and if a man brought them into this country he was to be fined so much for each seal. Do you suppose that it would be any use for any man who broke this law to say that he should be let off because he was accustomed to killing seals before this date for a great many years. The Court would say to him: "You have broken the law. We must administer it, and you must take your punishment."

Now if you do not need such a law as you have in regard to the expenditure of public moneys, why make it? What is the need for the Audit Act which we have had since 1898, or going on 15 years, if a man can get up in this House and justify this class of conduct by saying that he did not know there was such a law? The section of the Act dealing with this matter is as follows:

"Expenditure under Legislative votes may be authorized by the Head of a Department on account of appropriations managed by his Department, so soon as he has been notified by the Treasury Board as to the votes assigned to his Department, but he shall not operate in any way on such appropriations until such notification has been transmitted to him, and a letter of credit has been issued in his favour. Nor shall he

expend, during the first six months of any year, a sum greater than two-thirds of the appropriation under open vote. Provided further that no person or persons other than the Governor in Council or the Head of a Department (so far as the votes managed by his Department are concerned) shall have the power to authorize the undertaking of any work or the incurring of any expenditure upon any appropriation account. Votes which are by statute placed under the control of the Governor in Council shall not be operated upon until specifically allocated by Order in Council and placed by such Order under the management of a Departmental head."

The hon. member for Carbonear occupies a very important position in this House and he should have taken the utmost care to see that no finger of scorn should be pointed at any action of his in connection with the affairs of his District. Occupying the position he does here, he should have taken every precaution to see that no shadow of suspicion pointed at any action of his. Now the members on the other side of the House attempt to justify this class of conduct. How do you think you could justify it before the public? Do you think you could go to the electorate and ask them to justify what you have been doing the last four years? It is this class of conduct that works so much against you with the people. Why the action of Mr. Morison, who said he forgot the law in connection with that Timber matter, when he was Minister of Justice did more than anything else in turning the North against you. In 18 months or so from now or whenever the election comes, how will you be able to go to the people and justify your action in connection with this white-washing of Mr. Goodison. The only excuse that he made was: "that even if he had done wrong, the same thing had been going on in other districts year after year." Of course, that is no excuse at all, two blacks do not make a white, and it is certainly no good of saying that custom should supersede the law, and I should like for hon. members of this House to try and justify this conduct in 1917, and I should like to be side by side on the platform with them.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—You would get left.

MR. COAKER—No, I wouldn't.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I would like to have you for about one-half hour.

MR. COAKER—I would like you to come to my district for one half hour. I am afraid you would be picked up in pieces. In Twillingate that sort of conduct cannot be allowed, and will not be allowed, and if you allow it you will have to take the responsibility of facing the country. Now, as I have said before, in the 1913 election there was nothing that turned the Northern constituencies against you more than your action in white-washing Mr. Morison, a man who had said he forget the law when he was Minister of Justice, and if you now do not condemn Mr. Goodison's conduct, and if you white-wash him, you will have to take the consequence. Of course, you can do it if you like. We cannot prevent you. We can only do our duty and get up here and protest and point out to the Government what is their duty. If they disregard that duty, the responsibility is theirs.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman: Just one word in reply to the hon. member. His remarks were a mixture of earnestness and humour; because I know he could not have been serious in accusing us of white-washing anything wrong; and the very best proof that he was not serious is his own attitude in connection with the matter before the Chair, in as much as he supported the Leader of the

Opposition, Dr. Lloyd, in saying that if the Speaker, in spite of his offence and in spite of the alleged wrong-doing, had said that he regretted his action the whole matter would have been settled. Now that would be "white-washing." My learned friend takes the position that if these words: "I am sorry," had been said, the whole House would have been satisfied and the incident would have been closed. Now, if the Speaker has done wrong, and if he has violated the law, and if it was such a serious violation as members opposite try to represent, it surely would be too late for him to come in afterwards and merely express regret for his conduct; and I submit that if my hon. friend, the member for Twillingate, were serious in his remarks the only position he could take in such a case would be to say "you have done wrong and we cannot whitewash you. We cannot accept your expression of regret. It is too late." The only difference between the attitude of the hon. member and members on this side of the House is that he says we think you have done wrong, and we want to go further than members on the other side of the House and we want you to come in here and publicly express your regrets.

Now that is the effect of the motion. Now surely if the Speaker of this House gets up and makes an explanation and then says: "gentlemen I leave myself in your hands" that surely is not attempting to justify his conduct, but is merely giving his excuse in mitigation. He says in effect: "Gentlemen, that is my excuse. It is my answer in mitigation, and having given that I leave my case in your hands." Now, Mr. Chairman, surely hon. members on the other side are too fair-minded not to understand the position we take. I merely feel that in voting for that resolution I am not called upon to pronounce one bit more strongly than I have done as to what is right or wrong; that there is nothing in that resolution which asks from me one pronouncement any stronger than I have made or any condemnation, but it merely says before letting this incident close the Speaker should go further and apologise. I may say that as far as I am concerned, that after having heard what has been said from the other side of the House, and having heard the statement from the Speaker himself, and having heard the statement from hon. members opposite that a mere expression of regret would be sufficient to close the incident, I contend that there has not been anything done by the member for Carbonear in his capacity as a member that would entitle us to demand from him anything more than he has done. He has not brazened his action out; he has made his explanation to the Committee and then left the matter in our hands. Now, the hon. gentleman opposite says that he should go further; that he ought to be more abject in his submission. Personally, I know that if he had done so he would have prejudiced himself considerably in my eyes. I do not take too kindly to the man who cringes. I much more appreciate the spirit of the man who comes frankly and says: "That is my reason and that is my excuse, and now you can do as you please." I would be much more impressed with the bona fides of his case than in the case of a man who would come in and make an abject apology. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the light of all we have heard, could the Speaker give any further expression of regret? Could he say more than "I do not regret the incident, I do not regret the fact that I went out and gave money to my constituents that I had no right to give; but I am sorry that such a hub-bub should have been raised, and I am sorry that the Audi-

tor General should have been brought to Carbonear, and I am sorry that an investigation should have been brought about, because I was acting contrary to what was the law of the land." And because that is the most that can be said, I think that hon. members will admit—and the hon. member for Twillingate knows it better than anyone else—that this is not a process of whitewashing. We merely say that, in the light of all that has happened, the publicity which has been given this matter and the attention which has been drawn to it, sufficient has transpired, and we would not be warranted in trying to, what is called, "rub it in" by looking for anything in the nature of an appeal for mercy, or attempting to compel the hon. member to express regrets which, we submit, the circumstances of the case do not warrant, in the light, as I say, of what has been stated by various members on both sides of the House.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to a very remarkable piece of special pleading. The hon. member who has just sat down has endeavored to minimize the lack of any expression of contrition by the. hon. member for Carbonear. I would wish to point out to him that the very kernel of the offence against this House is that there is no expression of regret. No one asks for cringing; no one asks for abject abasement; but we do ask for a manly expression of regret from the hon. member for Carbonear, because the dignity and honor of this House have been outraged. That will close, and very properly close ,the incident, because it will vindicate the honor of this House in the matter of the proper expenditure of public moneys; but if we pass this by, and allow it to go forth that this House by its vote has vindicated the conduct of the member for Carbonear—what is it but an inducement to every member of this House to go and do likewise—to break the law and plead the customs of the country as an excuse That is the point. If the member for Carbonear would come before this House and say that he regretted having offended the House in this matter, then that would be an assurance that in future no member—not even the hon. member for Fortune Bay, who doesn't expect to go back there—would dare to repeat the offence that he has been guilty of during the past four years, according to the story of his agent, Mr. Powell of Victoria Village. At this stage I am prepared to withdraw this motion, and allow this Committee to rise, if there is any chance of the dignity of the House being upheld. I do not wish to press the matter, but I am not going to allow any flagrant disregard for the dignity of the House to pass.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had negatived the resolution.

On motion this Report was received.

On the motion for the adoption of the Report, Mr. Lloyd moved the following resolution:

"Be it resolved that this House, having heard in Committee the statement of Mr. Goodison the member for Carbonear, regrets that the hon. member has expressed no regret or contrition for conduct which has been condemned in a Report on the expenditure of public money in Victoria Village in the District of Carbonear, and Be it Resolved further that this House can no longer hold him in that confidence which the continuance of his tenure of the office of Speaker should command."

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker: I beg to second the motion, and I do so

very regretfully. It is a matter of great regret to me that I have to be a party to placing on record the Resolution which has been proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, but I feel that after the debate which I have just heard in Committee, no other course is left open to me. The matter which is referred to in that resolution was reported, Sir, to a Committee of this Whole House, and during the deliberations of that Committee, there was no expression whatever of any regret on behalf of yourself, Sir, for having, admittedly, committed an act which was illegal, but which was done in accordance with what you believed to be the custom prevailing in this country. I had hoped that during the debate in Committee some such explanation would have been given, and some such expression made, as would have satisfied those who are interested in this matter, and the incident would have been allowed to drop. But such was not the case. On the contrary, hon. members in debating this matter went so far as to justify what had been done. One member, Sir, said, speaking of the act as a transgression of the law, or against an Order in Council that "To his mind, it was not a transgression, and that he hoped that the hon. member would continue to do the self same thing." That, to me, is a sufficient justification for me to go on record in saying that I do not approve of members of this Legislature violating Orders in Council, or laws that have been duly passed by this Legislature. Had hon. members taken a different view of this matter, I am sure that the incident would have closed, and that we would not be placing upon our records the resolution which has now been proposed. It is a most regrettable incident—and the more regrettable because of the fact that hon. members have taken the view that they have, instead of admitting that something was done which should not have been done, and expressing the hope that such a practice would not continue. Hon. members seem to distinguish between a member living right in his constituency and a member who is not so happily surrounded. I don't see any distinction, and I think that it would have been more in keeping with the honour and dignity of the members of this House if they had strengthened rather than weakened the hands of the member who is living amongst his constituents, and made it clearly known to the constituents that the member for the district has no right whatever to directly handle Government moneys. Now, I take exception to the observations which were made when it was said by the hon. member for Fortune, I think, when he admitted having committed similar offences not only seventy times seven, but five hundred and seventy times seven, and when he said that he had, whilst visiting his district, promised the expenditure of certain moneys, and had when he came down to St. John's authorized such expenditure. Now, I don't know yet that a member of this House has the right to authorize the expenditure of money in this way.

MR. F. J. MORRIS—Mr. Speaker: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is now quoting to the House a speech made by an hon. member in Committee whilst dealing with the subject matter of the report now presented to this House. The member whose speech the hon. member is now quoting from, should have the right to reply if the hon. member is given the right to quote his speech. The report of the proceedings of the Committee is now before the House. The motion submitted by the Leader of the Opposition was properly submitted by him, and being a motion in the House it requires

to be seconded; but I submit my learned friend, the member for Twillingate, Mr. Clift, is out of order, when, whilst seconding the motion, he quotes to the House a speech delivered by an hon. member whilst in Committee.

MR. SPEAKER—Does the hon. member from Twillingate quote from proceedings whilst the House was in Committee when he addressed the House?

MR. CLIFT—I am quoting remarks that were made by members of this House when in Committee, in justification of the reason for which I second the motion. I rise to second a motion made by the Leader of the Opposition, and in seconding that motion I am giving my reasons for seconding it.

MR. SPEAKER—The hon. member must not quote at any time any of the remarks made in Committee, whilst addressing the Chair.

MR. CLIFT—Then I submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time I cannot admit that your ruling is correct. I shall content myself with seconding the motion. My only object in quoting what I had heard in Committee was for the purpose of making it known to the House why I was seconding this proposition.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—From being an up-holder of the law, you become a castaway yourself.

MR. LLOYD—I may point out that I am quite willing to withdraw the motion and I daresay my hon. and learned friend is willing to allow it, so that the Speaker may have the opportunity of closing the matter.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have already pointed out that I regard the statement made by the Speaker as everything to be desired by the House and in fact ———

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker: I rise to a point of order. The Rt. Hon. the Leader of the House is stating something that was said whilst the House was in Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am merely replying to the Leader of the Opposition ——

MR. LLOYD—As by reference to what you yourself said in Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am saying it now de novo.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: I ask for a ruling.

MR. CLIFT—Oh no, he will not do that.

THE SPEAKER—Will the hon. member for Twilingate please repeat what he said.

MR. CLIFT—I said: "Oh no, he will not do that."

THE SPEAKER—Will the hon. gentleman please explain what he meant.

MR. CLIFT—Mr. Speaker: I will not explain what I meant.

THE SPEAKER—I shall take notice that the hon. member remarks that he will not explain. I simply ask for an explanation from him. I do not regard the remark as unobjectionable. I would like to have a statement from the hon. member.

MR. CLIFT—I simply meant that I do not think you would make a ruling that would be contrary to the position taken by the Premier.

THE SPEAKER—In other words, that I would mete out one kind of treatment to the Opposition and another kind to the Premier?

MR. CLIFT—No. I did not mean that, I meant I did not think you would make such a ruling in this particular case. I was not speaking generally.

THE SPEAKER—The amendment proposed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is now in Order.

MR. LLOYD—I move the amendment. I also pointed out that it is quite possible to get it withdrawn.

THE SPEAKER—The statement which I made in Committee I need not amplify, for I think it covers all the hon. leader requires.

MR. LLOYD—I am sorry I cannot regard it so.

The Resolution was put; whereupon the House divided, and there appeared in favour of the Resolution: Messrs. Lloyd, Clift, Clapp, Dwyer, Hickman, Grimes, Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, (12); and against it, Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance, Emerson, Crosbie; Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Devereaux, Downey, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Moore, Parsons, Le Feuvre, Currie, Higgins, Young, Walsh, (18). So it passed in the negative and was ordered accordingly.

On motion the Report of the Committee was adopted.

MUNICIPAL COUNCIL BILL.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER presented the following Report:

House of Assembly,
St. John's, Nfld.,
April 26, 1916.

The Joint Select Committee appointed by the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly, to whom was referred the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws in Relation to the Municipal Affairs of St. John's," beg to report that they have had under consideration the provisions of the said Bill, but owing to the early closing of the present session and owing to the necessity of a careful consideration in detail of the various provisions of the Bill, your Committee considers that it is not desirable to attempt to report upon the Bill for adoption during the present session. Your Committee therefore requests:—

(1) That permission be given them to continue their deliberations after the closing of the present session, and until the next meeting of the Legislature.

(2) That a temporary Bill be passed at the present session under which an election may be held in the coming month of June, and that under the said Bill the Council be elected only for a term of two years.

(3) That during the sittings of the Joint Select Committee, an opportunity be afforded, from time to time as may be desired by the Citizens' Committee, as well as the City Commissioners, to lay before the Joint Select Committee any representations they may desire to make in relation to Municipal affairs.

(4) That an election be held in the last week of September, 1916, affording the rate-payers of St. John's an opportunity by plebiscite to vote on the question as to whether the Ward System, in relation to the election of City Councillors, should be adopted in all future elections.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed)

E. P. MORRIS
J. R. BENNETT
M. P. CASHIN
W. F. COAKER
W. F. LLOYD
J. A. CLIFT
(with reservations)
J. DWYER
W. J. HIGGINS
M. J. KENNEDY
S. D. BLANDFORD
S. MILLEY
JOHN HARVEY
MICHAEL POWER
R. K. BISHOP
JAMES ANGEL
M. P. GIBBS
J. ALEX. ROBINSON
(with one reservation)

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 Consolidate the Law Relating to Inflammable Substances," without amendment.

MOVING PICTURE CENSORSHIP BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. the

Prime Minister, the Bill entitled: 'An Act to Regulate the Censorship of Moving Pictures,' was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. Stone asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if the Governor in Council appointed Dominy to Port aux Basques and Captain Marshall to a position in the Customs Service; if not, by whom were they appointed.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker: In reply to Mr. Stone's question I may say that Mr. Dominy and Captain Marshall have not been appointed by the Governor in Council. On enquiry from the Minister I find that last summer representations were made by Inspector O'Reilly that certain irregularities were occurring in Port aux Basques in reference to the Customs, and it was desirable that a Customs official be sent there to assist those that were then in charge of the work. The work had largely increased, and there was not sufficient help, and the Minister sent Mr. Dominy as a temporary appointment. That is as I learned. Captain Marshall is acting only in the Statistical Department in place of a young man named Noonan who has volunteered.

MR. COAKER—May I ask if the appointee at Port aux Basques—Mr. Dominy—is also acting, in view of the Governor in Council not having appointed him?

EDUCATION BILL.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Both officials are acting—both Mr. Dominy and Captain Marshall.

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 and Cosolidate the Law relating to Education," were read a second time.

MR. LLOYD.—As far as I am concerned I shall accept all the amendments except the last, forbidding children under 12 from entering for examinations, which is perfectly absurd and ought to be stricken out.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I quite agree with the hon. member. If there is any work for which the Council of Higher Education was appointed, surely this would be it.

The amendments were concurred in with the exception of the amendment to Section 33 and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council so informing that body.

TRAWL FISHERY BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill entitled: "An Act for the Protection of Persons Engaged in Trawl Fishing," were read a second time.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I may say that the amendments to this Bill are very slight. I will just read them. As regards section 9 I may say that there is no reasonable probability that the surplus of the fund will ever amount to $25,990, and if it did it might be better to increase the amount of insurance paid than reduce the premium from fifty to twenty-five cents. In talking over these sections with the Law Clerk I have seen that the changes are merely verbal the word "fine" being used instead of penalty. The power is also given to hand money from the Crown to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The amendments were concurred in and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting them that the House had concurred in the said amendments.

SAWMILLS BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill

entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 4 George V. Cap. 17 entitled "An Act respecting the Operation of Saw Mills," was read a second time.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—In moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to point out that the amendments are introduced merely to exempt from the payment of royalties the lumber manufactured and cut on private property. Cases occur from time to time in the Department where parties complain that they are not bound to pay royalties, for the reason that the timber cut was cut on private property, and under the law they are not subject to royalties.

Section 2 is merely to give the Governor in Council power by proclamation to reserve timber lands other than property for milling purposes. Now it is proposed to broaden out the provision in the Act of 1914, so that the reservation if desirable may be made in the interest of the whole country, for fishery purposes or any other purpose that may occur, so that the Governor in Council may be able to reserve portions of public land upon which there will be no cutting whatever. It is made entirely in the interests of the fishermen of the country.

MR. LLOYD.—I do not remember that part of this Act, so I am speaking subject to correction. I assume this Act refers to all saw mills and that the intention of the amendments is to exempt from payment of royalties a certain class of property called here "private property." As far as I know these words have no specific meaning. Is there any definition of them.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I do not think there is any definition, but it is a well recognized thing. It would arise when a man owns the land in fee simple, and his right there is clearly defined.

MR. LLOYD—I think you had better deal with this matter in Committee.

It was ordered that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL.

Pursuant to order, the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs moved that the Bill: "An Act to Amend the Law respecting the Exportation of Timber" be read a second time.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker: I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. In 1914 we passed an Act dealing with the Exportation of Timber which we amended last year, and which we now propose to further amend.

Section 1, sub-section 4 reads:

1.—Section 4 of the Act 5 George V., Cap. 7, entitled: "An Act respecting the Exportation of Timber," as amended by Sec-2 of the Act 6, George V., Cap. 14, is hereby repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:

(4) Anything in any Act contained to the contrary notwithstanding, it shall be lawful for any person to export, on the usual export entry, to any place in the United Kingdom or in the Republic of France, any timber or lumber for pit props, cut before the 31st day of December, 1917, or before the expiration of six months from the date on which His Majesty shall cause a Proclamation or Proclamations to issue, declaring that a state of war no longer exists between His Majesty and the countries with which hostilities are at present pending, "whichever period shall be shorter."

Provided that such person shall satisfy the Customs Officer to whom he makes application for export entry that such timber or lumber was not cut on any part of that territory or area upon which the cutting of timber for such purposes shall under the provisions of any Act have been prohibited by the Governor in Council or, if such timber or lumber was cut on the said area known as the three-mile limit, that such timber or lumber was burnt timber when cut.

We have inserted in this Section after the word pit-props, the following words: "Cut before the 31st day of December, 1917, or before" the expiration, etc., and after the word pending, at the end of this Section we have added the words: "whichever period shall be shorter."

After the passing of the Act as amended last year, representations were made to the Government late in the Fall that a certain number of people, particularly Northern people, had done very little at the fishery and would be in great need during the winter. Representations were made, not alone to the Government, but a certain section of the Press circulated this report, which was, no doubt, a true report, throughout the country, so the Government, acting on the representations and reports given out, decided by a Minute of Council to permit the cutting of green timber on the area known as the "Three Mile Limit." The amendment which I have just referred to, covers the extreme limit which the Government is prepared to go with regard to exportation of pit-props cut on this area. There is no specific date set, as there is no possibility of the war terminating within a few months, therefore, we have fixed it to be regulated six months after the declaration of peace.

Last year the purchasers of pit-props placed their own price on them. In many cases the men do not get a living wage, some did not earn more than fifty cents a day last winter. I propose to introduce an amendment to remedy this. Section 3 as amended reads:

3.—The Governor in Council shall after the passing of this Act appoint a Board consisting of five members who shall serve without pay or reward, and of whom a majority shall be a quorum. Such Board shall be known as the "Timber Exportation Board."

and Section 4:

4.—The duties of the said Board shall be to fix from time to time for different localities in this Colony, a minimum price per cord to the cutter, which shall not be less than Five Dollars per cord for unrinded wood, nor Six Dollars per cord for rinded wood, on the bank, below which price it shall be unlawful for any person to purchase any timber or lumber for pit-props intended to be exported from this Colony. Men employed on wages cutting pit-props shall be paid at a rate of not less Thirty Dollars per month with board and lodging.

The reason for Section 3 is quite apparent. The Commission to be appointed under this Section will consist of five men who will enquire into existing conditions at the several localities where pit-props are being prepared, and find whether they are being cut close to the water, or if they have to be conveyed long distances, such as three or four miles inland. We are aware that many have not been paid anything like what the

value of their labour called for. A man who is being paid at the rate of $2.75 or $3.00 or even $4.00 per cord for pit-props on the bank is not being paid sufficient for them, and this matter will be dealt with later in Committee. I am confident those amendments will meet with the approval of the House, therefore, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. COAKER—Might I ask in respect to Sections 1 and 4, if any petitions were received asking for these amendments?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Representation was made by the Imperial Government in regard to Section 1. It has been tabled. Representation was made last year to the Government that a certain number of fishermen up North would be in very poor circumstances. I think this is correct, and I think the Government did the correct thing in permitting the fishermen to cut on the Three Mile Limit. This I think was set forth in the paper, which was controlled by the hon. gentleman who represents Twillingate. I think that paper stated that the people up North were starving.

MR. COAKER—The hon. gentleman was right in his quotation in this respect but the paper did not ask that green timber be cut on the Three Mile Limit. I may say that it was never supposed that the Government would adopt such a course.

MR. CLIFT—Might I ask the Minister if he will table the copy of the representations made to the Government asking for the right to cut timber on the Three Mile Limit.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—They have been tabled.

The motion for the second readaing was then put; whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the motion: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance, Crosbie, Emerson, Ministers of Marine and Fisheries, and Public Works, Messrs. Devereaux, Downey, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Moore, Parsons, LeFeuvre, Currie Higgins, Young, Walsh, (18), and against it Messrs. Lloyd, Clift, Clapp, Dwyer, Hickman, Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Grimes, (12). So it passed in the affirmative.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

PROHIBITION BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture, and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors," was read a second time and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

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

RE TREATMENT NAVAL RESERVISTS.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Government the fact that Naval Reservists travelling across country have been compelled to go second class, and Volunteers travelling through on the same train have gone in Sleeping Cars. I have received communications to this effect some days ago. I do not know if this is the case officially, but I have received letters from people along the line at various stations. Some action ought to be taken by someone in authority to see that all are treated alike, as this will interfere considerably with enlisting, if people think that any discrimina tion is made. I hope that this matter will receive attention.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I may say in reply to the remarks of the hon. member that I was unaware that any such case had occured, but I shall have an inquiry made and full information will be given next sitting. The men that came in the Sleeper were invalided volunteers under the care of a Doctor. I may say under full charge of Dr. Paterson. We have no control over the Naval Reservists, they are controlled directly by the Admiralty. However, I will draw the attention of the Admiralty to this fact. If upon examination it is found that any discrimination has occured, it will be remedied. The Naval Reservists may have been men returning home after the expiration of their term as private passengers.

MR. COAKER—Of course, these Naval Reservists should receive every attention as far as possible. They have risked their lives in the service of their country, and the Government ought to recognize them. However, I have no doubt that to-morrow we will have a satisfactory explanation.

MR. CLIFT—In reference, Mr. Speaker to your recent ruling to which I took exception, I beg to say that upon re-consideration I concur with your ruling, and regret my mistake.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 27th.

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

PETITIONS.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Speaker: I have been asked to present a petition from the licensed liquor dealers of this city, asking for an extension of time to close up their businesses for one year after January 1st, 1917. I have no desire to make any lengthy comment in relation to the petition. The question of Prohibition has been decided by the country, and there can be no doubt but that the desires of the citizens have been met in that connection. But sir, even those who fought the hardest to carry this measure that has placed this law on the Statute Books of the country, never I am sure, contemplated persecuting any particular section of the country. I am quite sure that the citizens, this House itself and the country never contemplated that people such as are described here would be unfairly dealt with. They merely ask for an extension of time in order that their property may realize more nearly normal values in view of the law which is to be enforced. They ask then for an extension of time, and pray that the House and the Government will give their request their consideration. They would point out the great difficulty of starting out in another business now with the exceedingly high prices that prevail, and the difficulties which would present themselves in the way of importing goods. Under these circumstances, I ask the Government and the House to accept this petition and have it referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary, so that this matter may be considered.

QUESTIONS.

MR. HALFYARD gave notice of question.

MR. GRIMES gave notice of question.

MR. STONE called the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to his question of April 12th, and also the Minister of Public Works to one of April 26th, unanswered.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES promised to table the information as soon as it reached his office.

RULINGS OF SPEAKER.

MR. SPEAKER at the request of the Minister of Marine gave his ruling on questions, quoting May's Parlia-

mentary Practice, page 252, as follows:

A Question fully answered whether orally or in print, cannot be renewed, nor can a question which one Minister has refused to answer be addressed to another Minister.

Questions are to be asked and answered without debate or comment.

A Question has been refused a reply because it referred to a matter of opinion.

A hypothetical question is out of order.

A question should not be ironical or convey an imputation.

A question is out of order which impugns the accuracy of certain information conveyed to the House by the Ministry.

No question is in order which affects the character or conduct of a member.

MR. LLOYD—May I point out to the Speaker in reference to the matter of questions, that his ruling does not cover the point raised. That is his ruling about information tabled during the session, but the question is, does this also cover information conveyed to this House already at an earlier session.

MR. SPEAKER—I should say that it covers questions already asked during this Parliament.

MR. LLOYD—Another ruling I would like the Speaker to look into and that is in reference to a question which has been answered in writing. I understand from the ruling that it is not open for a member to ask for further information in that connection when that answer is given. I would ask the Speaker to look into this matter, for it is not to my memory so provided in the Parliamentary Practice.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker: Might I have the references for this ruling?

MR. SPEAKER—May's Parliamentary Practice, 11th Edition, page 252.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman, according to the figures submitted by the Minister of Finance and Customs, the public debt of the Colony at the end of last June amounted to $30,214,-323.63. This includes $1,033,865.00 of war loans and $960,000 of special loans from the Bank of Montreal—$460,000 authorized in previous sessions and $500,000 to cover last year's deficit. I presume that is correct?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes.

MR. COAKER—Because the Auditor-General's report, in speaking about the debt of the Colony, put it at $32,-414,678.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—He is including the Municipal loans.

MR. COAKER—Well, isn't that a debt?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—We call one the net debt and the other the gross debt. The gross debt includes the debt of the city.

MR. COAKER—You don't refer to it as the net debt. However, there is a city debt which to all intents and purposes the Colony is responsible for, because if the city ever goes back on its interest payments the Colony will be called upon to pay the principle. There has been trouble in the past in regard to that matter. In the meantime I don't want to confound the two debts. I simply want a clear statement of what the total debt really is. According to your statement the net debt is $30,214,323, where the gross debt is $32,414,617.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is right.

MR. COAKER—Now, I think, a statement has been made here this session that in November last a new loan of $1,000,000 was taken up. There has been no statement with regard to war loans submitted to the House this session.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—A statement has been tabled. It was in the hands of the Committee. I think it was asked for by Dr. Lloyd and was tabled some time ago.

MR. COAKER—I asked for the information, but I did not see it tabled.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It was tabled alright.

MR. COAKER—Well, the first million that you received was spent. The second million was asked for and received last November. How much of that second million has been spent?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—$500,000.

MR. COAKER—That means that one and a half million dollars have been spent in connection with the war. If that is so and we have got to place another fifteen hundred or two thousand men in the field, and these men go on active service for another twelve or eighteen months, it will mean at least another million and a half or more, which will make a total of $3,000,000 expenditure. Now, I want as near as possible to fix the amount of the debt that the Colony will have incurred when our present obligations are paid. We have an obligation in connection with the railways. We have already authorized the raising of a loan of $2,000,000 of which amount we have received $1,000,000 as a temporary loan from the Banks in London, and there is a balance of $1,000,000 still to raise on account of that loan .The railways have yet to be finished and it will cost another two millions to complete them in accordance with the contract entered into with the Reid Newfoundland Co., in addition to the loans already authorized by this House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It will not cost half a million.

MR. COAKER—Do you intend to build a line to Bonne Bay?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—What has been authorized will cost about half a million dollars to finish. I cannot give details now because that would be showing our case to the Contractors, but I have no objection to showing the hon. member a statement prepared by the Government Engineer in relation to this matter.

MR. COAKER—Isn't the Premier prepared to state whether the Bonne Bay railway is to be built?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—At the present time nothing is being done, because we have no money. I can only give the hon. member information that he is already aware of —that a contract has been entered into to build a railway to Bonne Bay.

MR. LLOYD—We are under an obligation to build the railway.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Precisely.

MR. COAKER—And will half a million dollars cover the whole thing?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I would like to examine the statement before I answer on that point. As I said before, I caused a statement to be prepared by the Government Engineer within the last four or five months.

MR. COAKER—But you will be prepared to make a statement before we close?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I will be prepared to show you the statement prepared by the Government Engineer.

MR. COAKER—While Ways and Means is before the House.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. LLOYD—You are referring now, I take it, to outstanding obligations, not to contractual obligations?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In relation to everything.

MR. LLOYD—What about Fortune Bay?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Fortune Bay, too.

MR. COAKER—I am sure it will give us great pleasure to know; and as far as Bonne Bay is concerned, the hon. member for St. Barbe will be delighted to know that his district is to be sacrificed on behalf of the Colony.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. The only point I want to make clear is this: The hon. member was going on to say that it would cost $2,000,000 to complete our obligations under the branch railway contract. Now, I don't think it is in the interest of the Colony to make a statement like that. He must know that it is not a fact.

MR. COAKER—Do you think that the Reid Newfoundland Co. would send you a bill for $2,000,000 without having something to show for it?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I don't know what they might do. But will the hon. member give us an idea cf how he arrives at that $2,000,000?

MR. COAKER—The estimate that was made when the contract was entered into was $4,000,000, and according to what has been expended since I would not be surprised to find that two million dollars more will be asked for; but if you can show us that half a million dollars more will complete all our obligations under the contract, we shall certainly be very glad to hear it. For my part, I will be very glad if we can get out of the difficulties with the Reid Newfoundland Co., caused by the obligations entered into in connection with the building of the branch railways by the authorization of another half-million dollar loan. But that won't alter the fact that as far as the law goes at the present time, the Reids have the right to insist that we shall build the Bonne Bay line, and if they do insist upon it, according to my estimate our obligations under that branch railways contract will not be four million dollars, as was contemplated when the matter was first brought before this House, but something like ten million dollars. We have already raised six million dollars, and authorized two million dollars of which one has been raised and one is to be raised; so that I won't be very much out if the Bonne Bay line is to be constructed and completed according to contract. If that is so, we shall have to raise at the termination of the war three million dollars for war expenditure; two million dollars that have not yet been authorized to complete the railways in addition to the $1,000,000 that has been authorized but not yet raised, making a total of three million dollars for railway expenditure.

This will mean that when we have met our present obligations the public debt of the Colony will amount to $38,414,000. There is another million, of course, to be raised to pay off the temporary loan to the Bank of Montreal, but that has already been included in the debt of the Colony as explained by the Minister's statement tabled when he delivered his Budget. The amount of six million dollars will have to be raised at the end of the war in addition to the two million dollars on the Railway Loan authorized in 1914, in order to meet all our obligations. I don't know who is going to have the opportunity—it will not be a privilege—of raising that amount of money. I almost wish that the Rt. Hon. Premier himself would be the one that will

have to go to London to settle this account.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I would not have any difficulty at all. In fact, I think I might almost go as far as to say that you would get it.

MR. LLOYD—You did not get it in 1914 you remember.

MR. COAKER—I can state to the Premier that I have this much faith, that we could go to the States and raise five million dollars very easily for the Colony if we were prepared to pay 5 per cent. for the loan. I do not think we would find any difficulty at all in raising that amount in the New York markets.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Why could we not raise it in London or in Canada—our credit is just as good there?

MR. COAKER—Now, the Minister has explained in his Budget that he intends to collect from the people of this country next year—1916-1917—the sum of $4,160,000. In other words, that our people are going to pay into the Treasury of this country for that year $4,160,000. Now, that is quite a lot of money to raise from 240,000 or 250,000 people. In 1897, when the Whiteway Party went out of power, they ran the country for the amount of money that we have to raise this year to pay the interest on the debt of the Colony—$1,400,000. The whole obligations of the country in 1897, when the Whiteway Party went out of power, was covered by a revenue of the same amount that we now have to find in order to pay the interest on the debt of the Colony; and during that administration the railway was built across the country to Port aux Basques. During the present administration a few branch railways have been built, but the difference between the expenditure then and now—between $1,400,000 and 4,160,000—is so very great, that we are tempted to ask: What are you doing with the difference? What is the country paying for? What benefits have been derived from the tremendous increase in expenditure since 1897? What are you giving the people for the $4,160,000 that you are taking from them this year? I know that they are going to have so much for roads and lighthouses, for carrying on the Civil Service, for education and for poor relief. That is alright, but they have been getting these things for many years. What are you going to give them in addition? Are you going to do anything extra for the people? Are you going to do anything that will help them to live better, to catch more fish, to get a better price for their fish?

We have not heard a sound about any suggestion that the Government intends to spend any of this vast amout to supply the fishermen with a cold storage system that might give them a chance to catch 250,000 qtls. of fish more. We have heard nothing about that. One of the most serious problems that this country has to face today is the question of the shortage of bait, and yet we have heard nothing from the Government to show that they are taking this matter seriously, or that they intend to grapple with the situation and thus help the fishermen to make two ends meet and keep the Colony's head above water. If we were to spend a sum of money for the construction of Cold Storage plants, so that the fishermen could get a supply of bait in the fall of the year, when they want it so badly and cannot get it, they could easily add 250,000 quintals that would be $1,500,000 that the people could secure easily in addition to their present earnings, if we had a Government which was awake to its opportunities. Then, we have heard nothing whatever about any intention, or desire even, to reduce the taxes placed on

the fishermen last year—actually upon the fishing industry. I refer to the tax on motor engines, and the gasoline and kerosene to operate those engines. No one can have two opinions about that tax which was placed on the fishing industry last year. I am surprised to find, in view of the revenue that it is expected to collect this year—far exceeding that of last year—that nothing has been done in the way of reducing this tax, so as to enable the fishermen to do their best so as to get all the fish possible during the coming year. Now, I want to tell you that because of this tax many a motor boat that is owned in this country won't be operated continually this year.

The owners will have to let them remain at the wharves because of the high cost of operating. Before this tax was put on, kerosene could be secured for 14 cents a gallon today it is 23 cents, and the probabilities are that it will advance another cent or more. Gasoline, before this tax was put on, cost the fishermen 27 cents; today, selling at wholesale rates, it is 48 cents. And yet no attempt has been made to even reduce the tax of 6½ cents on this article, or to even take a part of it off. You are going to cripple the fishing industry; you are going to compel many a man who owns a motor boat to keep it tied up instead of using it, because he is not able to purchase the necessary fuel to operate it. Another thing that is very remarkable is this. We have had no suggestion at all that the Government intends to seriously consider the suggestion so often made here of sending men abroad—agents—with a view to the developing of the fish markets. I know that an effort was made a year or two ago to send Mr. Moulton away to see if anything could be done with regard to extending the markets in South America. Mr. Moulton, I understand, got as far as New York, and then he had to end his journey and return home. The reason for this action on his part has never been explained, and personally I have no idea as to what was at the bottom of the trouble that caused him to return instead of proceeding after he had left here with instructions and with authority to go on to South America in order to secure for us information in regard to the markets there.

This is a very serious matter. It has been brought up here time after time, and has been advocated by both sides of the House and yet the Government is not making any effort whatever in this direction—they have not even expressed a desire to do such a thing if we had the means. It seems that nothing whatever is done to assist the people and the country. It is only a question of raising the revenue and spending it. No constructive ability has been shown with regard to the management of affairs in such a way as to help the fishing industry—to assist the people to catch more fish and to sell it, to keep up the price, or to do anything that will in any way benefit the fishermen of the country. One of the things that might have been done at very little expense would have been the despatch of two or three men to the markets in South America or even in Europe to study conditions and see whether there was any possibility of extending the sales of fish. We remember that in 1908 the Premier, in his Manifesto, claimed that there were so many millions of people in Central and South America that did not get the chance to eat a fish, and he promised that as soon as he came into power he would have men despatched to those countries in order to open up markets here; but nothing has been done, except the attempt to send Mr. Moulton away. And by the

way, I should like to have an explanation of why Mr. Moulton did not complete his mission—why he ended his journey at New York instead of going on to South America as he was intended to do.

Another matter that was urged by the Premier, and that I am sorry nothing has been said about, is that of Night Schools. Now, this matter is one of such serious importance that we ought to have some definite statement as to what the Government intends to do with regard to it. Does the Government intend to leave everything until 1917, and then open their wings again and fly away with suggestios of the wonderful things that they are going to do during the next four years? I wonder whether they are going to adopt that plan again. I hope not, because I might inform them that the people are not to be caught by that sort of thing any longer. It might have succeeded in the past, but it is not going to do so any longer. It looks as if that was what the Government intends to do, however, They will probably come in here next year with a vote for $25,000 for Night Schools and say: "This is one of the things that we promised when we came into power, and now we are going to carry out our promise; we are sorry that the war intervened and made it impossible for us to do anything before, but now the land is flowing with milk and honey again and we hasten to perform our promises. In 1909 the F.P.U. approached the Government in this matter, and here is what they said:

"This Union is of the opinion that a mistake was made when the Government at the last session of the legislature passed an additional grant of $20,000 as a bonus for teachers. Under existing circumstances, we do not oppose the increase in this grant for education, we appreciate the increased vote, but we object to having $20,000 added to the bonus paid to teachers for daily services, as we are of the opinion that the bonus previously paid and the salaries, many of them received, well compensated them for the time they gave to teaching. They work but 210 days out of 365 and then for only about 5 hours each day, if the payments for such services were inadequate, then any lively teacher should have been enabled to supplement his income by opening a night school three hours for five nights each week for six months of the year, and this $20,000 vote allocated to pay a decent bonus to such teachers. One school in each settlement would be sufficient and all the teachers in a settlement who wished to receive the Government bonus should instruct in the one school, the higher or oldest teacher taking charge and the school purely undenominational. An extra bonus should be paid teachers who give instructions in navigation. The schools should open 1st November and close 1st May. There is a general demand nowadays for night schools all over the country, young men who left school with very little education, and more who never had the privilege of attending a school now realize what the want of education means, and would never forget a Government who placed night schools at their disposal. This $20,000 grant should not be expended for day teacher bonuses but should at the next session of the Legislature be withdrawn and given for night teachers' bonus, and if necessary increased to $25,000.

"The Grant for small places is still much too small. We would rejoice to find the government increase this vote by another $10,000. It is the smaller places that should be attended to now, for if the larger places lack education, it is the fault of the people and not the grants. The smaller places must not be permitted to remain in

ignorance, while their fellow fishermen at the largest settlements are provided with a fair education. The one black mark in education will be removed just as soon as the grant for smaller places is increased sufficient to place a teacher twelve months at places containing 20 schoolable children. Some system should be adopted by the Legislature to permit the co-operation of all denominations in the smaller places, or at least where a permanent school cannot be maintained unless by uniting grants. The fees should also be abolished. While fees are collected many a child will suffer for want of education. We strongly urge the Government to give us free schools, and with free schools we pray that compulsory attendance will be coupled. Schools should be open wherever 20 children reside. They should be free from the payment of any fee, and children over 7 years should be forced by law to attend schools until they pass the 5th Standard, or reach the age of 14 years. Compulsory attendance will be supported and aided by this Union with all its strength. No safer steps could be introduced for the fishermen's welfare. The attendance should cover at least 7 months out of the 12. All children should attend school from 1st. November till 1st May, the remaining months should be optional with parents. The time is ripe for the introduction of this system, almost every civilized country has adopted it, if it benefits the people of those countries it will also benefit ours. We pray that compulsory education be introduced at the next session of the Legislature ,and we predict a ready welcome of the system by the fishermen."

Now, that was contained in a Memorial that was sent the Government in 1909, and it is with great regret that I have to say that 1916 is now with us and as yet no effort has been made to meet the needs of the people in this direction in the outports—because in St. John's a man has plenty of facilities for educating himself. There are men here who have volunteered to teach Night Schools and they are doing splendid work ;but in the outports the old order has been allowed to run on and no attempt has been made to help the young man who was compelled to leave school while he was still very young in order to help his father to make a living.

I notice in looking over the Estimates that the salary voted T.R. McGrath in the Customs was increased from $800 to $1,100—the additional $300 being intended to cover amounts that were formerly received in the way of fees. Now, I am given to understand that there are lots of fees in connection with that Department that do not find their way into the Treasury. I would like to know whether any rule has been made in this connection and whether officials can now hold or claim the fees that formerly were held by them? Was there not some rule or order made here under which these fees were supposed to be paid into the Treasury? I would like to have some information with regard to that. Also, it is stated that Mr. H. W. LeMessurier receives quite a lot of fees for clearing vessels after hours. I would like to know whether that is justifiable, and if these fees are due to the Treasury let us get them. If not let all understand large fees go to Mr. LeMessurier and Mr. McGrath in the Custom House, but to whom should they go? The Minister should inform us as to whether the fees should be held by the persons receiving them. The Minister seemed very glad, when he advertised the fact that $1,000,000 had been added to the earnings of the people during the past year. He seemed to think

that because one million was added to the earnings of the people, that great credit was due to the Government. That this is the case just because the present Government is in power. I would ask now whether the Government had any part in raising this amount by one million dollars. I know they didn't. It is alright to make a statement, but why claim the credit? They contributed nothing towards it, and still come here claiming all the credit.

A great deal has been said, too, about the increase in the revenue, and even credit has been claimed by the Government in that respect. The Government claims itself the cause of this increase, and it is spread abroad to prove the splendid manner in which the public affairs of this country have been carried on by the present Government. Of course the Minister did confess that some of the increase was due to the increase in the price of foods. Of course the increase is largely due to this increase. It means that taxes are getting higher day by day, and it all shows what a rotten system this ad valorem tax is. We have to pay in England $2 for what could be got there for $1 before the war, and so the Government gets the duty on the extra dollar. It all comes in in the shape of Customs returns, and so the Minister claims it. What he ought to do is to give us cheaper goods, or try to, instead of blowing over this increase in price. All goods received now cost from 30 to 50 per cent. more than they did before the war, and for this reason I think the merchants here will have to be very careful, because after the war they will find themselves compelled to mark down their prices some forty or fifty per cent. to compete with the low prices. I think our merchants are watching out for this, and accordingly are getting only those things which are necessary. They are as far as possible not making excessive imports, but it is impossible to gauge it accurately, and trouble will probably ensue.

Now I wish to draw the attention of the Minister and the committee to a very serious matter in connection with the payment of bounties on vessels last year. A few months ago, in 1908, a law was passed to provide aid for the encouragement of building schooners, and certain rules were laid down as well as amounts to be paid. Every vessel had to fulfil certain conditions. I am very sorry I have to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that a vessel that he had registered in his name has been surveyed by the surveyor, and that a bounty of $8 per ton was authorized. All the gear on that vessel was not new, as provided by the Act. Now I do not blame the Minister for having anything to do with this matter, so far as getting this money is concerned, because I find that the surveyor has given a certificeived a bounty of $8 instead of $5 per ton, and that this money has been paid over. What I do say is that this ship did not come within the section that provides a bonus of $8. She recate that the ship should get $8 per ton. I call this to the attention of the House in Committee and trust some explanation will be given me.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct some of the statements made by the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Coaker, who in his speech in criticism of the Budget, has attempted to misrepresent matters in connection with our Public Debt.

The gross Public Debt of the Colony to the 30th June, 1915, is $32,414,-678.45, the War Loan of $1,010,113.18 being included in this amount. The net Public Debt, as shown in the Estimates tabled by me, is $30,214,332.63.

The hon. gentleman is $1,000,000.00 out in his calculations. There is no reason why he should be incorrect,as the full statement was tabled this session, and I feel sure the hon. gentleman will admit the correct figures. Hon. gentlemen opposite would like to have from me a statement of the amount of money required for completion of railway branches now under construction These figures will be tabled by the Rt. Hon. the Premier, as he has assured the House he would do so in a few days. We will probably have them to-morrow. The hon. gentleman has not criticised the Budget, but has forecasted our future position. I trust the hon. gentleman's prophesies will prove as false as all that he has spoken and written about this Colony and all connected with this Colony for the past eighteen months.

The hon. gentleman has asked a question in reference to the Clerk to the Registrar of Shipping, Mr. McGrath. I would inform him that Mr. T. R. McGrath, who acts in this capacity, has been engaged at $1,000 salary, and all fees are to go to the Treasury.

The Assistant Collector, Mr. LeMessurier, receives certain amounts for clearing vessels after hours. If a ship is ready for sea after the regular hours for clearing, and the owners are anxious that she be hurriedly dispatched, Mr. LeMessurier will go to his office and clear the vessel. This is apart from his regular duties, and he is paid $1.00 or $2.00 for clearing. This amount goes to the Assistant Collector. It is considered that he is entitled to this special fee for special services, and it does not come from the Government, but from those who ask and receive this privilege. As it is an overtime charge, he is fully entitled to it. The convenience afforded the trade by the steamer or other vessel sailing eight or twelve hours earlier than she otherwise could is very important, and means a good deal to the owners. The hon. gentleman took exception to the statement made by me that the earnings of the people this year exceeded their earnings last year by $1,000,000. I can tell the hon. member for Twillingate that statement is quite correct. With regard to the new markets referred to. I may say that for the past twelve months we have had no trouble about finding markets, our chief difficulty is to get fish to send to the markets already open to us, and in getting tonnage to take this fish to market. Mr. Coaker referred to a vessel certified by and registered in my name. I would inform him that this is a matter that concerns the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I have nothing whatever to do with it. I may say that I had nothing to do with regulating the survey or fixing the bounty paid. The bounty which this vessel qualified for as she stood was $5.00 per ton. Mr. Bell informed me after consultation with the Surveyor, that if certain fastenings were made and knees put in, she would be much stronger and better suited for the work which she would be engaged in,that it would cost the difference between the $5.00 and $8.00 bounty to do this, and I instructed a Shipwright to carry out the work under Mr. Bell's supervision. My desire was to have the vessel perfectly sea worthy, and in order to accomplish this, I gave instructions that the extra amount should be applied to strengthening the vessel in the manner called for in the schedule. It meant nothing to me, but it meant everything to those on the vessel, to have her as perfectly sound as any vessel that ever sailed out the Narrows. This was her condition when the extra bounty of $3.00 per ton was paid by the Fisheries Department.

With regard to the present and future prospects of this Colony and the alarming situation which the hon. member anticipates, I can assure him that our condition and our prospects were never brighter. As to the chaotic condition which will prevail after the war, well we will be ready to deal with any conditions that arise, and be ready to meet them. He has told us many things about the war, he told us it would not end for a couple of years yet. We have had all sorts of prophesies from the Opposition for the past two years. We have had statements published by the leading Opposition organ, stating what the Government had done, is doing, and will continue to do, and those statements are so utterly unreliable, that I intend, with your permission, to read some extracts to the Committee, to show the sort of stuff that is being sent broadcast, not alone to the people of this Colony, but to places outside the Colony, to be read by people who do not know the false prophet Mr. Coaker is, and may not judge him as we do as a man who sometimes tells the truth by accident.

I have taken the trouble to cull a few specimen bricks from the back fyles of the Mail and Advocate, and I am sure it will prove interesting reading to the country, as it demonstrates the utter unreliability of a man who poses as a moralist and leader of political thought to the fishermen of this Colony.

From the beginning of the war on August the 1st ,1914 Mr. Coaker has sharpened his rapier for all and sundry, and on the 8th of that month, four days after the British Empire became involved in this European life and death struggle, when Belgium was resisting with all her might the inroads of the German hordes that were desolating her country, and when our Allies were working in harmony with Britain in the defence of those Treaties which Germany had violated, when statesmen of all Allied Nations had united in an effort to support their Governments to successfully resist the German War Lords, Mr. Coaker was sitting in his easy chair churning out false and malicious statements, not only against the Government, but against the Governor, the King's representative in the Colony, as well as our commercial representatives, and Legislators.

On August 8th Mr. Coaker condemned Sir Edward Morris and his colleagues for their indifference to what he called "the financial situation of the Colony commercially and publicly, as to allow two days to pass without taking action." He went on to threaten violence, and said that unless the Government are bidding for mob rule from over three-fourths of the Colony next winter, they should immediately proceed to do all in their power to prepare for the worst year's fishery Newfoundland has ever seen. He also said: "The country can do very little now to aid the Mother Country in her tremendous struggle, but a great deal can be done and must be done to protect our toilers against starvation the coming winter." He further declared that "several business firms are now on a financial precipice and cannot see how they can escape financial destruction if they are required to meet their obligations." He went on to say: "The Government will have to act to-day, or within twenty-four hours consequences may result that will arouse the people to such an extent as to compel the Governor to dismiss the Government from office."

Hon. gentlemen will understand that these attacks upon the Premier and the Government were made at a most trying period, at the beginning of the war, when the greatest difficulties had to be met and a panic averted;

when people were naturally nervous, and the greatest anxiety was felt, this man who held a seat in this Legislature, as one of His Majesty's loyal Opposition, was, in his newspaper, the Mail and Advocate, the organ of that party, preaching mob law to embarass those who held the responsible position of advisers to His Excellency the Governor.

On the 10th without rhyme and reason, he went on to attack the Bank of Montreal, saying that "whether it is Morris, Reid, or the Bank of Montreal, each and all will receive their just deserts when we discover such is deserved." Then we have him say: "Many are asking what object the Bank of Montreal has in view. Many believe that Morris and Reid will exert but little energy in the present crisis, but let us warn them all that appeals by depositors in any bank will bring them to their senses." Here we find him encouraging a run on the Banks, and on August 11th, he charges the Government with holding back a session in order to ruin his Trading Company. We must ask ourselves is a man capable of those crazy vaporings, one in whom the people of this Colony can have confidence necessary as a Leader or fit to be entrusted with the administration of public affairs? And when we look back over that period, the idea forces itself upon us that we were fortunate in having the guiding hand of a level-headed, prudent and experienced Prime Minister to guide the Colony through such a serious crisis in her history.

On August 11th we find him threatening the Bank of Montreal, the Reids and the Premier in the same way, and charging the Government with "holding back a session in order to ruin his Trading Company".

On the 13th we again find him declaring: "The people will soon have to arouse from their slumbers and call upon His Excellency to dismiss from office the incapables now in charge of the country. That action must come sooner than some expect, for we know the universal feeling of the people strongly favors such an action." This bluster was got off to bolster up a charge that "in the hope to assassinate his Trading Company, every consideration of reason was thrust aside, and the risk of smashing a half dozen supplying firms that would have caused a greater commercial upheaval than that witnessed in 1894, was indulged in."

On August 14th he began a tirade against the Governor and the Premier for convening the first Patriotic Meeting, which he called "a political meeting"; and he declared that "yesterday citizens were furious over town when they considered what had taken place and how the Governor had been used to fool them at such a time of national peril," while he also charged that the reason for this was that we had increased the Governor's salary, he saying that "when a Governor goes so far as to pray his Government to raise his pay some $4,000, and his prayer is granted, that man's power for good becomes a thing of the past." Then listen to his opinion about the crisis that faces the Mother Country: "As for assistance to the Empire, the F.P.U. will die to a man to uphold British supremacy and crush Germany; if the need comes, 20,000 fishermen will be found ready and willing to die and uphold what their fathers fought for in days of yore. There will be no need of public meetings backed with bluff and dissipation in order to secure the aid of the Union Party or the fishermen, if the hour of trial presents itself. All will willingly die to uphold the Flag so dear to them, and so lovingly cherished by their fathers. Let England's hour of necessity come and she will find in Newfoundland 20,-

000 of the primest warriors ever born, ready to do or die. That day is yet far off, and the Colony's duty now is to put her House in order and arrange things so that in the event of the hour of necessity arising, Terra Nova's sons will be strong and healthy and prepared to meet the foe, because half-starved men will be useless as fighters. Thousands, through the failure of the fishery, will have to fight starvation, an enemy fifty times more to be dreaded than the Germans on the field of battle or on the seas." Could any one conceive of greater infamy than that of a man slandering the fair name of his country and traducing the manhood of the Colony by referring to our fishermen as half-starved men? Any one acquainted with real conditions in the outports knows that no people in any part of the world are better fed, better clothed and more comfortable than our outport planters and fishermen, and this man, Coaker, claiming the right to control those fishermen, body and soul, now claims the right to slander them in this contemptible manner. Compare conditions in Canada and the United States previous to the outbreak of the war. In January, February and March of last year and the year before, could one not see Bread Societies giving out bread and butter to relieve the poor? Why, in the City of Montreal alone there were over two thousand relieved in a day. This is a state of things unknown to us. In an archway, similar to those going down to our public wharves, the people filed in singly, and were given their relief at a certain time, they were given bread and butter or perhaps something to drink. This sort of thing went on for days and months even in the principal cities of the United States. How many Newfoundlanders were treated in this way, I should like to know. In St. John's poverty was unknown except to a chronic few. Yet, knowing these things, we have to allow such statements to be sent throughout the world. Those infamous charges have been read in Canada, the United States and in Great Britain, and leave the impression that we are nothing but a half-starved lot who are unable, because of our hunger, to aid the Empire on land or sea.

On August 15th we find Mr. Coaker at the same game, declaring that: "the Government have done nothing and are like school children asking on the street what can be done, for they have no ability and therefore are helpless to act"; and then we find these references to the Premier: "Coward that he is, liar that he is, trickster that he is, well does he realize what is in store for him when he next faces a regular session of Parliament."

On August 17th occurs this attack: "Away with such a political fraud as Sir E. P. Morris and his henchman, Governor Davidson. They care not who suffer as long as there is any hope of bolstering up their despicable conduct. From all sections of the people come in indignant condemnation of the Governor's conduct in presiding over a Morris political meeting on Wednesday night." Again he says, "the public are furious over the manner in which they were fooled by the Governor, as no one would imagine that any Governor knew his duty so badly as to allow himself to be made a catspaw of by any political trickster, even if he was a Premier for the time being." Why His Excellency the Governor should be attacked in this manner is inconceivable to any one except Coaker and his political coterie. Since the beginning of hostilities His Excellency has been untiring in his efforts to stimulate recruiting, and with the aid of Lady Davidson, has worked continually to provide comforts for those who had joined the

forces, and to aid the Patriotic Association (of which he was Chairman) to provide similar comforts for those unprovided for who were dependents of our Volunteers. What was true of the Governor was equally true of Sir Edward Morris. Both had done their utmost to fulfil a duty which they realized they owed the Empire, in encouraging recruiting, while Mr. Coaker had used every effort to prevent men joining the Colors.

Then listen to this declaration about the gentlemen who sit alongside him: "The action of the Governor in appointing Members of the Opposition Party to serve on Morris's political committee, mis-named the "Citizens' Regiment Committee," has about exasperated the people, and from all quarters come expressions of the bitterest indignation. No man representing the Opposition could decently accept an appointment on that committee. The expectation that Opposition Leaders would be parties to a plot invented by Morris to use the present position caused by war in order to bolster up the rottenest, most dishonest, false, and contemptible Government that ever ruled Newfoundland, would be to consider them pure fools and lacking in intelligence." This refers to a patriotic meeting held in the C. L. B. Hall, convened by the Governor, and all know what happened. Every man, woman and child knows what happened as a result of that meeting. The principal citizens were called together to consider what was best to be done. What has since been done it is scarcely necessary for me to state. Sub-committees were formed and recruiting started immediately. A Finance Committee was appointed, and a Recruiting Committee. All these Committees were started then, and have worked until to-day and are still working. Of course we do not expect the Member to know what was going to happen, but we all know what did happen. This is a sample of the literature that has been handed out to the people of this country by him for the past eighteen months. This is what recruiting in Newfoundland has had to fight against. This is the sort of stuff that has been handed out to the people throughout the whole Island, while other people are doing their duty as loyal British subjects. The Members of the Government, I think it can be said, have been patriotic in this respect, and have been always ready to do, and are still doing what they can to help in this great cause. At the same time this is the sort of literature that is published for an educated people to read.

Then Mr. Coaker goes on to say: "Governor Davidson is about the worst Governor the Colony has ever had, for every month shows him to be what he is. He got his $4,000 increase and his Knighthood, but Newfoundland has had its constitution trampled on. Never will Newfoundland forgive Governor Davidson for this crime against the Commonwealth; never will the people forgive the arch-traitor Morris for robbing the people of their liberties and rights secured at such a cost by their fathers sixty years ago."

On August 18th he attacks us for refusing facilities for bonds at the Custom House, and then he again invites a run on the Banks, saying: "Yesterday the first batch of outport people arrived in town and their first visit in the morning was to the bank to draw gold. At the Bank of Montreal thousands of dollars in gold were paid out, and the owners took the greater part of the money to their homes. That sort of thing will happen daily for the next four months, when two-thirds of all deposits will be withdrawn from the banks unless action is taken by our so-called Government of lunatics." Next he pro-

claims that "to realize that at this hour of the Colony's greatest need no action has been taken by the Government except to offer England 1500 men, which will cost $300,000 to fulfil, and mean greater burdens on the starving poor, must be galling to every intelligent man in the Colony, and the Premier now stands revealed in his true colors before the people as a man without ability to construct, and as a rotten stem in a serious emergency, utterly devoid of that knowledge and ability that is always perceptible in able men when trial days overcome a country."

On the 18th, however, we find him showing himself in his true colors in these words: "The offering of 1,000 Reservists and a land regiment was a mistake, as there was no real need of so doing at the time it was made. If the need arises, thousands will volunteer, but at the present time, according to the number, 20,000 offered by Canada with a population of eight millions, we would be doing as good had we offered 500 men all told. Is this to make a big show at the fishermen's expense and scoop in a few more blue ribbons for a few Government officials, or is it intended to hasten the blue ruin which the Government so strongly desire should overtake Newfoundland as a self-governing Colony. We repeat that when the need of men is apparent, Newfoundland will stand by the Mother Country and shed the blood of her bravest sons in defence of British liberties and freedom, but there was no genuine reason for offering 1500 men when 500 would well serve the same purpose."

We find him also publishing a letter on his front page wherein he glories in the fact that "while the Premier apparently succeeded in trapping Messrs. Kent and Clift into attending his meeting, he couldn't trap Dr. Lloyd and Dr. Mosdell, and although they have not openly declined to be made into tools by Morris, yet they will not act on the so-called committee." This letter goes on to assert that, "to make things worse, these wiseacres elected Governor Davidson as Chairman of the Committee, which is a sure indication of the coming failure." He also says: "No one expects the citizens' regiment to be anything but a farce, for if it could be a success, Morris would be running the whole job in order to have the credit for all the success coming, and in case of failure he will proclaim it was not his affair. It was those who ran the affair that made a mess of it."

But even more discreditable is the reference in this letter to the Naval Reserve. It reads: "One thousand naval reserve men have been offered to Britain and accepted. But where are they? There are only 600 naval Reserve men in the Colony. As things are now going on, there is no hope of securing a thousand naval men. Many of the men now on duty are disgusted to find they have been taken away from the fishery just when a few quintals of fish were to be had, for while the fishery up north was a blank, to August 5th, some places have done fairly well since that date even with the traps. Many of the men called here are young married men and will have to leave their families destitute, and now they are stuffed like herring down a barrel on board the Calypso. They have nothing to do but idle away their time, and they may never be required to leave St. John's."

On August 20th he was at it again, charging that "the object of raising a regiment for home defence was to raise a force to maintain order in the Colony, as the Government and Governor dread the trouble of facing a winter with so many people unprovided for, and the idea then is to intimidate the people into suffering in

silence and to die from hunger while the Government is wasting $250,000 on the raising of fighters that will never see active service. The sins of the Government and Governor against the Commonwealth are about to find them out, and, fearing the righteous indignation of the people around the Island, they attempt to ease their guilty consciences by equipping a land force of 500 brigade boys to protect them from any storms that may arise during the coming winter. What great statesmen! What a pity Great Britain cannot avail of the wonderful abilities of Sir Edward and Sir Walter at this critical crisis in British history."

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I say that Great Britain would gladly avail of the brilliant abilities of both Sir Edward and His Excellency, and I am sure that in the Councils of the British Government to-day there are men less qualified than either of those men whom he insults so glibly, and I say this without intending to reflect in any way on the gentlemen who at present compose that Cabinet.

I would now ask you to note that Mr. Coaker then went on to charge that "the offer of 1500 men was a blunder, that the offer should never have been made, that the blunder will cause untold miseries and sacrifice, and will cost not one cent under $400,000 unless the war is over before our men get to the front. It was a blunder to offer any men as a Newfoundland regiment. Our men should have gone forward with the Canadian soldiers." And this from the man who was declaring against Confederation.

On August 19th he writes: "Again we demand that action be taken by the Government to meet the financial condition of the Colony. The run on the banks must not be permitted to strangle the financial condition of the Colony; merchants now on the brink of bankruptcy must be aided for a few months in order to secure the produce of this season's voyage; provision must be made for the construction of the remaining branch railways and for the necessary public works in the districts that have come short of a catch of fish."

Here we have him proclaiming to the world the bankruptcy of our merchants, a condition sufficiently deplorable if it were true, but base calumny in as much as the financial position of our mercantile firms was never more solvent than on the 19th of August, the day when Coaker sent this false report to all the business centres outside this Colony.

On August 20th we find him attacking his present leader, Dr. Lloyd, and the Evening Telegram newspaper. He says: "Harmonious, indeed, is the harping of the Telegram and Daily News to the tune that Newfoundland must send volunteers, but both papers are too hastily engaged in their sentimental rhapsodies to get down to such vulgarity practical considerations as counting the cost or reckoning up the possibility of Newfoundland carrying out such proposals. Doesn't the whole position, as set forth in the Telgram's editorial, irresistibly remind one of the famous Biblical character who first built his tower and then sat down to count the cost? Sir Edward Morris, in his usual foresight manner, made haste to cable the Imperial authorities that Newfoundland would contribute a thousand naval reservists and five hundred land forces to the Navy and Army of Great Britain. It is all very well for Sir Edward Morris and those fiddlers of his, the Telegram and the News, to shout increase the Naval Reserve and send a volunteer regiment, but how are we going to do it? The Telegram says we must do it some way. Truly a sage observation and extremely helpful in such a

comprising situation."

Then we find this patriot, who talks so glibly about 20,000 men dying in defence of the Empire, giving his idea of what should have been done, saying that all this action of Sir Edward Morris was unnecessary, and had he cut according to the cloth available we should have offered our reserves that would have been available for manning ships of the British fleet. The Admiralty would have been quite satisfied that her eldest daughter was contributing a mite to the solution of the insistent war problem anyway, but through bungling o nthe part of the Administration, through hasty ill-considered action, through an unfortunate attempt to embark on an undertaking neither our means nor our financial position could justify, we are faced with the humiliation of breaking a solemn promise to the harrassed Motherland."

On Aug. 21st, the worst he had to say was a sneer at the Patriotic Association for adding a large number of citizens to its membership.

On August 22nd we find him vehemently denouncing the sending of a regiment in these terms: "Fancy sending a regiment of 500 men—the flower of the country—and 100 officers, and calling on the poor fishermen of Newfoundland, who are facing the worst fishery in sixty years, to pay the bills, which will not be less than $400,000. The wages alone will amount to $220,000 if the men are engaged for a year. Then, to make things worse, he has offered Britain a thousand Naval Reservists for services abroad. They will be fitted and clothed by the Home Authorities, to which expense the Colony makes a certain grant, but the British government will only allow $10 per month wages. Therefore, if the regiment is paid a dollar a day, the Colony must pay the Naval Reservists the same wages, which means finding $20 additional per month for each of the one thousand men, or $20,000 a month or $240,000 a year. Therefore, it is possible that the 60,000 toilers of Newfoundland will have to find about $750,000 for these services before the war is over."

Here he is refreshing in his argument, putting the position to our Naval Reservists, that in comparison to the soldiers, they are underpaid, and that the government is to find the difference, and in the same breath condemning the government on the assumption that they must find it.

Then we find this amusing wind-up: "The House meets on September 2nd, and should prorogue within a few days. The Union Party will stand by the Empire,but the men that failed in their duty to Terra Nova at this crisis in its history, will not escape the consequence of their madness"

On Aug. 24th. he attacked the Premier for giving a note to the newspapers saying the duties had been added to spirits, sugar and tobacco by the Canadian government, to meet the interest of the war loan, and he protested against such a proceeding on the part of our Premier.

Then he went on to say: "The people are now realizing what the country must face in carrying out the offer of the government to raise 1500 men for service abroad. Needless to say, all concerned wish today that common sense had been prominent in the government councils when they were considering the raising of this force for home and foreign service. That decision and subsequent action therein will prove to be the greatest of all the Premier's blunders, and had he consulted the Opposition party that he should have done, he would have been spared the anxiety and wor-

ry which this muddle must entail upon him."

He winds up this article by saying: "As for Mr. Coaker, he will never forgive the Premier for using the Governor as he did at the so called patriotic meeting and deceiving the public as he did in reference to those resolutions, nor will Mr. Coaker soon forget the Governor's action in consenting to preside at a meeting solely supported by members of the government party and ignoring so contemptuously the representatives of the electorate." Yet a week later this same Mr. Coaker was declaring himself in his paper as prepared to join a coalition government under the leadership of Sir Edward Morris.

On August 27th we find him figuring out that for the volunteers and the reservists the colony will have to pay about $800,000 and also declaring that there will be a deficit in the Revenue next year of two million dollars. Two days later he outdid himself when he called for a coalition government.and the next day he published a monstrous article in which he did his very utmost to discredit the naval reserve and undermine the discipline of those connected with it. He said: "The officers on the Calypso will have to mend their manners and their haughty attitude towards our fishermen who come under their instructions, or the Naval Reserve movement will soon be a dead letter"; and then we hear the same sort of twaddle as previously "Newfoundland fishermen will fight for the British flag as strongly and as freely as any soldiers of the King, but they must be allowed to do it in their own way and under officers they respect and have confidence in."

The day after, however, he was as harmless as the cooing dove, and announced that the House would likely close on Saturday and that criticism of the government's general policy would be reserved for the regular meeting of the House next winter.

On September 7th Mr. Coaker prophesied as follows:—"Not one cent has been granted to provide employment for the coming winter. The only course left open to the government will be to make all paupers and deal out a few pounds of flour, an ounce or two of tea and a quart of molasses to the hungry through their usual business dealers and thus make serfs and paupers of one fifth of the people". What an opinion to be scattered broadcast about our people when no such condition ever existed; and now we know from the Commissioner of Public Charities, Mr. O'Dwyer, that the whole expenditure on able-bodied pauper relief the ensuing winter was less than twenty thousand dollars altogether.

On September 24th. Mr. Coaker said thus:—"The sinking of three British cruisers by five German submarines is a chapter in the annals of the British Navy that every Britisher will remember with shame. The Captains of those cruisers if they escaped should be shot," and in replying to a query a day or two later said, in explanation of the harsh measures proposed to be meted to those Captains, that their offence was "that instead of fleeing to get away from what they might have expected was a submarine attack and out of harm's way, they both steamed with all speed to the aid of the crew of the destroyed ship."

On October 1st a Naval officer writing in defence of his brother officer said: "Had you, Coaker, been in the United Kingdom with your paper and printing machinery, before the paper had been on sale an hour, your machines would have been wrecked by civilians."

Mr. Coaker on this same date advises the fishermen to "keep their

powder dry and their guns well primed," fearing an attack by British Tars whom he had insulted, condemning the Naval Officer, whom he charges with inciting to mob law, whilst he is preaching revolution and bloodshed to the fishermen.

On Oct. 3rd. he attacks Hon. John Harvey, who commended the Premier in not favouring a Moratorium. Mr. Coaker writes: "Mr. Harvey's remarks might just as well be left unsaid, for they did no good and showed that he could use his position in the Legislature to advance his pet fads, irrespective of the public welfare. Such small minds as Mr. Harvey's will never be useful to a country in trying times." When it is understood that the Hon. John Harvey is one of our foremost business men, a man thoroughly educated and experienced we can put a proper value on such drivel. There is, however, another and more serious side to this. The second in command of the Cressy, one of the battleships torpedoed in the North Sea, was Mr. Harvey's brother, and this attack was made as we were mourning the loss of that gallant officer, the first from this colony to pay the supreme sacrifice in defence of the British Empire, and for the principles so dear to the heart of every true British subject. It is hard to be patient under such circumstances,and I believe there is sufficient chivalry in our poorest fishermen to feel ashamed that one calling himself a fishermen's friend and champion,could in this manner, and at such a time, attack without compunction a man of Mr. Harvey's character, and hold him up to ridicule in this manner.

On Oct. 29th. Coaker made this attack on His Excellency the Governor "Do all concerned know that the Northern people so hate and despise the Governor and the Premier that it is doubtful if any of them will respond to the call for Naval Recruits? Do they realize that the fishermen will demand the recall of Governor Davidson very shortly."

I have done with this matter, Mr. Chairman. I have endeavoured to illustrate the political character of the man who claims the Divine right to rule the fishermen of this Colony,and to show that the Hon. gentleman is inconsistent and unreliable. I hope the fishermen of the country will take this lesson fully to heart, and realize that a man who for his political advantage could scatter broadcast articles of the nature quoted by me, is not a safe advocate for them to place their confidence in, that he is unworthy of their support and of their influence.

MR. LLOYD—I would like to say a few words in protest against the attempt that has been made this evening, the most serious attempt that has yet been offered, to injure the cause of recruiting in this Island. There is nothing that has been done in this country more calculated to do more harm than the attitude which has been taken by the Minister, whose responsibilities are so great that one would think he would exercise more care in his criticism, this very evening. For the past twelve months complete harmony has reigned as far as questions dealing with this matter are concerned, and in regard to which we have overlooked everything, that has been possible, to aid the government.

MIN. OF. FINANCE & CUSTOMS —Will you take back those statements?

MR. LLOYD—I say that during a period of perfect harmony in this matter when we were working with the government as far as we could, this very afternoon a Minister, a responsible Minister of the Crown comes in here and makes a speech which will

tend to cripple every effort made with recruiting. He comes in here and in the midst of perfect harmony throws a bomb in our midst, Now Sir, I hope that this bomb will not be effective. I would like to tell him just one thing, and that is where that paper is read by every man and every child the greatest recruiting has been done. In every district where this paper has been read the response has been greater than when it has not been taken. How dare the Minister come in here and talk patriotism. How dare he come in here and try to set up a division in this House, and say that in the districts where this paper has been read, like Trinity for instance, where it is read in every settlement, that the response is not as great as in that district which the hon. member represents. Trinity Bay is the banner outport district of the Island.

MR. COAKER—I wish to make a very few remarks in reply to the Hon Minister of Finance and Customs. I would congratulate him upon the fact that he has been busy for four or more days, and gathering together, various remarks from the Mail and Advocate, and I will go further and say that it is very gratifying to me to find him attempting to injure me and the party that I belong to. The only effect his criticism would have will be to make me more popular. If that is gratifying to him, it is equally gratifying to me. If you are proud of your stand, be proud, if you are not ashamed of your conduct, it is your own affair. The people can only consider you by your conduct as being the greatest disturber of the peace in this country. I am pleased to have the tingling of these words in my ear. I did not write one quarter of what was read out. Some of the matter he read I did write, but a great deal of the matter was written by a Clergyman in Newfoundland. Put that in your pipe and smoke it.

MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS. —I do not care who wrote it.

MR. COAKER—Whenever you criticise anyone in this House that man is sure to have the sympathy of the public in Newfoundland. You have only to attack a man here and he is sure to become a hero in the eyes of the people.

MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS. —Your defence is not worth answering. All you say is you are responsible for one quarter, and a Clergyman is responsible for the balance. If this is the way you get your popularity, you should not get into a temper over such popular measures. If that is all the answer you have to give to these charges they must be true.

MR. COAKER—What charges have been made against me by the member for Ferryland. Read your charges. Write them and put them on the table

MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS. —You are the Proprietor of that paper I presume?

MR. COAKER—Mr .Chairman, the hon. member is trying to turn this House into a play house. I protest against his attitude. Something has got to be done.

MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS. That is no reason why you should get up frothing at the mouth. You say my attitude only makes you more popular Then I am doing you good, and you should not get annoyed about it.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. I would like to say one word. I am not ashamed of anything that has appeared in my paper. I deplore that there should be this division on this subject. I do not mind any discussion or debate on legitimate topics. I have had a confidential document asking for our co-operation and yet this very day, this very afternoon, one of the Chief Ministers of the Government gets up and tries to attack us all he

can. We are doing all we can to try and avoid trouble. Anything connected with the Empire or War we are willing to work with the government in. I cannot congratulate the Minister on his effort this afternoon.

MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS. You will understand that the reason I got up and made my criticism this afternoon was because I wanted the member for Twillingate to explain the reason for all the nonsense that we have been listening to from his paper ever since the period of war.

MR. LLOYD—I would like to point out that the major part of the quotations read by the Hon. Minister were printed and published three sessions ago and he waits until the very end of this session when we are working together in perfect harmony before he comes and makes this attack. I have already pointed out that where the paper is most read the best results have been obtained as far as recruiting is concerned.

MR. CLAPP—There is just one matter Mr. Chairman that I would like to make reference to. I was very sorry to hear from the lips of the Premier that the Government did not intend to build the railway to Bonne Bay.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I did not say that. I can assure you I made no such statement.

MR. CLAPP—Well, if that is so, I am glad to hear it, and the Premier will be able to explain to the House the intention of the government when I have finished. If the Premier did say it, and it is a fact, it will come as a thunderbolt to the people of Bonne Bay. Bonne Bay is the first place that should have been touched by the iron horse. Bonne Bay is the home of the herring, and an extensive codfishery is carried on on the coast. Bonne Bay is the seat of the lobsters. Bonne Bay does an enormous business, but is very isolated during the winter months, and is in great need of communication with the capital. I am not going to extend my remarks, but I may say that if I had been a member of. the government, Bonne Bay would have been the first of the five branches of the railway to be built. I had no objection as I have already stated in this House to the construction of these branch railways, namely Bonne Bay, Fortune Bay and Trinity. Fortune Bay deserves a railway and so does Trinity, and I cannot see now why Bonne Bay should be left standing alone with its tremendous area of woodland, and as I have stated the home of the herring, and the seat of the lobster. If I have understood the Premier aright, I say again that it will come as a thunderbolt to the people of that part of the district of St. Barbe.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—I would like to make it clear to the Hon. member that I made no such statement. Nothing that I have stated this evening could justify any such inference. I used the very plainest language. I was speaking in reply to the Hon. member for Twillingate,who asked me what the estimated cost of building this railway would be, and I stated that I thought it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of half a million, and the Hon. the leader of the Opposition asked me if that included the completion of the Bonne Bay Branch. I said I was not certain. I had not the documents with me now. I can assure the hon. member that the matter will come before the Government in due time. The matter has never been discussed or debated in anyway by the government. Further there is a contract signed sealed and ratified by this House for the building of this line.

MR. CLAPP—I would like to ask

the Premier if he can state to this House if it is his intention to carry out that contract and construct a railway to Bonne Bay.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—As far as I know that is the intention of the Government at the present time. I have heard nothing to the contrary.

MR. CLAPP—Is it the intention of the Government to construct it at this present time?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—You ought to know this, being a member of the Legislature. The reason railway work was abandoned since 1914 is that we have not the money, and the present time is not opportune to borrow money to build railways.

MR. CLAPP—But was there not lots of time before now?

RT. HON THE PRIME MINISTER—Now, I don't want to misquote the hon. member, but if I mistake not, when this Railway Bill was before the House the hon. member voted against it.

MR. CLAPP—I beg your pardon. I did not.

MR. LLOYD—The records will surely show how the hon. member voted.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am only quoting from memory three or four years back, and so if the hon. member says he did not vote against the Bonne Bay Branch I will take it back.

MR. LLOYD—I was going to take this matter up, but as the Leader has taken his statements back, there is no need for further discussion.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is the position. I have no desire to say anything incorrect. I was quoting entirely from memory. All this happened five or six years ago.

MR. LLOYD—May I point out that if he was incorrect, he brought it on himself. Because he said that there would be extra cost in building the Bonne Bay Railway unless some agreement was entered into.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—What is it that I have brought upon myself?

MR. LLOYD—The punishment is the misunderstanding on our part.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would point out to the hon. member in reply to a question that has been already asked in reference to the indebtedness of the Colony to the Reid Newfoundland Company, that it is not in the interest of the country that I should state here what that is. Mr. Coaker estimated it at $2,000,000. That I said was in my opinion incorrect. That the amount due the Reid Newfoundland Company to-day was not one half million.

MR. COAKER—Up to to-day, but when you finish.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I said to-day for everything. Then the question was asked does that include Bonne Bay. Some person asked if Bonne Bay was included in that estimate. Now, I replied I did not know. There need be no misunderstanding. The position is this: I asked the Government Engineer what would be the indebtedness to the Reid Company when all the branches are completed, and he told me that it would not be more than one half million. Now I cannot say if he included Bonne Bay or not in that estimate. If it does not, then the indebtedness could only be about one half million dollars more, because that is about the cost of thirty-five miles of road at $15,000 per mile. That would make a total of one million even were Bonne Bay not included in his estimate. That is different from $2,000,000 as stated by the member opposite. According to this the hon. member will be out $1,000,000. Now, I say that it is not in the interest of the country to have it circulated through the country that we are in-

debted to the Reid Newfoundland Company for $2,000,000 when the position really is that we owe at the most but one. That is the estimate of the Government Engineer, but I cannot be sure whether he included Bonne Bay in his estimate or not. It he did then the indebtedness is but one half million. If he did not then it will not be much over a million. I just say this to assure the member that his estimate of two million is incorrect.

MR. LLOYD—The hon. member in his remarks has as much as said that the Bonne Bay Railway was not included. It cannot have, because he has estimated that it would cost one half million, and that is the total indebtedness. Now we are calculating on past experiences. We must take that view of it because the hon. member if he remembers correctly will admit that in his first calculations in this connection he was quite a lot out.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER Not one dollar.

MR. LLOYD—I differ from the hon. member. I think he will find that he was substantially out in his first calculation.

RT. HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —I take issue with the hon. member. Now I do not wish to have it inferred that I blame the Leader of the Opposition with deliberately miscontruing anything that I have said. I would be very sorry indeed to believe any such thing. As the member desires it, however, I may tell him just where I stand in relation to this matter. When these estimates first came up here, in the session of 1910, I think the estimate made was $4,000,000. The line subsequently cost $8,000,000, but it was not the same line. It took a different route from the line which was calculated on. It took a longer route. The estimate made by me was made before the Government Engineer went over the line, and was within 50 miles of the estimate of Sir Robert Bond. In this we were misled. As I said it was before the engineer went over the line. The whole question as it came up in 1908 was only an estimate, and it is not fair to come here and say that we were out four millions. We were not out four millions. We were not out four hundred thousand dollars. We were not out four dollars. We were not out four cents. These are absolute facts. There were several points in the remarks of the hon. member for Twilligate, Mr. Coaker, made this afternoon, that I would like to refer to, but at this late hour of the evening I cannot and shall not delay the House to reply. I will, however, take advantage of doing so in greater detail before the close of the session. As I have said, I do not propose to go into them now in detail.

The main point, endeavoured to be made by my friend was the growth of the estimate for the Public Service, to-day amounting to about four million dollars including interest on the Public Debt, as compared with the amount of the estimates when the railway was completed to Port aux Basques in 1897 which appeared in the estimate to be $1,831,866.51. In other words, we have increased since then, twenty years, in our annual expenditure about $2,200,000 and the Public Debt of the Colony has increased since 1907 from about $17,000,000 to about $32,000,000.

Now, what are the facts? We have more than doubled our expenditure since 1907, but if we have doubled our expenditure, our people have trebled their earnings. The most accurate test of the earnings of our people in any normal year of importation is the value of the imports. That would not be true of a year when there was any large importation of machinery for the establishment of industrial plants, but in ordinary

years the value of our imports expresses correctly the purchasing power of our people. Let us go back to the year 1897 mentioned by my hon. friend, when the Whiteway administration, of which I was a member for a period of eight years, went out of power. The imports then amounted to $5,188,000. The imports the year before the war (1913) amounted to $16,000,000, or more than three times the amount of the imports of 1897, and every dollar of the imports of 1913 represented food and clothing for the people, as there was no importation of mining or railway or other industrial machinery that year to any considerable extent, or any larger proportion than in 1897.

Now it is quite evident from this that the fishermen of the country earned three times the amount in 1913 than they did in 1897, and their purchasing power was trebled, although the population of the country had only increased 40,000, the figures for 1897 showing a population of 200,000 and those for 1913 being 240,000.

But there is still another point to be made, and it is this: What was the Customs duty paid in 1897 and what was the Customs duty paid in 1913? In 1897 the duty collected at the Customs was $1,567,000 and the duty collected at the Customs in 1913 was just double or about $3,000,000. I am quoting now entirely from memory, but I think on investigation it will be found that I am within the mark, so that it will be seen by this that 240,000 people in 1913 with a purchasing power of $16,000,000 only paid double the Customs Revenue that 200,000 people paid in 1897 with one-third of their earning power and one-third of their purchasing power. It seems to me that this argument is unassailable and unanswerable. In other words, the people were earning $25 per head in 1897 and they were earning $75 per head in 1913, so that if we have doubled the taxation of the people we have also trebled their earnings. The people are now paid higher wages. The ordinary man is receiving double the rate of wages that he was paid in the 'nineties,' and living and dressing better as a consequence. The fisherman to-day is getting double for his fish.

Again, if we have doubled the public annual expenditure by this increase of revenue, where does the money go? How do we spend it? It goes for more public works, more schools, more lighthouses, better hospitals, the creation of Old Age Pensions, increased widows' and orphans' pay, better steam service on the bays, on the Labrador and around the coasts, a daily passenger and mail service across the country, five new branch railways and all the other improvements in the public service demanded by the people and given them at their request I would like to see any member in this House rise to his feet and name the lighthouse whose light he would have extinguished, or the school whose door he would have closed. It might be that you might find a few salaries in the civil service that could be reduced, but a curtailment and reduction through the entire service would only mean a few thousands of dollars. The great increases in the efficiency of the public service have gone directly to the people and for their benefit and advantage This administration alone, within the past eight years has increased the Education Vote by $100,000. The vote for Old Age Pensions which we also provided for is to-day $80,000. These two items alone make up an increase of $180,000 annually.

If you require any further evidence as to the prosperity of our people, that they are living and dressing better

and earning more money, you have only to look at the statements of the Savings Banks. In 1897 we had only one Savings Bank in the country, namely the Government Savings Bank, which that year had deposits amounting to something over $2,000,000. To-day there are five Savings Banks whose total deposits aggregate something like $10,000,000. In the last normal year (1913) $16,000,000 went out of the country to buy food and clothing for our people, and if that amount was spent, it must have been earned. In 1897 $5,000,000 represented the earnings of the people, that amount having been sent away to purchase their food and clothing, while in the year in question (1913) we were able to send away $16,000,000 for the same purpose. That is my answer to the hon. gentleman.

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 to the same.

This report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act further to Amend 'The Revenue Act, 1915'," was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

MOVING PICTURES CENSORSHIP BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt .Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Censorship of Moving Pictures" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIIL.

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 Certain Retiring Allowances," without amendment.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BIILL.

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 and Consolidate the Law relating to Weights and Measures and the Inspection of Lumber," with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Hon. Colonial Secretary, the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

RULES SUSPENDED.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Rt. Hon. The Prime Minister the Rules of the House in relation to all matters now before the House were suspended.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to raise a loan for certain public services of the Colony.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Death Duties Act 1914-1915."

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

MR. COAKER.—I asked the Minister of Marine for an explanation about that schooner to which I referred earlier in the afternoon.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHEERIES.—I will have this matter looked into. I was not aware that the Minister of Finance had a schooner

until I saw his name in the list. I will get in touch with Mr. Bell, the surveyor, and get a report for this Committee.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY April 28th, 1916.

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

The Hon .the Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of the Superintendent of the General Hospital for 1915.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House will consider Certain Resolutions respecting the Raising of a Loan for Certain Public Services on tomorrow.

DEATH DUTIES BILL.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Death Duties Act 1914-1915" was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

QUESTIONS.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for an itemized statement of all expenditures made for the erection of public wharf at Point Leamington and to whom allocations for that purpose were made

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, that statement is being prepared.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a detailed statement of all amounts paid to E. J. Horwood, G. M. Barr, M. A. Duffy, W. E. Bearns, for years 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, that statement is also being prepared.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works for a detailed statement of all amounts paid for supplies outside of tenders and to whom paid; also, copy of tenders as supplied by E. J. Horwood.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Hon. Colonial Secretary the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Weights and Measures and the Inspection of Lumber," was read a second time.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker, the Council's amendments to this Act are in the main trifling. There is only one that might be debatable. The first section altered is 27, which provides for the sale of salt. The Bill merely provides that salt be sold by measure. The Council suggest that the following words be inserted after the word 'buy' in the first line: "The weight of each ton shall constitute 2240 lbs. if sold by weight." The next amendment is in section 28, which refers to coal. The Bill says: "Coal shall be sold by measure or by weight." The Council suggest that "may" be substituted for "shall." I don't just know what the idea is. The next is in section 32, which refers to fish oils. The Bill reads: "The quantity contained in such casks . ." They suggest that the section be changed to read: "The gross cubical contents of such cask . ." This is merely a transformation of the words. The next is in section 40. It will be remembered that when the Bill was going through we changed the length of shingles from 18 to 16 inches. Owing to a printer's error it went up as 18, and they changed it to 16. The last is in section 43, which refers to the inspection of lumber, pit props and so on. They strike out that section and suggest the following: "Any person being a party to the purchase

or sale of any timber, pit props, plank, lumber or shingles may, any previous contract to the contrary notwithstanding, demand that the same shall be surveyed by a duly appointed surveyor of lumber, and may give notice in writing of such demand to the other party to such purchase or sale; and if any person to whom such notice is given shall deliver or cause to be delivered any timber, pit props, plank, lumber or shingles sold by measure and before the same shall be surveyed by a duly appointed surveyor of lumber, such person shall be subject to a penalty not exceeding $25." These are the alterations.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker. I am nct prepared to accept the whole of these amendments. I shall oppose that which does not make the survey of pit props imperative. In the Bill as it went up the survey was imperative, now it is only permissible. I move that we reject that amendment.

These amendments were then read section by section. On section 43 as amended being read:

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: I rise to propose that that amendment be not accepted, on the ground that we contend, on this side of the House, that a survey should be imperative and not left to the discretion of either party.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Speaker: The effect of that amendment would be to put the pit-prop business exactly where it was before we passed that Act. The Bill as sent up provided that all pit-props must be measured by a lumber surveyor, and that any person interested in the purchase of those pit-props could not survey them. The amendment suggested by the Upper House simply does away with this whole thing. No man is going to give notice in writing that he requires to have pit-props surveyed, and this means that there will not be any survey.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Personally, I feel the same as the hon. member. It is desirable that the people who are cutting these pit-props who are mostly poor men, perhaps not possessing the astuteness of ordinary business men, should be protected in every possible way; and I think the section as first framed had that end in view. I cannot fall in line with the amendment of the Legislative Council. I think the section as it stood is preferable.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: I beg to move the rejection of this amendment.

The amendments were passed, with the exception of that made to Section 43, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council so informing that Body.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

On motion of the Hon. Colonial Secretary, a Select Committee consisting of Hon. Mr. Bennett, Mr. Devereaux, Hon. Mr. Cashin, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Lloyd, was appointed and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council, requesting that Body to appoint a similar Committee for conference on the said amendment to Section 43.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received.

On motion for the adoption of the

Report, Mr. Lloyd moved and Mr. Clift seconded the following amendment:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House is of the opinion that the Minister of Finance should have recommended the imposition of taxes on profits made by the sale of steel steamers to the Russian Government.

"AND BE IT RESOLVED FURTHER that this House is of opinion that some steps should have been taken to relieve in whole or in part the duties now being collected on either kerosene oil, motor engines used for fishery purposes gasolene used for fishery purposes, or cattle feed."

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared in favour of the amendment: Messrs. Lloyd, Clift, Dwyer, Coaker, Halfyard, Stone, Targett, Winsor, Abbott, Grimes, Clapp, (11); and against it: Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Hons. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Finance and Customs, Ministers of Marine and Fisheries, and Public Works, and Messrs. Devereaux, Downey, M. J. Kennedy, Morris, Moore, Parsons, Currie, Higgins, George Kennedy, Walsh, (17). So it passed in the negative and was ordered accordingly.

The motion for the adoption of the Report was then put and agreed to.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

Whereupon the Bill entitled: "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, 1916, and the 30th day of June, 1917, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service" was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled: "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, 1916, and the 30th day of June, 1917, 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 presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: "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, 1916, and the 30th day of June, 1917, and for other purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled: "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, 1916, and the 30th day of June, 1917, 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.

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 to Amend the Act 4, George V., Cap. 17, 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: The first section of the bill, as I pointed out in its earlier stages, is the granting of exemption from the payment of royalty on lumber manufactured under the provisions of the Saw Mills Act, when that lumber is manufactured from timber cut on private property. It was thought that the words "private property" would not describe all the property on which lumber might be cut which did not call for royalty, and I suggest to the Committee that this section read "property elsewhere than on ungranted Crown Lands." That would, I think, take in every kind. In other words, a man having property in fee simple grant is allowed to cut without royalty. The section will accordingly be read with this addition.

MR. CLIFT—The question might arise as to what "grant" means. A license might be granted.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There is great confusion now as to who should pay royalties, and the Department has recommended that this be done.

The next section gives the Governor in Council power to define certain areas on which timber cannot be cut. I think that everybody will appreciate these amendments.

MR. COAKER—Might I enquire from the Premier if he has any information as to the amount of royalties which have been received since the former act was passed.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am not in a position at the present time, but will have this information in a day or two.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted and ordered to be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the said Bill 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.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER 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 to Amend the Law respecting the Exportation of Timber."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—On the second reading of this Bill, I explained the amendments which I proposed to submit to the Committee and the object of those amendments.

(4.) Anything in any Act contained to the contrary notwithstanding, it shall be lawful for any person to export, on the usual export entry, to any place in the United Kingdom or in the Republic of France, any timber or lumber for pit-props, cut before the thirty-first day of December, 1917, or before the expiration of six months from the date on which His Majesty shall cause a Proclamation or Proclamations to issue, declaring that a state of war no longer exists between His Majesty and the countries with which hostilities are at present pending, whichever period shall be shorter.

> Provided that such person shall satisfy the Customs Officer to whom he makes application for export entry that such timber or lumber was not cut on any part of that territory or area known as the three-mile limit, nor on any territory or area upon which the cutting of timber for such purposes shall under the provisions of any Act have been prohibited by the Governor in Council or, if such timber or lumber was cut on the said area known as the three-mile limit that such timber or lumber was burnt timber when cut.

This means that no pit-props shall be exported except those cut before the 31st day of December, 1917, provided the war ends six months prior to that date, or until six months has elapsed after the declaration of peace has been proclaimed.

The next alteration is in Section 3, which reads:

> 3.—The Governor in Council 'shall after the passing of this Act' appoint a Board consisting of five members, who shall serve without pay or reward, and of whom a majority shall be a quorum. Such Board shall be known as the "Timber Exportation Board."

I think those changes will be acceptable for two reasons: the first is that it will prohibit the cutting of green timber on the three-mile limit. We are allowing burnt timber to be cut on this area, as everyone is aware that the cutting of burnt timber is not destructive to the territory; after a few years it will rot and blow down, and it is, therefore, permitted that this material be cut and disposed of as pit-props. Section 3 provides a very necessary amendment to this Bill.

It has been brought to the notice of the Government and this House that an enormous amount of hardship has been suffered by men engaged in this industry during the past year or two, and as they were underpaid, it will be the duty of those appointed under this Section to deal with the prices to be paid, and see the different conditions which call for special consideration, and fix a minimum price,which shall not be less than the prices named in the Section.

Men who have been engaged at this industry have not had an opportunity of figuring on a profitable price to accept for their labour. The employment was given and accepted, and many were driven to accept it by conditions of poverty. We are endeavouring to better their position by this measure. It has been calculated that the producer has averaged less than $3.00 per cord which is not enough. It is recognized by every one except the purchasers, that pit-props cannot be cut at this figure except at a loss to those who engaged in the work. In some localities men have averaged less than 50 cents a day cutting. I know of men who went to Colinet, St. Mary's Bay, to cut pit-props under contract, and discovered after two months working in bad weather, and under other disagreeable circumstances, that their earnings were not sufficient to pay their passages back to their homes on the Southern Shore.

MR. COAKER—What were those people paid, do you know?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—About $3.50 per cord. When we consider what has been done in this industry and the increased value of pit-props in Newfoundland, we shall see how every man makes money out of the business except the man who cuts the wood. Those who

freight it get as high as forty dollars per cord, whereas before the war they got seven or even six dollars. That I think was the current price of freighting across the Atlantic. And taking these things into consideration, it seems but right and fair that the poor man who cuts it should receive a more liberal sum than in the cases I have referred to. They must have these pit-props which are around our Island Home, and which were placed by God for man's use and benefit. We have been told here in this House that the pitprop men in this country have formed a ring to buy in all pit-props at a certain figure, which means in practice that any man who goes to the pit-prop men cannot make a separate arrangement until after the pit-prop man has consulted his partners in this business If they can come to this country and pay forty dollars for freight for each cord of pit-props, and pay other expenses as well, at least they can pay an additional fifty per cent to the men in Newfoundland who can produce these pit-props, so the Government has resolved to put in the following clause:

> 4.—The duties of the said Board shall be to fix from time to time for different localities in this Colony, a minimum price per cord to the cutter, which shall not be less than Five Dollars per cord for unrinded wood, nor Six Dollars per cord for rinded wood, on the bank, below which price it shall be unlawful for any person to purchase any timber or lumber for pit-props intended to be exported from this Colony. Men employed on wages cutting pit-props shall be paid at a rate of not less than Thirty Dollars per month, with board and lodging.

So that next year men going out to cut pit-props will first have to find how cheaply they can produce these pit-props and under what conditions. The Committee that the Governor in Council has power to appoint will assess the charge per cord according to the difficulty attending the production, for example if a man cuts near the sea shore, and has no difficulty in procuring his wood for shipment, his charges ought not to be, in reason as high as the charges made by a man who has to go three or four miles into the country. The Committee, I feel, will have no objection to these amendments. Personally, I fail to see what ground there is for objecting.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: It is the intention of this side of the House to offer no opposition to Clause 1 of this Bill. Under normal conditions we do not consider it desirable to encourage the exportation of pit-props from Newfoundland. It is the interest of the Colony to conserve our woods for manufacturing purposes in order that pulp and lumber mills may be established, and it was therefore the intention of those of my colleagues on this side of the House not to let this section go through without offering strenuous opposition, but there are certain documents placed before us which though they have not led us to modify our opinions, yet make us feel that we can offer no opposition. In order that it may be recognized that Newfoundland is prepared to sacrifice her own interests t the exigencies of the Empire, we have determined to offer no opposition, and are satisfied on this side to accept the proposals of the Government in this matter, as outlined by the Minister of Finance and Customs.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: The explanations of the Leader of the Opposition fully suffices to inform the House as to why we are going to permit that clause to pass. It is very

much to be regretted that this information was not supplied to the Leader of the Opposition before the introduction of the Bill, and I trust that in future that on similar occasions that the Government will take the Leader of this side of the House into their confidence. The Leader of the Opposition has pointed out that the members of this side of the House resolved to oppose any measure having for its object the establishment of the pit-prop industry in Newfoundland. The reason that we have come to that conclusion and have resolved on this policy is, because, we believe that the pit-props remaining in Newfoundland should be manufactured in the Colony, I mean by this that the wood that would be used for pit props would bring in greater profits if utilized as pulp wood. I have every confidence that in eight or ten years we will see three established industries, such as Grand Falls if we can possibly conserve the timber requisite to give these industries a sufficient supply of wood. If, as I say, we can hold on to this timber, in eight or ten years you ought to have two more establishments, one of which would be at Glenwood. It is only madness on the part of the Government to export our timber for pit-props. Grand Falls is worth half a million to the Colony, two more industries of similar magnitude would mean one and a half million more for the Government coffers for this alone.

If the Government make up their minds to allow pit props to be exported as the promoters of the industry from the other side of the water would like, then in eight or ten years from now we are going to have nothing but a barren country. It is useless for anyone to say that there is no harm done, and that by cutting the pit props you allow the remaining timber a better opportunity to grow, because only small timber is cut for pit props; because when they are cutting pit-props they take everything in the shape of timber off the land. They take trees up to seven and eight inches in the top and down as low as two and a half inches, mere pickets; and in the northern areas where these pit-props have been cut the country has become a barren waste with nothing large or small left standing. There might be some excuse for allowing the export of pit props if arrangements were made in the future for a combined trade in timber. What I mean is that there may be an industry started in this country for allowing small timber to be exported as pit props; cutting pulp wood as pulp wood and turning it into paper, and manufacturing pine and other timber into lumber. Such a proposition is open to consideration, but any proposition to permit the exportation of pit props we must oppose if we have any regard for the future.

Now I trust I have said sufficient to show the House and the country where we stand on this matter of pit props. There are thousands of reasons which can be adduced and which we have learned from experience, which will back up our position not to allow the exportation of this timber. The timber supply of North America is becoming very limited. All over Canada and the United States people with money are buying timber areas to provide for the future. The supply is limited, and the day must come—and it is not very far off, when those who require paper will have to come to Newfoundland and do as Harmsworth did, and if we have the timber we can make arrangements with those companies and have many of our areas that are now lying waste and unproductive turned into industries that will give the country large returns. If we do not want that industry and development that will give much labour and big profit you can

go ahead with the export of these pit props and get four or five dollars a cord for them, and then within eight or ten years you will have a barren country—only a rock as a heritage for the people of the country. We certainly will insist to the fullest of our power and get up and fight as strongly as we can against any such thing as the exportation of pit props. Now in view of the facts confidentially revealed to us we are prepared to allow the exportation of pit props, as suggested by this Clause before us, till the end of 1917.

I trust now that the Premier will be able to give us a promise that the law we propose passing here now with regard to the cutting of timber on the three-mile limit will not be altered, and that he will not consent to any man coming forward and coaxing the Government to allow him to cut timber over the three-mile limit. I feel sure that what has been done formerly in connection with this matter has not been done with full knowledge of the consequence, and that the Government has not given the matter that full consideration they should have given it. We know the facts in connection with those matters; and as has been advanced by the Minister some representations were made last fall with regard to the shortage of the fisheries and the necessity of providing labour for the people; but I feel sure that the Premier will give us his promise that this permission to cut on the three-mile limit will not be given again. If he gives us that assurance I shall be very glad to accept it and shall appreciate his magnanimity.

Now there is another matter, the matter of providing a Board. The great pity about that is that the Government did not wake up before the horse was stolen. We have had cut in two years about three hundred thousand cords of wood and we have lost on that three dollars a cord. When the Companies were buying this wood first they were willing to pay $8 or $8.50 a cord for this wood on board their steamers; and the first steamer load that went from Newfoundland was paid for at the rate of $8.25 or $8.50. Then the small men in this country, middlemen, came forward and said to these Companies, if you give us contracts we will get this wood for you for $5.50. Of course, the Companies would be foolish not to accept that proposal. It was our own people, these middlemen, that brought down the price and allowed those men to cut the value of pit props one hundred per cent.

Now this Board has come, and we are not going to oppose its formation. If it can do anything to benefit the fishermen by increasing the value of pit props we shall give it our hearty support. We cannot accept that clause as you have it there, but in all probability when we come to it we shall be able to show you how to make it more effective. I feel sure that the promise I suggested we might get from the Prime Minister will be very gladly given, and if that is done any objections I had to offer to the Bill will be overcome.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: Just a word or two. I desire to congratulate my friends on the other side of the House for the very proper spirit evinced by them in relation to this Bill before the Committee. They are in precisely the same position as ourselves, as this Bill would not have been introduced here this evening if it was not in the interest of the Empire; and their support of it is for the same motive as that actuating us on this side of the House. I am sure that the Committee will agree with me that a Bill of this class is very appropriately in the hands of the Minister of Finance, who,

I regret to say, has just had a cable from France informing him that his son, Lieutenant Cashin, was wounded only this afternoon; but I am glad to be able to say to the House that he is not dangerously wounded.

My honourable friend on the other side has desired that I should give a statement to the House in relation to future cutting on the three-mile limit, and I unhesitatingly inform the House and the Committee that it is not the intention of the Government nor will they between now and the meeting of the House again sanction any permission for cutting on the three-mile limit under any circumstances. Further, I may say that the permission given last years was not, as I said already in the session, due to representations by parties interested in pit props, but from other causes. In the first place we were anxious to aid as much as possible in securing a supply of pit props from the Mother Country and for France, and that was number one reason for giving it. Number two was that that desire could not be very well accomplished if pit props were not allowed to be cut on the three mile limit. No. three was that a great deal of destitution would prevail in the country. That destitution would mean the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and the Government was confronted with the fact that labour would have to be given in some form and the Colony was not in a position to give that labour. We had just had a very large shortage in the revenue of the Colony. We had to go to the Banks for a temporary loan and to have to face another half million for labour would have a very injurious effect abroad and at home; and the result was the granting of permission to cut on the three-mile limit. I very much sympathize with those portions of the country that have been denuded as my friend has pointed out, but I hope it is not as bad as has been represented, and that after a little while the forests will be restored again. It is not as if it was absolutely destroyed. A spruce forest reproduces itself in twenty-five or thirty years, and we may fairly conclude that the injury has only been done in a few spots in certain portions of the country.

Now, as regards the larger question as to the future policy of the country in relation to pit prop cutting, that is a matter that will have to be dealt with in the future. It is not likely to be dealt with this year or next, but the time will come when the country, through the Legislature, will have to decide on the question as to what is to be done in relation to the timber that is now lying down every year, valueless and a menace to the good timber. It is waste and of no value to the country, and it will have to be decided whether the present policy of non-exportation is to be continued or whether the timber can be utilized in any way without effecting a permanent injury to the forest. Now, I am entirely with those who think that no timber ought to be exported from Newfoundland in an unmanufactured condition if such a thing is going to permanently injure the country; but then we want expert opinion on that—that is when we are in the position to have the service of a forester, a man thoroughly acquainted with this whole question of forestry who will be able to say to us, "There is a section of the country where it would do no harm whatever if you thinned it out; but on the contrary would improve it. It will make what will remain of more value and enable it to grow better. Here is a section where you ought not to permit any cutting." That is a matter which will require the opinion of an expert. Now, take an ordinary ten-mile block of land. It is quite pos-

sible to cut on a block of that sort for fifty years and at the end of the fifty years, to have as large a quantity of timber on it as the day you commenced. That is what is happening now out at Harmsworth's. They are cutting out there, and in thirty years from the day they commenced to cut they can go back to the place where they started from and find a new forest. The young trees that were allowed to remain will have grown up in that time. We can see it ourselves. Those of us who live near St. John's can remember the time when there was not half the growth on Virginia and similar places like that that there is to-day. Our spruce forests reproduce themselves in about thirty years, at least for pulp and pit prop wood. They grow on an average of about nine inches a year for the first few years; afterwards, of course, not as much in height as in girth; but I think that as a general principle you can lay it down that our spruce forests reproduce themselves in thirty or forty years. Well, now, if there are portions of the country that have not been operated on by saw mills or pulp mills, and there is no likelihood of their being operated on, might it not be a very wise policy, where it would pay, to thin these areas out, and in that way provide labour and improve what is left behind. Take an ordinary farmer, who owns, say, 500 acres—we will say around St. John's. Take the Mount Pearl Estate or the Estate of the late Judge Emerson—Virginia Water. Now, you can go out to Virginia with its 500 acres of heavily wooded land and you can take a cord of wood per year off every acre. That is 500 cords a year; and after you have been doing so for fifty years you will have more timber there than the day you commenced. You will only be cleaning up the forest. If you take a cord per acre per year off fairly thickly wooded land, in fifty years you will probably have more timber on that land than when you commenced. There are ten or twelve cords to the acre in ordinary fairly wooded land. Well, now, what have we been doing? Up to the present time we have been doing nothing with our forests. They have been reproducing themselves and laying down when they become old. Drive from here to St. Mary's, drive to Placentia, drive through Salmonier wood, and what do you see? Forest after forest has grown up and lain down, except where they have been swept by fires, and they have never heard the ring of a woodman's axe. Now, is it wise to continue that? I am not advocating a policy to denude the country of its timber, but surely if a policy can be devised whereby we can find an industry which will be paying and profitable and valuable for our people and at the same time that will not lessen the quantity of timber, would it not be wise to do so? That is the point. This is essentially a country where our people require timber for fuel, for fencing, for boat-building and fishery purposes generally, and we ought to be careful not to do anything which would in any way contract the supply. I congratulate my friends on the other side of the House on the spirit on which they have taken this matter up. The cutting of pit props is permitted entirely in the interests of the Empire, and I can assure them that that will be done in the future without in any way interfering with that area so necessary to and so prized by the fishermen, and known as The Three Mile Limit.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. I would first of all like to convey to the Minister who has charge of the Bill the sympathy of this House on the news which he has received this afternoon. We earnestly hope that the next news may be consoling and

satisfactory. Now, Sir, in reference to section 4, so far as the clause goes, we on this side of the House agree with it; we also agree partially with the reasons which have been set forth by the Minister in commenting on this clause. We regard it as an unfortunate feature of this industry that many of our people have been very inadequately paid—have as a matter of fact been sweated in this industry. I am informed that it is a fact that many of those engaged in the cutting of pit props have been remunerated at the rate of thirty or forty cents a day. Now under the circumstances particularly when we consider, as has been pointed out by the Minister, that while the rates paid per cord on the bank have been as low as $3.20 or $3.50, the freights being paid at the present time have in some cases exceeded $40 per cord. Freights have jumped from $6 or $8 in the early days of the war up to that amount. It seems a most ridiculous position for any community to permit the sweating of its people in an industry such as this is, which can stand such an extraordinary freight rate—twelve times as much as is paid for the cutting. Now, Sir, under these circumstances, it is well that the government, or those in charge of the Bill, should have decided to take this matter up and have it regulated by the establishment of a Board. The only regret is that this was not done at an earlier session,so that those of our people who have been engaged in this business during the past seasons might have had the benefit of the work of such a Board. But, Sir, I think this House should go further than is intended by section 4, and while giving power to the Board to fix a minimum price, it should also fix a price below which that Board should not go—a reasonable and proper price in view of the present situation, the great demand, and the extraordinary price that is being paid for pit props on the other side. I wish to make it plain that in doing that we will not be in any way harming the industry, in view of the extraordinary prices that are being paid for pitprops in Great Britain and in France. I am informed by my better-informed friend behind me, the hon. member for Twillingate, that pitprops are being sold on the other side at 250s. that is in the neighbourhood of $60 a cord, and in the light of this fact it is absurd that our people should be paid at the rate of 40 cents a day for cutting them. Under these circumstances I would move that section 4 be amended as follows:

The first two lines to read as they stand, namely: "The duties of the said Board shall be to fix from time to time for different localities in this colony a minimum price per cord." I propose the first amendment to be the addition at the end of the second line, after the word "cord," of the following words: "The minimum price per cord to the cutter shall not be less than $5 a cord for rinded wood on the bank or in the boom." That is, roughly speaking, what the Minister himself advocated.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—We had it in the Bill.

MR. LLOYD—Then I am glad that there will be a chance of having it re-inserted. Then to continue: "below which it shall not be lawful for any person to purchase any timber or lumber for pitprops intended to be exported from this colony." And at the end of the section I propose the addition of these words: "Provided also that a man shipped by the month shall not be paid less than $30 a month and board and lodging." The effect really is this: That if the cutter has a contract per cord, he is to be paid a minimum price of $5 per cord; if a man is shipped by the month, he

is not to be paid less than $30 a month and found.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman. I rise to support the proposed amendment and in doing so I might point out that in all probability you will find, next year, that a great proportion of the men will be engaged by the month, because the green timber being exhausted, and no wood being allowed to be cut along the water-front, it will mean that the men who have inside areas will ship the men by the month and will not pay them per cord. Quite a number of men were engaged that way this year. For that reason we think that if you place a section in the bill fixing the minimum price per cord at $5 and do not provide a rate per month, that the employers of these men will take advantage of the fact that you are fixing $5 as the minimum rate per cord and they will hire the men at their own prices, from $20 to $25 per month. There have been some men hired at these prices this year. Another thing is that the prices paid will largely depend on the result of the fishery. If the fishery is a good one there will, in a great many cases, be no urgent reason for the men to flock to the lumber camps seeking employment, in fact there may be a scarcity of laborers for that purpose, and consequently the rate of wages will be increased; but if we have a bad fishery next year it will mean that men will be abundant and the prices as wages per month that will be quoted then, will be in proportion to the number of men who present themselves. In view of the fact that you are fixing minimum prices per cord, if you do not fix a minimum rate per month employers will avail of the opportunity of hiring men and paying them any rates at all. If you adopt the suggestion fixing labor wages as $30 per month then any man engaged in cutting pit props will receive an amount for his labor which we consider only a very fair remuneration.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman. I rise to support the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition. I think myself there should be a clause put in that bill whereby the men will really know they are protected. As the honourable member for Twillingate has already stated if there is a poor fishery quite a number of men will have to go to work in the woods; and because there will be a number of men looking for work, they will be employed at a lower rate as wages than the yare really worth. I think too much of that class of employment has gone on in this country in the past years and is still going on. The employer knows that the man leaves his home and looks for work in the lumber woods; he has got him there and he keeps him there; and he has an idea that the man will stay there rather than return home unsuccessful, and will go to work at whatever wages he offers. The man knows really that he has nothing at home and as half a loaf is better than no bread, he cannot afford to go home and he will have to take that wage. I think every member in this House of Assembly who wants to have our people looked after in this respect, will give that amendment his hearty support and as regards the idea of a bonus, I think that if there is to be a bonus given, I think the employers will be only too glad to give it to the man who has proved himself to be a good axeman, rather than to another not so skilled with the axe. I have much pleasure in supporting the suggestion.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I may say that the Government considered this, and, in fact, had it framed in the

Bill, but thought that the clause put in here would cover the same thing, namely, "The Governor in Council shall, after the passing of this Act, appoint a board, consisting of five members, who shall serve without pay or reward, and of whom a majority shall be a quorum. Such Board shall be known as the "Timber Exportation Board." That Board w l have the power to put prices on the pit props after they have been cut and placed on the shore. It is practically the same thing; but if the hon. member wants to put that amendment in, I am prepared to accept it, and, in fact, I am willing to go further and say—with reference to the rate per cord—that the hon. member having stated that the lowest price per cord ought to be $5.00, the lowest price per cord of pit props unrinded shall be $5.00, and not less than $6.00 per cord for pit props rinded, because if a man cuts a cord of wood end, saws it and hauls it to the specified place, it is going to take him another day to rind it, and the rinding of it alone means a day's pay, and a very small day's pay at $1.00. I think we can go further and improve on that amendment, if it is an amendment, and put in the Bill a clause to the effect that the lowest price to be paid for pit props shall be $5.00 per cord of wood unrinded, and for rinded pit props the price shall not be less than $6.00 per cord. I quite agree with all that was said this afternoon; and, in fact, I know a number of men from my own district who were employed in cutting pit props; I heard their story; and 1 felt for them when I met them at the train and heard their experiences. They had been two and a half months cutting pit props, and were then on their way home, and had cut and hauled a certain number of cords to the sea shore; and when they found the prices that were to be paid them they discarded the whole thing and came home and allowed the pit props they had cut and hauled down a certain distance to remain; they did not go back to get them. Under the contract they had to haul the wood down to where it was to be shipped, but the rates were so low they would not complete the contract; they were not paid for what they had done; they did not make enough to pay their passages home, not to speak of being unable to send any assistance to their families. Their story was certainly doleful, and I sympathized deeply with them.

MR LLOYD—I would like to add words to the bill in amendment that will embody the sense of what the hon. Minister means. I would suggest the addition of certain words to bring out the intention of the Minister. After the end of the second line to add the words "to cut which shall not be less than $5 per cord for unrinded wood and $6 for rinded wood on the bank or in the boom." In some cases, I am informed, the wood is not placed on the bank—it is placed in the boom immediately and shipped from there.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Hauling the wood to the bank is a different thing from placing it in the boom, for they would have to cut the wood, make the boom, and then bring the pit props out to it.

MR. COAKER—I think it is just as well to leave out the words "in the boom."

MR. LLOYD—It has been suggested that it might be desirable to drop the words "in the boom." 1 am content.

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.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered to be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the said Bill 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.

EDUCATION BILL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly in reply to their message of the 25th of April instant, disagreeing with the Council amendments to section 33, subsection (1) of the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Relating to Education," that they regret that the House of Assembly do not set out any reasons for not concurring in the said amendments. The Legislative Council, in view of the fact that the said amendment was the unanimous vote of this House, cannot recede from their said amendment.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I beg to propose that a Committee be appointed to meet the Upper Chamber and see if they will not reconsider that matter. In my opinion it would be a great pity to lose for a year the benefits of the amendments contained in the Consolidated Act produced and passed by this House, for, this being the case, we simply revert to the old law, and the amendments prepared with such care by the various Superintendents will be utterly lost for a year I would suggest that a conference be asked for.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister a Committee consisting of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Currie, and Mr. Grimes was appointed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that body to appoint a similar Committee for conference on the said amendments.

PROHIBITION 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 Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MR. COAKER—That fine of fifty dollars seems to me very small. What is to prevent any number of men evading the consequences of this Act when the fine is only fifty dollars, which you say is to be the limit.

RT. HON PRIME MINISTER.—That would be for every offense. But I have no objections to the amount being increased.

MR. COAKER—Make it one hundred.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Alright.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. I beg to move an amendment to section 7, the object of which is to bring patent medicine under the definition of intoxicants. It is alleged at the present time that patent medicines are sold which contain a greater percentage of alcohol than the ordinary beverages sold as alcoholic beverages. It is an extraordinary fact that a woman selling hop beer containing by an oversight over two per cent. of alcohol is liable to punishment and yet patent medicines are sold containing a higher percentage of alcohol than any intoxicants and nothing is said. After the passing of the Prohibition Act it means than an enormous trade will spring up in the patent medicines, and the last state of affairs will be considerably worse than the first.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I quite agree with the hon. leader of

the opposition in his suggested amendment, but I would like to point out the position of the Druggists with regard to the proposed amendments, because they are, as a rule, vendors of these medicines. They will not be allowed to sell patent medicine under the Act without a Doctor's prescription, and to all intents and purposes patent medicines will be treated exactly the same as any other alcoholic liquors. The Druggists do not want to have the weight of selling alcoholic liquors cast upon their shoulders. Under this Act they will not be able to sell it without a Doctor's prescription.

MR. HIGGINS—I think Mr. Chairman that it is generally known that the druggists here are all members of the Pharmaceutical Society which contains all the druggists of the country. They have unanimously requested that they be not permitted to obtain Licenses to sell intoxicating liquors. Under a doctor's prescription they could give any amount of liquor I understand that they are not going to dispense liquor in any form. which seems to me to raise a question as to whether they will sell patent medicine or not. It certainly would be difficult for the Druggists to tell whether the patent medicines were sold for medicinal purposes or not. We must remember that doing away with alcohol will have an effect upon the business of the Druggist which at present we cannot possibly contemplate. I merely mention these points because I think they may be useful to the Committee in considering these matters.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. These points raised by the Hon. member for St. John's East only tend to clear the atmosphere. The insertion of the words I have mentioned will make no difference whatever to the legal position of Druggists, as that member will readily appreciate. No addition is made to the law by the insertion of these words, because it is already provided that all spirituous liquors having over two per cent of alcohol are to be treated as intoxicants. Therefore, the sale of this patent medicine will be illegal whether these words are inserted there or not, but the object of putting that in is to meet a situation that has grown up under which the sale of patent medicine is winked at by the people and the police. If you are going to deal with this matter at all, you ought to have everything above board.

MR. HIGGINS—The difficulty arose in this way. Although spirituous liquors have always included patent medicines, yet patent medicines are allowed to be sold as if they were not intoxicating. I have a notorious case in my mind where a number of men went into an outport shop, purchased some bottle of patent medicine, and drank them right there in the shop. One cannot tell beforehand whether these are sold for a bona fide medicinal purpose or not. I fully appreciate that these words make no difference to the legal position of druggists but I think any doubtful matter ought to be cleared up.

MR. LLOYD—It is not a question of Druggists at all. It is a business that is carried on for the most part by Grocers, this dealing in patent medicine and in many cases the sale of patent medicine formed a big portion of their trade. If the sale of patent medicine were confined to Druggists it would be another matter altogether.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I would like to point out that by including patent medicines you are not covering all the ground I think you wish to, for bay rum, florida water, and perfume are highly spirituous, and contain a large percentage of alcohol, but still they are necessities. Bay rum is used for family purposes,

and one will not be permitted under this scheme to buy bay rum without a doctor's prescription. I think the operation of this Act is going to be much more sweeping than appears on the face of it. If you are going to carry this out to the strict letter there are a good many surprises in store for the Committee.

I know this to be a fact that a very large business is done here in what is called "Malt Extract." It is imported here under that name and sold in prohibition districts, and I know that it is nothing more or less than ordinary porter. For these reasons I think the Act should be explicit in defining what it considers are suitable to be sold here.

MR. DEVEREAUX—This is an important question, and in my opinion merits a good discussion here. We must remember that in the outport towns things are different from what they are here. There one or two little stores sell all the medicines, and are, in fact, the drug stores of the place. They sell a very large quantity of patent medicines and if you confine their sale to certain places you will be giving a monopoly to those places, because there can be no doubt but that there is an extraordinary sale of this class of goods in the smaller grocery stores in the Island. You would be making a monopoly for the druggists of a character not commendable. You will not allow under this act the larger or even the smaller stores to sell a bottle of Radway's Relief, but you will give the monopoly to the druggist, as well as the monopoly in other medicines. Then by this you will cut out the settlements which have no drug stores. To do this will surely start trouble. I might say that if these are not allowed to be imported, they will get into the country, because they are necessities, and I could tell you of much good being done by such cures as Radway's, and others; all of which are undoubtedly good. The people have used them in the past and will ask for them in future. There are places where there are no doctors or magistrates, or at least where such are not accessible at all hours, and the result is that these are used to a great extent during the period of their absence. Now this act prohibits this. To prohibit the use of these patent medicines would be to spoil the working of the law, and the result will be the demoralization of the law of the land. However, the people have decided, and probably rightly so, but I do not think it is their wish to prohibit people from buying a bottle of perfume or of Radway's Relief You must remember that the people in the outports have not the facilities of the people here for buying medicines, and you must be particular not to infringe on their rights. It is impossible to restrict altogether the sale of patent medicines. I do not for one minute argue that when the electors in November last voted for prohibition, they voted for prohibition of medicines such as these. What they meant, Sir, and what everyone knows they meant, is the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as such, and unless this proclamation confines the working of this act to whiskey, rum, and a few other alcohol drinking liquors, trouble must most certainly result. The result, Sir, cannot be other than disastrous, and the result can only be not only the demoralization of this law, but that of all the other laws on our Statute Books. The whole result cannot but be disastrous, and the result will be the rise of smugglers all over the country, instead of liquor saloons, because although you can cut off a man from his whiskey you cannot cut him off from his medicine, especially when that medicine has been used by him, and recommended by his doctors all his lifetime. We cannot expect that

such a law would other than injure the morale of the people. We would not be realizing our responsibility as legislators, if we failed to give due consideration to this matter. I am not dwelling on this matter for the sake of such towns as we have at Harbour Grace, Placentia and Bonavista, where drug stores are open, but rather for the sake of places apart from these which have no such facilities, where the doctor is distant, and small stores predominate. I believe that this was not the intention of the electors when they marked their ballots as they did. What they wanted was the prohibition of wines, ales and spirituous liquors, and I do not believe it is their wish to prohibit such importations as have already been referred to here today.

MR. DOWNEY.—Mr. Chairman, I do not want to see anything stand in the way of the Temperance measure becoming law, but would ask that this amendment have the fullest consideration before being adopted .

I am loath to see such patent medicines as Ready Relief, Minard's and other Liniments, excluded. From personal experience I can vouch that such prove of very great value at times in cases of illness or accident when a doctor cannot immediately be procured. I have time and again been compelled to resort to such preparations when dealing with considerable numbers of men in isolated localities. In small lumbering camps, and on the hundreds of small schooners that are working throughout the entire season on our coasts and in which no regular medicine chests are kept, a bottle of Ready Relief or other liniment may at times be of very great value.

On the other hand, we all know that there are so-called medical tonics, such as Peruna, Beef, Iron and Wine; Wincarnis, and others, that are nothing more nor less than intoxicants masquerading in the form of medical tonics and such should be rigidly excluded.

A few weeks since I was in a city drug store on a Saturday evening after the liquor stores had closed and two young chaps of probably 17 or 18 years old, came in and asked for thirty cents worth of Bay Rum. The druggist appeared to me to hesitate about filling the order but finally did so. When the customers had gone he told me that he believed that that Bay Rum was bought with the view to its being taken as a stimulant, and that in the past year or two, since the closing of the Liquor Saloons at 6 p.m. many demands had been made for Bay Rum in such quantities, and that he felt quite certain that in many cases it was not required for toilet purposes. From this it will be seen that these preparations may be quite seriously abused, and the privilege of doing this should certainly be curtailed. As a means towards this end I would suggest that the Government seek the advice of the Medical Health Officer and be guided by his advice as to what liniments it is desirable to admit and what, including all the so-called medical tonics to exclude, and absolutely prohibit the importation of such.

MR. LLOYD—Mr Chairman: This has been an interesting discussion, but I am of the same opinion still. I venture to assert that more harm is being done to the country of Newfoundland by the sale of patent medicines than by all the rum that has ever been drunk. The unregulated taking of patent medicines is one of the greatest evils of the day, and great trouble arises therefrom. That is all I have to add.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman: It seems to be a difficult thing, Sir, to determine what is to be done in the way of excluding certain kinds of liquors. It certainly seems, Sir, that it would be a great hardship for any

man to be compelled to go to the additional expense of getting a doctor's prescription, just to be able to purchase a bottle of Radway's or any such mixture. The point that came to my mind, as this discussion was on, was the question as to whether or not the people when voting on this question, realized its fullest meaning, and what might be interpreted therefrom. All will agree, however, that no one for one minute expected patent medicines to be branded. The difficulty would then crop up as to which patent medicines the prohibition law might affect. It is well known that some are nothing but intoxicating liquors. There are many which have mere tonic names,and among these are 'Peruna,' Beef, Iron and Wine,' and 'Wincarnis.' All these are clearly mixtures to satisfy the desires for strong drink, and nothing more or less. As to the argument about doctors' bills and other expenses arising from the curtailment as provided in this bill, I think it would be well to curtail in some way the demands made for certain of these brands. I would go further and say that such sales have been injurious, for I have no hesitation in saying that some people buy bay rum and other of these mixtures just for drinking purposes. Anything we can do in this way ought to be done. I can quite realize the position of the druggists. What they want, in my opinion, is a guarantee that their places of business will not be turned into public houses, and of course everybody will agree with them in their contention. This is an important matter, however, and it is to be hoped that it will be satisfactory to all concerned.

MR. DOWNEY—I think the best thing to do is to arrange for the Public Health Officer or some other official to specify which of these medicines are necessary, and to allow a proclamation of the Governor in Council to specify the same. This is, in my opinion, the best way of dealing with this matter. I say this because I have found out the advantages of certain liniments, etc., at logging camps, and in the case of accidents. For that reason, I would, as I have already said here, be loath to have the indiscriminate sale of these discontinued. I am sure that if the suggestion of having the Medical Health Officer decide were carried out that much good would result, as he would without any doubt allow the sale of such liniments, though they might come under the head of alcoholic liquors.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman,the difficulty might be got over by making it perfectly clear that "spirituous liquors" include patent medicines except such patent medicines as may be excepted by the Governor in Council who shall have machinery provided for him under this act which shall suffice for these requirements.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—In reference to the remarks made by the member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, in relation to the objection taken by the Pharmaceutical Society, I would point out that this Society comprises certain druggists in the country, who decline to act under the powers given to them by this act. In the face of their objection, authority might be given to the Controller to supply liquor under the authority of the medical prescription, I would suggest the following amendment. (Hon. Prime Minister reads.) This amendment puts the Controller in precisely the same position as the druggists without in any way relieving them of any duty under the Act. The case might arise where a doctor is not available at the moment. Then as regards importing sacramental wine for certain religious bodies, I would suggest an amendment enabling them to appoint an official to import it for them, instead of doing it themselves.

After a while, druggists may see that there is really no serious objection to the duties which this Act proposes to cast upon them. I know that there is a great deal of alcohol in many of the drugs which they use every day. I can see no objection to this clause as it stands. There is no danger that the druggists will be drawn into the liquor traffic. My own idea is that nine-tenths of people who drink, drink from habit, and I do not think the difficulties we anticipate will prove very alarming.

MR. COAKER—I think it would be a good idea to limit the amount which the Controller may sell.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have no objection whatever. I have already taken precaution here that a record shall be kept.

MR. HIGGINS—I have not the Act here just now, but I think that you will find that under the law passed last year, doctors can give a gallon if they want to. The check lies in the fact that the druggists keep a record of what they sell as provided in the last two sections. I think it will be found that it will largely be a question of time working these questions out. We have to assume that medical men will live up to the provisions of this Act.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The spirit of the Act is so to hedge around the sale of liquor in every possible way that any disposition of liquor for any other than medicinal purposes would be illicit I must confess that I am surprised that the druggists have taken the stand that they have when you consider the fact that the Act recognises that a certain amount of alcohol for medicinal purposes is necessary. It does not impose upon druggists a greater necessity of keeping alcohol than they have today, as the Act strongly emphasizes the fact that no liquor should be sold without the authority of a doctor's prescription. I therefore fail to see how a druggist can be placed in any undesirable position owing to the mere fact that he is expected to keep alcohol on his premises. The druggist must be a trained man and pass a certain examination. If any machinery is brought to bear he ought not be allowed to shirk it. It would indeed be unfortunate if doctors and druggists did not rise to the occasion and work in accordance with the spirit of this Act. Patent medicines are sold by individuals other than druggists for the most part. It would be deplorable if druggists did not realize their responsibilities. Druggists are generally available in case of emergency and the Controller would not always be in a position to attend these cases of emergency,and of course the need for stimulant is often peremptory; sometimes in the middle of the night a case of vital importance might arise when the Controller might be twenty miles away. It is a question of fact always if the liquor prescribed is for bona fide medicinal purposes or not.

MR. CURRIE—I agree very largely with the remarks of the Hon. Colonial Secretary, and am unable to appreciate the objection raised by the Druggists. Under the Act they are not compelled to sell liquor, they are entirely free agents in the matter, and the most that will be expected of them will be to continue to do as they are now doing. Because they will have to fill a prescription for intoxicating liquor, will not necessarily involve them in the liquor traffic. They surely will be wise enough to distinguish a prescription for purely medical purposes from one which may be given to evade the law. If they refuse to sell alcoholic liquors, I do not see how they hope to carry on their business, for I am assured many prescriptions call for more than the legal percentage of alcohol. Personally I con-

fess I do not see the necessity for the amendment as proposed. It will be giving the Controller powers beyond what was originally intended, and I fear might open the way for abuses. The duty of the Controller was to sell wholesale only, he now becomes a retailer.

MR HIGGINS—I support the amendment because I think it is necessary. Licensed druggists have petitioned the Government for an amendment to the Act which would make it impossible for them to sell alcoholic liquors in St. John's. They want to avoid selling liquor say for medicinal purposes. There are only two classes of people that can retail liquor, the doctors and the druggists, and I do not think it likely that we will have a great deal of trouble. It is not a novel situation as far as I can see. There is no limit as to the amount of liquor that may be sold. As I have said, I consider the amendment necessary.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: Hon. members who have just expressed their disapproval of the decision of the druggists not to dispense spirituous liquors under the coming prohibition law either for medicinal or other purposes, are not so much concerned over that decision as they are over the probability of the Government having to do that work. Government control to the extent of dispensing liquors is what they oppose. Now Government ownership and control is not a new idea. You will find it in force all over the civilized world in some form or other and it has on the whole been entirely successful. Its application to the dispensing of liquors under our coming prohibitory law will have a like result if conducted properly. It could be sold much cheaper to the doctor and to the people who would be obliged to use it; for the Government need not concern itself about making the handsome profits upon its sale the same as the druggists would require, and the people would be that much better off by the lower prices they would pay, and the Government would be better off by the revenue it would receive from the profits it would derive. From that standpoint I fully believe that the suggestion that the Government Controller with a competent staff should carry on the work of distribution is the wisest course to follow.

MR. LLOYD—This bill is calculated to create a difficulty as far as the Government is concerned, and I fully appreciate the position which the druggists take in this matter. They do not want their business to be anything more than it is at present. I would suggest that we accept that clause which leaves druggists in the same position as they are today and says: "Except such drugs and medicines as may be specially excepted by the Governor in Council."

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.

On motion this report was received and adopted and ordered to be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the said Bill 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.

REVENUE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill enittled: "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 to-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had appointed the Hons. Messrs. Bishop, Murphy, Harvey, Angel and Robinson, a Select Committee, to confer with the Select Committee of the House of Assembly upon the subject of 'An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Weights and Measures and the Inspection of Lumber.'

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 or to come before the House.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, the first day of May, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

MR. COAKER—May I ask the Premier if he will table the information in connection with the Naval Reserves I asked for the other day.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I wrote the Captain of H.M.S. Briton in connection with the matter. His reply is here, which I beg to table.

MR. COAKER—I beg to ask whether the Committee has been yet appointed to visit the Penitentiary and report on conditions there.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Not as far as I know. The Committee visited that Institution last year several times and sent in their reports. I shall be glad to arrange for a Committee to go down there any day.

DR. LLOYD—That would be a good thing considering the questions that have been raised in connection with the matter. We can go either Monday or Tuesday.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 1st, 1916.

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

MESSAGE FROM COUNCIL.

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 consisting of the Honourables Messrs. Bishop, Robinson, Squires, Power, and Milley, to confer with the House of Assembly Committee on the Education Bill amendments.

QUESTIONS.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works for a detailed statement of all amounts paid for supplies outside of tenders and to whom paid; also, copy of tenders as supplied by E. J. Horwood.

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table that statement.

RULES SUSPENDED.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Rules of the House in relation to all matters, now before the House or to come before the House, were suspended.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Report of the Select Committee and Bill respecting Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: The Bill which has been circulated for the consideration of the Committee is, in fact, entirely the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee. It will be remembered that two years ago the rate-payers of St. John's petitioned this Legislature for

a suspension of the municipal government in the city of St. John's, and asked that for a period of one year Commissioners be appointed with a view of making a study of municipal government, and at the same time carrying on the ordinary functions of city government. Commissioners were appointed under the Act and the Municipal Council was suspended, in so far as the Government of the city was concerned, and for a year the Commissioners carried on the municipal government of the city. Last year it was found, when their report was presented, that they had not had sufficient time to formulate a complete charter for the town, and it was then considered desirable that they should be given another term of one year. Only a few days ago they reported to the Governor in Council, under their commission, a very elaborate and exhaustive and extensive charter, embracing a number of new principles and new matters which they recommend should be incorporated in a permanent Bill. It will also be remembered that that report, which really took the form of a bill, was tabled here, and a Select Committee was appointed to consider its provisions. At the same time a Committee from the Legislative Council was also appointed. That Joint Select Committee had several meetings; they met the City Commissioners and heard their views in relation to various matters concerning the Bill, and they also heard the views of a Committee appointed by the citizens at a public meeting held some days ago; and this Bill that I now propose to the Committee is the outcome of the report of the Joint Select Committee. In effect, the Bill asks for an election for two years, to be held in the month of June, for Municipal Councillors, and that a plebiscite be held in the month of September to give the rate-payers of the city an opportunity of pronouncing on the question of the Ward System. The Committee will remember that in the report of the Joint Select Committee these were two of the recommendations; and in addition the Joint Select Committee pointed out that at this late hour in the session they did not consider that the Legislature had sufficient time to consider the far-reaching proposals contained in the Bill, and that it would be in the interests of the city and of all concerned, especially as there is no very great hurry, and as this is a case in which we had better make haste slowly. if this present Bill that I now recommend to the Committee were introduced, and that in the meantime the Select Committee be given authority to sit out of session to consider the Bill as proposed by the Commissioners and at the same time take into consideration any suggestions which may be made by the Citizens' Committee. The Citizens Committee is a committee which was appointed by a public meeting in St. John's, called together by the representatives of St. John's in the Legislature and held in the T. A. Hall, at which something like 1500 or 1600 ratepayers were present. This committee was appointed at that meeting, and I am glad to say is on all fours with the Joint Select Committee as regards these suggestions, first, as to the necessity to go back even for two years on an elective board, and secondly that in the meantime an opportunity should be afforded the ratepayers to decide on the question as to whether in the future the councillors should be elected for wards or for the whole city. Now the Committee need not concern themselves with the principle contained in that suggestion. That will be a matter entirely for the citizens to say, and I have no doubt that if this House adopts the principle of the bill and a plebiscite is provided for in Septem-

ber next, that between now and then the people who are immediately concerned will have ample time to fully consider the merits of the question in relation to the ward system. It is a principle that a good deal can be said in favor of and a good deal can be said against; but I think a great deal of the difference that exists as between the people who favor and those who oppose the ward system, is accounted for by the fact that the idea is not clearly understood. If it was once clearly understood, I think, a good deal of the differences that exist in relation to the ward system would entirely vanish; I do not mean to say all the objections would disappear, but a great many of them. In the first place there are two classes of ward elections—first the class which comprises the man who stands for a ward and then considers himself earmarked for the business of that ward and for no other business; and secondly, the class in which the councillor is elected as a ward councillor merely for the purpose of convenience, merely for the convenience of election. The election being over, he ceases to be a ward councillor and becomes a councillor for the whole town. Practically the same position as we are in in this Legislature. We are elected here for various districts merely for the purpose of convenience, first as regards election, and secondly in order that we may more easily come in contact with the needs and requirements of our various constituencies for the purpose of more correctly and individually representing them. But no man would be prepared to admit that when he comes into this House that he is a member merely for one district and not for the whole Island. It is quite true that as regards the special and particular and local requirements of his district that he is especially charged with these; but these matters refer only to the regular grants to which his distict is entitled, but as regards the general policy that affects the whole Island; and it is in that capacity that we as a whole speak and act. Sometimes in this capacity we have to do very disagreeable things, things that bring us right up against our constituents who do not see eye to eye with the special policy before the House; but anyone who has been in the Legislature for any time knows he has to face that and very often to his detriment and his injury; but history very often establishes that the representative was right and those who thought otherwise at the time were wrong and are the first to approve of it. I can remember in my short experience that when this country became practically insolvent on account of the French fish competition, when Newfoundland fish was returned from the Mediterranean and could not be sold in 1886 and 1887, the causes which largely contributed to bringing about the Crash, and when fish was $2 a quintal, we had to pass the Bait Act and we had to carry out the Bait Act,—in the carrying out of that Act many persons were seriously damaged and injured; but the members for those districts that were specially concerned, had no other course open but to favor the legislation and support the Act. I merely mention that as an illustration of how very often a man may repesent a particular constituency and his constituents may not see eye to eye with him in some particular policy perhaps, but he may have to support it. In the ward system it is much the same. If men are elected for wards and after they are elected forget that they have any special interested in doing more for that ward in proportion than they are going to do for the rest of the town, other things being equal, then there will be very little objection to the ward system. The great advan-

tage in favor of the ward system is that a good representative, a good citizen, may be prepared to face and contest an election in a small ward when his election would in all probability be guaranteed by a requisition from the ratepayers, and might not be prepared to face a constituency representing the whole town. But we are not called upon to decide that question. That is a matter we now propose to leave to the people, and I should suppose that between now and next September that ample time will be afforded them to enable them to make up their minds in relation to that matter. The proposal then is that an election should be held in June for a new council for the city together with a Mayor —and these gentlemen to hold office for two years; and that in the month of September a plebiscite will be granted the ratepayers to decide on the question of election by ward or not. The ratepayers to vote at the election will be the same as heretofore voted, and the ratepayers that will vote in September will be from the same list of voters that will be used in June. There will be no additions made, as there will likely be very few to be added to this between June and September, and it will save the cost of making up a new list.

MR. CLIFT—What is the estimated cost of the election?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I do not know; but it will be in the region of $1600.

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.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

MOVING PICTURES CENSORSHIP 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 Censoring of Moving Pictures."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I have already explained on the second reading of this bill, that it is a measure in relation to the censorship of moving pictures. It is proposed that the Board, which will be of three, will be appointed by the Governor in Council, the board to be called the Board of Censorship. A majority of this Board shall be a quorum. The Censors, or any of them, may at any time enter any building or place where any exhibition of moving pictures is carried on for the purpose of inspecting and passing upon the fitness for public exhibition of any moving picture or stationary slide used or displayed in such building or place. They have this right, and persons obstructing them are subject to a penalty as herein set forth. A quorum of the Board of Censors present at any such exhibition may by verbal or written notification to the proprietor of such exhibition or to the person operating the projection machine thereat summarily prohibit the exhibition of any moving picture or stationary slide, which they may consider to be injurious to the morals of the public, or against the public welfare, or offensive to the public, and penalties are attached to any case in

which these commands are not obeyed. That is the whole tenor of the bill, and the object for which it was introduced. I may say that it has been called to the attention of the government by reputable citizens, who frequent these places some of them every week, that sometimes there are shown pictures which in their opinion are not at all in the public interest of the morals of the people. Now the moving pictures afford not only amusement, but education. Everybody knows that the moving pictures are a great educator, and not only are they educators, but afford pleasant cheap amusement. They can be shown at a cheap rate because they are circulated in the different towns. In this way, at a very reasonable rate they not only prove a good amusement maker, but a good educator. They educate the public. They educate in the line of live topics, and show views such as views of the great war in Europe, and the war in Mexico. They deal with all sorts of interesting matter. They show you at one time the manufacture of lumber from the tree, and the full manufacture of that wood into paper, and on account of these educating pictures, it is only right and in the public interest that every facility should be given to the proprietors of such entertainment; but this measure is brought in to prevent pictures which are considered improper and offensive from being exhibited in St. John's. It is thus to censor such objectionable pictures as these that this bill will operate. I am glad to say that from enquiries it has been found that only very occasionally have pictures been shown which have been considered objectionable, and were of a character which could not be approved of. I think it will be found that it will be fairly safe in thus leaving the censorship to three citizens, who will take upon themselves this duty without any pay, and in the interest of the public. For these reasons, I beg to move the bill be read.

MR. HIGGINS—May I suggest that the word "being" be inserted after "is" in the second line of section 2. I think it will probably have the effect of making the bill more practicable.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER.—That is alright.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman, before making any general remarks, I would suggest the substitution of the word "oral" for the word "verbal" in section three. "Oral" is clearly intended. The word "verbal" includes both oral and written, and is therefore not the word required here in this context.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I have seen moving pictures, I think it must be on a very rare occasion that anything of an objectionable nature occurs. I readily confess that as far as time will allow, I frequent the moving picture shows. It is an amusement, a diversion, and a rest. But sir, on some occasions there is need of a censorship. A censorship quite apart from the ordinary moral character of the shows. I can name a moving picture house in this city where I must say the pictures are of a very high standard, and the proprietors thereof take great pains to show clean and instructive pictures, and would not show any which were of a very objectionable character. I have seen on one or two occasions war pictures which were certainly never meant to cater to a British public. War pictures which I am sure emanated from German sources in America. Pictures which are meant to depress the British public, and enhance the German side of the struggle. These pictures have been on exhibition in St.John's, and I have seen them. I have in my hand a letter of protest from a citi-

zen of this city against a picture which is offensive to British people. I have seen the picture myself, but this letter refers I am sure to the same picture. It was the sort of pictures which would be approved of only by Sinn Feiners, and nobody else. To my judgment, I think the picture was made to insult the ordinary English, Scotch and Welsh soldier. Now I need say nothing further. In the picture in question the uniforms were undoubtedly American, though they were supposed to be British. The officers and men were acting in a manner in which British soldiers would never think of acting. As an example of this I might read the legend of one scene:

"Come on, you dirty devils, the Irish Regiment has laid the carpet down for you."

MR. HIGGINS—Had not that better be "not more than"? It seems a hard and fast law to make. You are leaving nothing to the magistrate whatever, but bind him to give this penalty. I can perceive certain cases where offenses might be less serious than others, and would recommend leaving this to the magistrate.

MR. CLIFT—I was going to say with regard to the amendment proposed by the member for St. John's East, that otherwise the only reading could be that censors only had the right to enter while the show is actually in progress. This would in my opinion be an error, as the first exhibition might cause the damage this bill is trying to censor. The object I should think is to censor these pictures before they are displayed, and provision should be made whereby this might be done. It will sometimes be too late if the pictures are already shown before the censors have time to act.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, my reason for suggesting this was to give provision to have the pictures censored before they are shown. It is locking the door after the horse has gone if you limit the time of censorship to the time that the show is in progress. What is wanted under this bill is provision to have these censored before exhibition, and unless you provide for this satisfaction cannot be obtained. It would be better for all concerned, for this bill, as it read, left hanging over the heads of the proprietors, a constant fear at any minute the show might be stopped. That of itself is a check. I think the Board of Censors appointed under this Bill would not likely be able to devote time to censuring every picture, which ought strictly to be done, and we are awkwardly situated here as there is no regular continuation of pictures, that is to say, where the pictures go from one place to another, and one censoring suffices. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I have suggested, I think that better results can be got from this Bill as per section 3, which allows at any time a visit by the Board of Censors to be made, because it will be found in practice impossible, unless it is intended to have a Board that will regularly and continually inspect all films, to be put into effect some practice that will never be carried out. I have had reasonable connection with one of these theatres in St. John's, and some slight knowledge of the way in which the Bill is viewed by people who are interested in these things themselves. They welcome it. It would mean considerable delay having to run off the films at once, and considerable expense in the way of extra labour and time.

MR. LLOYD—While there is a good deal in what the hon. member for St. John's East says that we neither have the machinery nor the means still the uncertainty of the visit from

the censor excludes the possibility of any films being examined except at the regular time of the performance. Occasion may occur when, without any set censors or without any organized system, it is known by advertisements before that certain pictures are to be shown here which have been objected to elsewhere. I cannot say that this censoring in practice will turn out anything more than to be a visit. The occasion may occur when it would be desirable to run a film off. The language would be wide enough to authorize that.

MR. DOWNEY—It is quite conceivable in my opinion that this clause now under discussion will in practice not quite come up to the anticipation we are now indulging in, because it is possible that the public will see these pictures perhaps a show before, or perhaps simultaneously with the censors themselves. I know the proprietors of these theatres exercise great care, but then they have to accept whatever films are sent them. I very rarely attend these theatres, and I remember one certain film which was quite of an ordinary character and had nothing objectionable in it except for one moment when a picture of a transformation character was thrown upon the screen, and which scene was most objectionable from a moral point of view. I cannot speak in terms too strongly. No doubt the proprietors were unaware of this episode being in it. The only means I see of accomplishing your desires is by having a Board of Censors provided to go through every film before produced, which would entail considerable expense. Let the police be deputed and give them the power to pass upon films. This would exonerate the proprietors fully and save expense.

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.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Censoring of Moving Pictures," 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.

REVENUE BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act, 1905."

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.

This report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act, 1905," 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.

DEATH DUTIES BILL.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Death Duties Act, 1914-1915," was read a second time.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think there will be found nothing of an objectionable nature in the fol-

lowing section. I will just read it for the Committee:

1.—All personal property of a deceased person, whether situate within or without this Colony, shall be deemed to be the property in this Colony within the meaning of subsection (a) of Section 1 of the Act 6, George V, Cap. 26: Provided however, that where any item of such property situated outside the Colony shall, by reason of the death of the deceased, be subject to duty in the country in which it is situated, the amount of such duty, if and when actually paid, shall be deducted from the duty payable or refunded out of the duty paid in this Colony in respect of the same item, and that for this purpose the shares of a Company on a Register kept outside the Colony shall be deemed to be situate in the country in which such Register is kept, anything in section 2 of the said Act contained to the contrary notwithstanding.

It will be remembered that section 2 of the Act passed last year dealing with Death Duties provided as follows in sub-section (a)

"Shares and debentures in a Company shall, for the purposes of the said Act" (that is the Act passed the year before) "and of this Act be deemed to be property in this Colony, at the date of his death."

It has been drawn to the attention of the government by a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies that under that section a conflict has arisen with the Imperial law.

Shares and debentures of a Company under the Act and for the purposes of Newfoundland death duty are to be deemed to be property in the Colony. Where, therefore, the Company, although incorporated in the Colony, has a register of shareholders in England as provided in clause 2 subsection "c" shares on such register would, by Newfoundland law, be regarded as situated in the Colony, whereas by the English law they would be regarded as situated in England. It was not the intention of the Newfoundland Legislature to adopt a test of situation which differs from that adopted in England the effect of which would be to destroy the application of section 20 of the Imperial Finance Act 1894 which would make that Act impossible. The rule to avoid double taxation is that the country where the asset is situate should be entitled to levy its tax upon that asset without regard to any tax levied in the other country, and the other country, when levying its tax, is to make an allowance of the amount of the tax paid in the country where the asset is situate. If, therefore, both countries treat the situation as within their own borders, neither would make the allowance and the object of the section would be frustrated. It is necessary consequently if the Order in Council of the Imperial Government of the 8th March 1895 applying section 20 of the Finance Act of 1894 to Newfoundland is not to be revoked, for a clause to be passed by the Newfoundland Legislature on the lines I now propose. This section is borrowed from the New Zealand Act which adopted the same legislation to deal with the same difficulty.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman. I think we can accept the Bill as suggested by the leader of the government. The principle is that the same asset should not be taxed twice, once in England and once here. The suggested principle is that wherever a personal asset shall be that country shall have the right to tax it. If shares in a Company in Newfoundland are owned in England then those shares shall be taxable for death duties in England and similarly here. It

is a very small contribution, if it can be called a Colonial contribution,from Newfoundland's assets to Imperial taxation, and it is a principle that has been accepted by all the other Dominions; and therefore I think we should accept it, and I rise to support it.

The bill was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Death Duties Act 1914-1915."

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.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act To Amend the Death Duties Act 1914-1915" 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 provision.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Loan for Public Purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman: In introducing these Resolutions, I may say that they are divided into three parts. We are asking for a loan of Five Million Dollars, divided into three parts. First we ask for the sum of One Million Dollars to pay off the Temporary Loan borrowed for railway purposes in 1914. This Loan, as you remember, was secured two years ago by Sir Edward Morris, who, after we passed the Act here in the House of Assembly asking for the loan of one million dollars to complete the railroad system throughout the Island, went to England and found that the money market was very tight at the time. Depression was setting in at the time in the Old Country as well as in Canada and the United States, and Sir Edward was advised not to put the loan on the market at the amount of interest allowed in that Loan Bill of 3½ per cent. He secured a temporary loan from Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co. to carry on the work, and he returned to this country without putting that loan on the market. Now we all know what has happened since. A few months after war broke out, and that amount owed to Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co. is still in the balance. It is not raised, and they have not been paid back that amount, and in this Bill we propose bringing in here today, we ask authority for paying off that amount borrowed temporarily two years ago.

Secondly, we are asking for the sum of three million dollars. I might say that when the war broke out in August, 1914, we immediately tried to do something to help the old land, and it was decided that we should send soldiers to the other side, and before we had time to borrow any money or to go into the question with the British Government financially, we raised a certain sum by loan from the Bank of Montreal. After we got on our feet we raised a sum of money from the British Government. The amount paid for that

loan of half a million was 3½ per cent. As the war went on, it was found that we would have to borrow more money, and we again applied to the British Government for another loan of half a million. On that loan we had to pay 4½ per cent. When these two amounts were spent, we found that we still had to go on increasing, and on our second million we were asked to pay 5 per cent., which was the interest that was being paid by the other British Colonies.

MR. LLOYD—Did you pay off the temporary loan from the Bank of Montreal?

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes. As soon as we received the first half million we paid off the Bank of Montreal. The position is that we have practically spent $1,500,000 to date for war purposes. Our expenses are about $120,000 per month, and the number of volunteers is increasing day after day. We estimate that the amount asked for here will meet our expenditure up to April next, or until this House meets again. Now, we are asking in this Loan Bill for a total of $5,000,000 made up of $1,000,000 due Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co. for railway expenditure; $3,000,000 received from the British Government for war purposes; and the other million is made up as follows: Extension of Telephone System, $150,000; temporary loan from Bank of Montreal, $100,000; extension of telegraphs, $140,000; erection of light houses and fog alarms, $45,000; construction and improvement of public buildings, $175,000. We are dropping the amount of $150,000 for telephone service and putting in practically the exact amount which we owe the Bank of Montreal; then we owe $500,000 raised last year as a temporary loan in connection with the public service of the Colony. This makes a total of $960,000, and we are asking for the other $40,000 to meet any emergency that cannot be foreseen at the present moment. As far as the interest is concerned, we are not asking for any extra interest, for the reason that the balance of the loan of Act 1, George V., Cap. 23,—$135,000—has not been spent. Interest was voted on that $150,000 for telephone service and on $100,000 for lighthouses and fog alarms. Our total interest for temporary loans, railway extension and war loans is $247,951.34. If we were in the position that we would have to pay interest from the 30th June, the beginning of the fiscal year, we would want $275,000, but here is the position: The $135,000 not taken up and the $150,000 dropped, leaves a balance of interest of $14,560. Now, if we are fortunate enough to raise this loan within six months from the 30th June next, we will be doing good work; and if six months' interest is dropped, we will still be in credit on the $247,951.34 voted here. Therefore, it is not the intention to ask for any further interest until the next session of the House. I hope I have made that point clear to the House. The drop balance of our interest account last year was something like forty thousand odd dollars, and if the interest account went on for the time being without any additional loans, this year we would have a substantial drop balance. As already pointed out, the interest due on the $150,000 and the $135,000 is sufficient to meet the shortage, that is, allowing six months in which to raise the loan. Therefore, it is not necessary for me to come down this afternoon with Additional Estimates to ask for any further interest for this loan which we hope to raise.

Now, this loan is a short loan, for ten years. The reason for that is that we don't know what the position may be ten years from now. Money may be away down, as it was

five years ago. That is the principal reason for making this loan a ten-year loan. It will also be noticed that these resolutions are different from any brought into the House before, in that we are in a position to raise this money in the United States as well as in England, or to take up part of it here in Newfoundland. Considerable money may be forthcoming here, when it is considered that there are over $12,000,000 lying in the Savings Banks of the Colony at the present moment at 3 per cent. There is no reason why some of this money should not be utilized to float some of these loans when the inducement is so good and the term is so short, at 5½ per cent.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: May I suggest that at this stage the opportunity be afforded the Leader of the House to make a statement of his position in reference to railway expenditure.

MR. COAKER—I might point out to the Premier that the Government have already authority for one million dollars which they have not raised. What are they going to do with that? Allow that to remain at 4 per cent?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—For the present. With regard to the railway expenditure, the reply received from Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, shows that the amount due on all branches except Bonne Bay, is $574,000. The estimated cost of the Bonne Bay branch is $704,000, less $100,000, if you adopt the short line.

MR. COAKER—That does not include anything for land or right of way?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—There is no right of way between Deer Lake and Bonne Bay where it comes out; it is all through a wilderness; there is not a human habitation there.

MR. LLOYD—What is the meaning of that reference to a sinking fund?

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—That was an Act passed in 1895, a loan Act, under which a certain sum is paid off every year; there is a certain amount of the stock cancelled for the purpose of paying off the principal, and there is a provision in the Act by which we allow, under this Act, the stock to go in payment. I will show the hon. member. (Act given Mr. Lloyd).

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Chairman: There is nothing very striking about the Bill now under discussion. It is a Bill that has been long expected and must necessarily come from certain transactions that have been under way for some considerable time. The only unfortunate part of it is that it has been delayed practically till almost the last day of the session. I do not think that this is the class of legislation that ought to come before us under suspended rules; and we ought to have no inclination to consider such a Bill while the rules are suspended for general work. Therefore, I cannot compliment the Minister on the occasion on which he has introduced this Bill. Now, Sir, as to the provisions which the Minister has told us are to raise $5,000,000. Five million dollars are needed to pay debts roughly estimated at three and a half millions, and only one and a half millions are to meet expenditures that will be incurred between now and the next meeting of the Legislature next year in connection with the war; and therefore on these points we have nothing to do but to accept the situation. May I point out that in reference to the first section authorizing the raising of one million dollars, that there is nothing in this Act or rather nothing in these resolutions which compels that one million dollars to be appropriated for the

purposes set forth. I have no doubt it is the intention of the Government to use that one million dollars for that purpose; but there is nothing in the Resolutions that insists on its being appropriated for that purpose. All there is, is that that one million dollars are to be appropriated for railway purposes; and that one million dollars can next year be equally used for railway construction instead of paying the bankers who advanced the one million dollars. I have no doubt such money will reach the hands of the Bankers because I think the loan has been outstanding two years, and the intention of the borrowers and the lenders was that the loan should not be for any longer period than one year. And therefore the force of circumstances without the force of the words of the Act will be sufficient to direct that one million dollars to flow into the chests of the Bankers. May I point out in this connection also that when that one million dollars is raised, and assuming it is appropriated by the Minister to pay off one million dollars of indebtedness there will still be authority to raise two million dollars for railway purposes. And therefore the present authority for the completion of railway system raises two million dollars more, and according to the estimates of the Government Engineer, no more than one million and a quarter dollars will be required for the completion of these works; and therefore in complying with this measure you will give the Government three-quarters of a million dollars more than they want. That is a dangerous position. The cat is coming out of the bag; it may be that the Government will have to act under our estimate and not under their own. We are now getting nearer the truth. While we have this very sudden dose from the Government Engineer put before us we are still told that it is necessary or desirable to give full authority to raise two million dollars in addition, or in spite of the one million dollars provided for in this Act. With regard to the war loan we have to express our entire accord with it. We have to face our war obligations. It is notorious that our expenditure is going up by leaps and bounds and as the recruits come in the daily expenditure will increase. At the present time I think we have some 500 recruits, and that is the result of the impetus in recruiting. I think the country ought to be congratulated on the response that has been made during the last few months because it really means that not only 500 are under drill and getting ready to go away but the recruits have been coming in particularly during the last few weeks in large numbers. Several times a week we read in the newspapers of 38, 32, 35 and 20 recruits coming at a time, and I should say for the past fortnight probably over 150 have been accepted. I am not saying recruited; there have been far more men recruited; these are actually the men who have been accepted, and in addition to that and the large part of the last draft which was sent to reinforce the second battalion raised under this same impetus to recruiting, there are some 120 naval reservists who have also been raised. So that the position is this: that very nearly 700 men have been raised since this new recruiting has started. It all points to this: that as far as the recruiting is concerned, as these recruits come in, as the country responds, so our liabilities will increase. There are 20 months gone by, and one and a half million dollars spent; it is evident that another one and a half million dollars will be spent in the next tweve months. And we should judge that the three million dollars provided under this second section is a fair and proper estimate.

With regard to the other million dollars, that is merely to pay off local indebtedness due the bank, with the exception of some $40,000. Therefore, the position that we will take up is this: that we are faced with the necessity of raising money to pay off three and a half million dollars of indebtedness, and to provide for a loan for another one and a half million which money will be needed between now and the time the House meets next, to provide money for war purposes.

I am pleased to find that an effort is being directed to other channels for money than London. London is the centre of the money markets of the world,but the chief business of London at the present time is not for finding money for promoting industry throughout the world. Its real business today is to provide money so that civilization shall rule throughout the world. We should therefore as far as possible, relieve that pressure on London for silver bullets. It is a notorious fact, that owing to the war itself, New York has become a second London, and plenty of money is available throughout the States, made largely out of the war. It is also well known that we have in Newfoundland on deposit in the Savings Banks large sums of money earning a comparatively small rate of interest, and it is a wise provision for the Government to encourage the people by offering sufficient inducements to them to interest themselves in Government securities, and in order to do that the only thing you will have to, but it is a very big task, is to get the confidence of the people. If you can get the confidence and respect of the people as to your financial operations, and as to the manner in which you spend the money, you will succeed in getting all the money you want without any trouble. I am not going to enlarge upon that matter, a hint is sufficient, it does not need illustrating. I wish you success in this endeavour, but it will depend largely upon yourselves and how you conduct the Government of the country.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, there is just one word I would like to say in reference to one matter mentioned by the hon. member in regard to the one million dollars loan. That loan is to pay a million dollars that was advanced in connection with the railway under the Railway Loan Act, 1914. It was not thought desirable to repeal the former Act providing for the raising of two million dollars, because it was on the faith of that Act that the former million was raised, and if we repealed it, it might create some misunderstanding. While it is true that the former Bill for two million dollars is in existence, there is no intention whatever of raising one cent under it. There was just one other point that was suggested in regard to gaining the confidence of the people. I hope we shall have the assistance of my hon. friends in this regard, who control such a large section of the Press which influences such a large section of our people, but it is a very hard thing, no matter how high your financial character may be to influence the public in regard to financial matters. Our people today have over ten million dollars in the various city Savings Banks and a large amount of money on deposit in the city banks, and yet they prefer to take this low interest rather than invest in British Government and French Government bods.

MR. COAKER—It is not generally known throughout the country.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—Well, it is advertised in every paper in the country. However, these investments would nearly double their income, because the Savings Banks are only paying 3 per cent.

MR. COAKER—Mr. Chairman: I would suggest that if the Government wants to raise money they should raise it by commission and make an appeal to the public, signed by men of various political complexions. I think you will find the public will respond.

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 to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled: "An Act to Authorize the Raising of a Sum of Money by Loan for Naval, Military, Railway and other public purposes," was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled: "An Act to Authorize the Raising of a Sum of Money by Loan for Naval, Military, Railway and other Public Purposes," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled: "An Act to Authorize the Raising of a Sum of Money by Loan for Naval, Military, Railway, and other Public Purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled: "An Act to Authorize the Raising of a Sum of Money by Loan for Naval, Military, Railway, and other Public 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.

COD OIL BILL.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the manufacture of cod oil for medicinal purposes.

MR. LLOYD—In view of the fact that we are doing everything in a bit of a hurry, perhaps the Minister would not mind explaining the nature of the bill of which he just gave notice.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker: There have been a number of petitions to this House during this session asking that those who put up cod oil for medical purposes should be granted licenses in the same way in which lobster and salmon licenses are granted, and that there should be an inspector of cod oil for medical purposes. This Bill provides that no one shall export cod-oil for medical purposes without having a license which shall be shown to the Customs Officer,and a certificate that it has been inspected. The people say that the price of cod oil has a tendency to rise, but people have been manufacturing this article carelessly, and those who do it well want protection. Pretty nearly all the information that I have obtained I got from Conception Bay and the West Coast. These men want to put on the market a good article to get a good price. If they can put a good article which has been inspected, marked with the Inspector's brand, on the New York market, they will get very high prices. In the past cod oil has gone out of the country without inspection, and those who put up a good

article have received a black eye owing to the manner in which others have mixed impurities like seal oil with it. It is hoped by this Bill to over come this.

MR. COAKER—You intend to make inspection compulsory?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Yes.

MR. COAKER—What are you going to do with the stuff that is condemned?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Well, that is another proposition. Perhaps there won't be any condemned. On the other hand, we may have three brands, marked one, two and three. However that is a matter for consideration when the Act comes up.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—During the debate on the Saw Mills Act the hon. member for Twillingate asked me for the returns of royalties made under the old Act. I now wisn to table them.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 2nd, 1916.

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

Mr. Speaker left the chair until 4.30 of the clock .

COD OIL BILL.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill "An Act respecting the Refining of Cod Liver Oil," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill, "An Act respecting the Refining of Cod Liver Oil," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Refining of Cod Liver Oil."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, I said pretty nearly all I had to say by way of explanation of this Bill on yesterday. The Bill empowers the Department of Marine and Fisheries to issue licenses to any persons wishing to put up cod oil for medical purposes. It is not only a protection to the trade, but it is also a protection to those who wish to engage in the business. There will be very little expense attached to it. As far as the license is concerned, there will be no expense unless the Government decide to issue stamps similar to those used in connection with the lobster and salmon business at the present day, but that may be dealt with by means of a brand. The Bill also provides for an Inspector or Inspectors to inspect the cod oil to see that the right kind of article is put up and branded before the people go to the Custom House for an export entry.

I think this Bill will answer the prayer of the many petitions which have been presented to this House, and also the letters which have been received in this connection by the Government and myself and also, I think, by the hon. member for Twillingate.

We want to compete with other countries that have been manufacturing cod oil. We have been putting cod oil on the different markets of the world for many years, but it has never had the protection from the Government which it should have had, and therefore an inferior quality oil has been sent out. Now, I think this Bill will help our people, and it will also

help the trade considerably, and that as a result of it we will be able to put on the markets of the world—the United States, Canada and Great Britain—an oil that will really be equal to that supplied by Norway and the other countries that have been trying to wrest these markets from us, and that have partially succeeded in doing so.

A few years ago the Government thought it wise to bring out here from Norway a man who had had a life-time experience in this matter. That man was here for two years. He went around the country, was introduced to the various fishermen and others engaged in this business, and gave them a great deal of information on the matter of the putting up of cod liver oil. Owing to illness he had to leave the country and go to his native home. I think that if it were again possible to hire this man, or some one like him, that the people would receive a great deal of benefit from his instruction. It is necessary that the Government employ a man, or two or three men, to help carry out this Act, and to instruct our people in the best methods of putting up this article. I am sure that it would be money well spent. This, Mr. Chairman, is about all the explanation I think necessary. As we go thr ugh the Bill, if there are any questions asked, I will be pleased to answer them.

MR. COAKER.—In reference to that first section, I think the date there should be changed from July 1st to June 1st. Quite a lot of oil will be manufactured before 1st July, and if this date is not altered, people won't have licenses .

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I agree with that. The intention was to put in June.

MR. COAKER.—May I ask, what is that reference to Chapter 104 of the Consolidated Statutes? Have you that Act at hand?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Yes, (reads part of Cap. 104, Consolidated Statutes, Second Series). That is the old act on fish oils.

MR. COAKER.—Have you any provision with regard to first quality and second quality? Is it going to be left to the Inspector?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Yes. That is all you can do.

MR. COAKER.—What do you mean?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.--He is the man who understands the work.

MR. COAKER.—Do you expect to get back that man you had?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Yes.

MR. COAKER—He is a good man?

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Yes he is a good man.

MR. COAKER.—There is nothing here (in the Consolidated Statute reference.)

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—No.

MR. COAKER.—I have no objection.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say if there is one word in the world that I hate to see in print it is the word "informer." I think that could be put in as "the person who gives the information." It is all the same.

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.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the law respecting the Refining of Cod Liver Oil," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being en-

titled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesing the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT ON EDUCATION BILL.

Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister on behalf of the Joint Select Committee presented the following Report:

House of Assembly, May 2, 1916.

The Joint Committee appointed by the House of Assembly and Legislative Council to confer upon the subject of the amendment made by the Council in and upon the Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Education," beg to report that they have held such conference and consider that while the Committee regard the age of 12 the lowest at which any child should be permitted to enter competitive examinations outside their own schools, they recommend that consideration of the amendment be held over for another year and the Council therefore withdraws the amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

J. ALEX. ROBINSON.
S. MILLEY.
R. A. SQUIRES.
M. POWER.
A. F. GOODRIDGE.
W. F. LLOYD.
E. P. MORRIS.
CHARLES H. EMERSON.
JOHN S. CURRIE.
GEORGE F. GRIMES.

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT ON WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

The Hon. Colonial Secretary on behalf of the Joint Select Committee on "Weights, Measures, and the Inspection of Lumber, presented the report that they have considered the matter to them referred and report the following amendment herewith attached.

Signed,

J. R. BENNETT, Chairman.
W. F. COAKER.
R. J. DEVEREAUX.
R. K. BISHOP.
JOHN HARVEY.
JAMES ANGEL.
J .J. MURPHY.
JOHN ANDERSON.
J. G. STONE.

Committee Room,House of Assembly.

May 2nd, 1916.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the said report.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Parsons took the chair of Committee.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, you will remember that when the amendments made by the Legislative Council on section 43 were before this House they were not accepted, and it was considered desirable that a joint select committee from both Houses be appointed to consider this section ,as it was thought that the section as introduced in this House originally, was carefully considered and would be in the best interests of those whom it was our duty to protect in this matter, that is, the cutters of pit props. The amendments as suggested by the Legislative Council did not put that safeguard around the cutters that was originally intended, a committee was appointed, and after a conference this afternoon beg to submit an agreed amendment for the consideration of this committee. Section 43 has been divided into two sub-sections, (a) and (b), the first sub-section, (a), deals entirely with pit props and provides that the actual cutter of pit

props who is the man who goes into the woods either on his own behalf or on the behalf of other persons must have them surveyed before sale. It has been the practice in the past that the purchaser of those pit props would have them measured and would pay the vendor according to the measurement that he would decide; but this provision is now made so that the cutter is compelled to have them surveyed and thereby he is protected not alone from himself but also from any unscrupulous person who might in any way take advantage of his lack of knowledge of the regular procedure. The other sub-section which deals entirely with timber of all kinds except pit props is not new except that in the past although it was by law necessary to have it surveyed when passing it from one party to another, yet that law was not carried out in the great majority of cases. Therefore it was considered desirable that the law be made explicit on this point, and it was considered that we should introduce a sub-section which would put it beyond peradventure as to the procedure in future; so that now when a person is selling or purchasing lumber and any dispute arises as to measurement, they will have the right to appeal to a regularly recognized surveyor of lumber and the decision of the surveyor will be final. The penalties as provided in the original bill are the same as these proposed by these amendments.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that the Committee had considered the matter to them referred, and concurred with the Report of the Committee therein.

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 Bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting the Seal Fishery," with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time.

MR. DOWNEY.—I merely desire to remark, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the amendments now read to the House, that I object to the Clause by which a sealing steamer's catch is limited to 35,000, and the Master penalized in a very considerable amount for bringing in and landing even a single seal over that number.

The Gold Coinage Act of Great Britain was prepared by experts in law-making; absolute accuracy was aimed at therein, yet despite all the care lavished upon the preparation of that Act, backed by great experience on the part of those responsible for it, it was found impossible to attain the precision and conformity to the theoretical standard of values established, and that what is known is "The Remedy" had to be created. This "Remedy" is a margin to cover the variations that were found inevitable in giving and maintaining the accurate legal weight to minted coins.

I think the same procedure should apply to the particular amendment here proposed because I know as a matter of fact that no sealing master who may ever enter a port in this Colony with a trip of seals will be able to make an affidavit, or even to say with any degree of accuracy, that he has within four or five hundred, and possibly even more, on one side or the other of the stipulated 35,000 seals which should constitute his maximum catch.

The very procedure involved in the tallying of seals debars the possibility of anything like strict accuracy being attained in the count thereof. When seals are kept on deck to "cool off"

before being stowed in the hold, as is frequently necessary these seals will usually be put below by the night watches, and there will be probably ten or a dozen men passing seals at once into the hold, and each of these men will be checking off the number of seals he passes into the hold in lots of five and calling "tally" for every fifth seal. For every tally of five one or two tallymen will simply cut a notch in a stick kept for the purpose, and when one considers the conditions under which this work is done the wonder is that greater errors do not occur, and we need never be surprised at the fact that a sealing ship when returning never turns out the number of seals that she "hails" for. She either turns out considerably less or considerably more. Generally the only light available is that of a kerosene lantern; it may be blowing or snowing and, all round, the weather conditions may be such as to render accurate work of this character impossible, and the result is that accuracy of count is impossible to attain.

I therefore consider it not alone unreasonable but unjust that the master of a ship should be liable for heavy damages for an error that he not alone did not commit but is even in no way responsible for. I consequently think that a margin to cover errors similar to "The Remedy" above referred to in the Coinage Act should be inserted in this Amendment and I trust that such will commend itself favorably to the introducer thereof.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Speaker, owing to the number of amendments before this House, and as the members have not had time to study them closely, I suggest that we have these amendments printed for to-morrow and placed on each member's desk,so that each section may be gone over, and I move that it stand over until to-morrow when the amendments may be more fully discussed.

MR. LLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I think that it would be better to have a conference of members from both Houses, owing to the diversity of opinion between this Assembly and the Legislative Council, which I think will only be got over by the conference of the two Chambers. I think this will be the most expeditious way to get over the difficulty.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I have no objection.

MR. LLOYD.—I have no objection to the printing. A conference could take up the matter section by section and see where they can agree. A number of the amendments sent down by the Legislative Council I cordially agree with such as that amendment providing for the compensation of workmen, and the rules regulating granting of certificates. There are a great many points we will have no difficulty in coming to an understanding about. The radical differences can be got over at a conference.

MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I am quite satisfied to carry out your suggestion. I think it would be a good thing if the Select Committee met to-night.

On motion a Select Committee consisting of the following: Mr. Piccott, Hon. Mr. Cashin, Mr. Coaker, Mr. Downey, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Devereaux, Hon. Mr. Crosbie, was appointed to consider the said amendments, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council so informing that body and requesting the Legislative Council to appoint a similiar committee for the purpose of conference on the said amendments.

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

MR. PARSONS.—Mr. Speaker, I

would like to make a few remarks on the motion to adjourn. I see by the paper to-day that there is to be a demonstration of volunteers at the closing ceremony. As a member of the Hr. Grace Branch Committee, I appreciate the work that the Patriotic Committee has done in St. John's, and I am glad to see that there has been a noble response from the Outports, and particularly from the District which I have the honour to represent. It is true that we have had troubles of late, but at the same time I think when this matter is made known, it will be found that there is no doubting the patriotism of the Irish troops in the trenches. I have no doubt, however, that the number we have to-day on the roll of volunteers will be far exceeded in the near future. Some of the boys who have been turned down here for some slight medical unfitness went to Sydney, and other places, tried again, and passed. Up in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, the greatest efforts are made to stimulate recruiting. Each man who volunteers is given one dollar for every new recruit he brings in, as a consequence many are writing down for new recruits to come up, but we must say for ourselves that if they are putting up the money we are putting up the goods. We can only regard as traitors such men as Casement, Pearce and others, hirelings who are hindering the Empire in her efforts for victory, and this feeling prevails all over the Empire. The Irish and the English, the Scotch and the Welsh, fall side by side, and never was Irish patriotism so high. It may be asked where is my authority? My answer is, in the first place, I say as a matter of common sense, and in the next place I have proof from the trenches, which I have received this morning from Flanders. This circular was put in circulation among the Irish Regiment, and I will read it for the benefit of this Committee. I will read it to allay any misconception that may be felt as to the loyalty of the Irish troops. I may say that this circular has been besmirched by the mud and dirt of the trenches. It may be sealed with the blood of the man who received it.

Here we see the Royal standard and the following:

"TO THE SOLDIERS OF CHRIST
ON
ST. PATRICK'S DAY, 1916.

Live for those who love you,
For those who think you true,
For the Heaven that is above you,
For the Crown you have in view.
For the cause that needs assistance.
For the wrongs that need resistance,
For the future in the distance,
For the good that you can do."

Sir, in conclusion, with this spirit in view, I have no fear of the ultimate victory of England and her Allies.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 3rd, 1916.

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

The Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of the Superintendent of Education under Methodist Boards for 1915.

PETITION.

MR. LLOYD—Mr. Speaker: I have here a petition to present from the residents of St. Jones Without, and other places in Random Sound, on the North Side of Trinity Bay. The petition is signed by some 150 or 160 inhabitants of these places. The petitioners beg to draw the attention of the House to the need of a harbour at St. Jones Without. There is none, they state, from the eastern end of Random Sound to the bottom of the Bay, and the inhabitants of these places naturally feel the need of one.

St. Jones Without is a very suitable place for a harbour,and consequently I beg to move that this petition be referred to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries,so that he can consider the advisability and possibility of expending the required money, and give this petition my hearty support.

MR. DEVEREAUX—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present a pettion signed by William Collins, J. F. Roach, and others, asking that a small subsidy be given to enable a motor boat to convey freight and mail from Branch to St. Joseph's twice a month. The petition is very largely signed, for it is signed by over 200 names, and in fact this is the best evidence of the popularity of this suggestion. I trust the Government will do their best in this connection. As you know, Sir, Branch is only a few miles from Cape St. Mary's, but it is nevertheless very difficult to get freight there. For these reasons and others which I will not delay the House to mention, I heartily support the petition, and ask that it be received and referred to the Department to which it refers.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker: I beg to give my heartiest support to this petition just presented by my colleague Mr. Devereaux. I am entirely in accord with the representations made therein, and may say for the benefit of this House, that I know that there are quite a number of settlements in this section of the District which have not the facilities that other parts of the Island have, and I consequently hope that the Government will take this matter into consideration, into their very careful consideration, and if anything possibly can be done to grant coastal facilities to these people, I hope it will be done. I may say that this district includes many settlements, among which may be named: Pt Verde, Barachoix, Ship Cove, Gooseberry, Patrick's Cove, Angel's Cove, Custlett, St. Bride's, Pear's Cove,Golden Bay, Pt. Lance, Branch, Beckford, North Harbour, John's Pond, Colinet, Haricot, Tickles, Mother Rex, Mosquito, Admiral's Beach, Mall Bay, Riverhead, Gaskiers, Pt. Le Hay, St. Vincent, Peter's River, St. Shotts. Golden Bay is a place which in summer time is very largely populated, sufficient then to look after upwards of 100 or 150 traps, which means that the population must be about 450 or 500 people. All of these settlements have no communication whatever with the Bowring or the Reid services. Most of the larger places here have in the past had the 'Prospero' calling fortnightly, but the majority of the smaller places have no railway connection or no coastal connection. I think that this is a very important matter, and now that my colleague, Mr. Devereaux, has brought this matter before the House in presenting this petition from the residents of Branch, might I express the hope that the Government will see its way clear to subsidize a small motor boat service from Branch to St. Joseph's. The distance is only 12 or 15 miles, and I feel it could be managed satisfactorily to the population at but little expense. I think that at the same time as this is considered, the advisability of placing another larger boat between Trepassey and Placentia should also be considered, as this one from Branch to St. Joseph's will not be sufficient to cover the district. The residents of these places have been looking for improved facilities now for a number of years, and I feel sure that were the war in which we are now so busily engaged over, there would be no desire or need to present this petition and bring this matter before the House. I think the railway extension will remedy this condition, and of course we all appreciate that we cannot expect

to continue such expenditure at such a time as this. The motor service, therefore, will only be needed until the construction of the railway, and I feel that as it is thus only a temporary arrangement this service should be granted. I hope the Government will give this matter very serious consideration, which will result in the establishing of a service from Trepassey to Placentia,and it would be of incalculable value to the people. If I was held at Placentia to-morrow with any person, for instance any member of this House, and I wanted to go to Branch, and the member wanted to go to Boston in the United States, it would cost me just as much for my journey as it would cost him. Take for more particular example, Mr. Devereaux, my colleague, and myself. Were we both at Placentia, and I wanted to go to Boston, and Mr. Devereaux wanted to go to Branch, it would cost me less for my journey than it would cost Mr. Devereaux for his, although mine would be an infinitely longer one. I just mention this to show how poor are the communications of this district, and I do hope the Government will find itself able to meet the request of the petitioners in this regard, and supply them with this service until the railway connections are completed. I have therefore very great pleasure in supporting this petition just presented by my colleague, Mr. Devereaux.

HON. MR. EMERSON—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present two petitions signed by a number of people at Bay d'Espoir, asking that the royalty tax of $1 per thousand on timber be rescinded. I ask that these be received and referred to the Department to which they relate.

MR. CURRIE—I ask leave to present a petition of more than ordinary importance to-day, one for which I ask the immediate attention and consideration of the Government. It is from the business people of Burin,—and I am advised by wire that a similar petition is on the way from Grand Bank —praying that a subsidy may be granted to the steamship 'Sable Island' to enable her to call during her regular trips at Grand Bank and Burin. I understand that during the coming summer this steamer will be running between Halifax, Charlottetown and St. John's, and the desire of the petitioners is that she shall call at the ports previously stated en route. I need hardly point out to the House and to the Government that such a service would be of infinite and incalculable benefit to the whole District of Burin. While the war continues, and while tonnage is so limited and freight congestion so great, those sections of the country which are not in direct communication with shipping ports abroad must suffer enormously through the delay in receiving freights. Burin District today is probably the largest fishing district in the country; the industry is carried on from there more industriously and more energetically than elsewhere. Very large supplies are therefore constantly needed to keep the business on the move, and nearly all these are imported direct. During the past few months operations have been considerably delayed and hampered by the non-arrival of stocks, to the great annoyance not only of the merchants, but the fishermen depending upon them. The large portion of freights, I understand, come via Port aux Basques and the S. S. 'Glencoe,' and the conditions which have existed in Sydney are too well known to the House for me to dwell upon them. It is not alone the District I have the honour to represent which is affected, the neighbouring Districts of Fortune Bay on the West, and Placentia and St. Mary's on the East, are equally interested. I think I am not straining the position when I claim that Burin, Marystown

and St. Lawrence are today the trade centres for the whole of Placentia Bay, while Grand Bank and Fortune are centres for Fortune Bay. Burin has always been the home of large business interests, and an important banking port. Within the past few years, Marystown has developed into an equally busy place, and the trade carried on from there today has assumed large proportions. It is essential, therefore, not alone for the people particularly and immediately affected, but for the country as a whole, that this trade development should be fostered and encouraged. For this reason, I give my heartiest support to the petition, and urge upon the Government the necessity of granting the prayer thereof. If the war had not intervened, the district would have come within the scope of the policy of railway construction inaugurated by the present administration, and ere this, I have no doubt, the facilities afforded by the iron horse would have been at the disposal of the people. Until the financial situation improves I suppose we must be content to do without the railway, but in the meantime I do think that any facilities within our means—and this petition suggests one, —should be afforded the people of this most flourishing and most important section of the country. The subsidy asked for is not large—$300 a trip—and I cannot too strongly impress upon the Government the necessity of granting it.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly in reply to their Message requesting the Council to appoint a Select Committee of this body to confer with the Select Committee appointed by the House of Assembly, in conference, to consider the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the Seal Fishery," that they had appointed the Hons. Messrs. Bishop, Gibbs, Harvey, Squires, Goodridge, Murphy and Angel, a Select Committee upon the said subject.

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 prohibit the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors into and in Newfoundland after the first day of January, 1917," 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 for granting to His Majesty certain Sums of Money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1916, and the 30th day of June, 1917, and for other purposes," 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: "An Act to Amend the Act 4, George 7., Cap. 17, entitled: 'An Act respecting the Operation of Saw Mills'; 'An Act to authorize the Raising of a Sum of Money by Loan for Naval, Military, Railway, and other Public Purposes'; 'An Act to Amend the Death Duties Act, 1914-15'; and 'An Act respecting the Censoring of Moving Pictures,' without amendment.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER 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 the Law respecting the Exportation of Timber,' with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the said amendments were read a first time.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The amendments to the Bill relating to the exportation of timber made by the Upper House are as follows: (Minister reads Section 3 and 4).

I think there is nothing objectionable in these amendments. I am sorry that the Upper House has reduced the price from five dollars to four and a half. But half a loaf is better than no bread. The price fixed is not altogether permanent, as the Board that will be appointed under this Act has power to adjust the price as high or as low as seems best to them as the case may be. Before this matter is taken up next year this Board will have been appointed.

MR. LLOYD—With the exception of the reduction of price from five dollars to four and a half which, as the Minister pointed out, may be adjusted by the Board, the rest of the amendments are really of no importance because they make no addition or alteration to the Bill at all. They do not alter in any way the original effect of the Bill. The legal effect is unchanged.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the said amendments were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council so informing that Body.

DATING OF BILLS.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council informing the House of Assembly that they had passed certain Resolutions as follows, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

Resolved: That it is the opinion of this House that it is desirable and it is hereby ordered that from and after this date all Acts passed by the Legislature shall in addition to the usual form of title be further distinguished and shall hereafter be cited by reference to the calendar year in which they were passed.

Resolved: That a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Hon. House of Assembly, requesting their concurrence in the same.

Signed: P. T. McGRATH,
President.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—A little time is necessary to consider the effect of these resolutions. The proposal is that from and after this date: (Rt. Hon. Prime Minister reads the resolution.) It does not appear to be a vital matter, and probably the Upper Chamber would be satisfied if the matter was referred to the law officers to have the matter gone into. As regards the date of a Bill, it would mean that every Act passed is to be known by the year it is assented to by His Excellency the Governor. I would suggest a slight amendment.

On motion the said Resolutions were amended as follows: After the word cited in the fifth line insert the words: "as at present and", and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council so informing that body.

MESSAGES FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had withdrawn the amendment made by them to the 33rd section, sub-section (1) of the Bill, entitled: "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Education."

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 Refining of Cod Liver Oil" 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 further to Amend 'The Revenue Act, 1905.'"

SEALING BILL.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries on behalf of the Committee presented the following Report:

We, the undersigned members of the Joint Select Committee appointed by the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council to consider the Council's amendments to the Sealing Bill, beg to report that we have held a conference on the same and as the result of our deliberations, submit the attached Bill.

Signed:—

A.W. PICCOTT, Chairman,
W.F. LLOYD,
J.F. DOWNEY,
JOHN C. CROSBIE,
R. K. BISHOP,
JOHN HARVEY,
JAMES ANGEL,
A. F. GOODRIDGE,
J. J. MURPHY,
R.J. DEVEREAUX,
W.F. COAKER,
M.P. GIBBS,
R.A. SQUIRES.

Assembly Room, May 3rd, 1916.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the said Report and Bill.

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.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council so informing that Body.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair until six of the clock.

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 Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled: "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Weights and Measures and the Inspection of Lumber," 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 amendments made by the House of Assembly in and upon the amendments made by the Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled: "An Act respecting the Seal Fishery."

MUNICIPAL BILL.

RT. HON. PRIME MINISTER—It will be remembered that one of the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee appointed to deal with the Bill in relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's was that the Committee be given power to sit out of session, to take evidence, and to report a Bill. In order to give effect to that recommendation I propose the following resolution:—

RESOLVED: That in accordance with the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee appointed by the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly to consider the Municipal Bill to them referred, that an address be moved to His Excellency the Gov-

ernor in Council praying that a Commission be appointed with power to take evidence, to sit during the year, and until the opening of the next session of the Legislature and to report a bill for adoption by the Legislature; and that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council asking them for their concurrence in the said Address.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, seconded by Mr. Lloyd, the above Resolution was adopted, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting the concurrence of that Body in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled: "An Act respecting the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's," with an amendment, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendment was read a first time.

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 they had passed the said amendment without amendment.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 4th, 1916.

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

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 amendment made by the House of Assembly in and upon the Resolutions sent down and herewith attached, without amendment.

Resolved that is the opinion of this House that it is desirable and it is hereby ordered that from and after this date all Acts passed by the Legislature shall in addition to the usual form of title be further distinguished, and shall hereafter be cited as at present and by reference to the calendar year in which they were passed.

Resolved that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Hon. House of Assembly requesting their concurrence in the same.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had concurred in the Resolutions sent up respecting the Municipal Commission.

MR. CURRIE.—I beg to present a petition from the business people of Grand Bank which reached me only by mail to-day, asking that a subsidy be granted the S.S. Sable Island in order that she may make Grand Bank and Burin ports of call while on the Halifax-St. John's route the coming summer. This petition is similar to the one presented by me on yesterday from the merchants of Burin. I have very great pleasure in giving it my heartiest support and asking for it the favourable consideration of the Government.

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 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 consent:

An Act to Amend the Act 8 Edward VII. Cap. 8, entitled "An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding."

An Act respecting Companies Payment of Whose Capital Stock or of Interest thereon is guaranteed by the Government.

An Act respecting Certain Retiring Allowances.

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 1916, and the 30th day of June, 1917, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

An Act for the Protection of Persons engaged in Trawl Fishing.

An Act to authorize the raising of a sum of money by Loan for Naval Military, Railway, and other Public purposes.

An Act further to amend "The Revenue Act, 1905."

An Act to Amend the Death Duties Act 1914-1915.

An Act to Amend and Consolidate the law relating to Weights and Measures and the Inspection of Lumber.

An Act to Amend the War Measures Act, 1914.

An Act to Amend the Law respecting the Naturalization of Aliens.

An Act to Amend 3 Geo. V. Cap. 14, entitled "An Act respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador."

An Act to Incorporate the Salvation Army.

An Act to Enable the Governor in Council during the Existence of a State of War to take possession of articles of Commerce unreasonably withheld.

An Act respecting the Control of Trading in certain Commodities.

An Act to Amend and Continue in Force for a further period the Act 5, George V. Session 1 Cap. 4, entitled "An Act respecting a Volunteer Force in this Colony."

An Act for Rvising and Consolidating the Public General Statute Laws of this Colony and for the Publication of the same.

An Act respecting Trading with the Enemy.

An Act to Amend Chapter 44, of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Second Series) entitled "Of the Re-building of Carbonear."

An Act to Amend Chapter 115 of the Consolidated Statutes (Second Series) entitled "Of Passenger Accommodation on Board Steamers and Sailing Vessels."

An Act to Incorporate "The Union Electric Light and Power Company," and for other purposes.

An Act to Facilitate Marriages between British Subjects Resident in Newfoundland, and British Subjects Resident in the United Kingdom .

An Act to Amend the Law relating to the Herring Fishery.

An Act to Amend the Act 4, George V. Cap. 17, entitled "An Act respecting the Operation of Saw Mills."

An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Inflammable Substances.

An Act to Amend the Act 6, George V. Cap. 18,entitled "An Act respecting the Administration of Local Affairs."

An Act to Prohibit the Importation, Manufacture, and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors into and in Newfoundland after the first day of January, 1917.

An Act to Amend the Law respecting the Exportation of Timber.

An Act respecting the Censoring of Moving Pictures.

An Act Respecting the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's.

An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law relating to Education.

An Act respecting the Seal Fishery.

An Act respecting the Refining of Cod Liver Oil.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

His Excellency was then pleased to make the following Speech to both branches of the Legislature.

Mr. President and Hon. Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

I am pleased that I am able to relieve you at this, to many of you, a very busy season, from further attendance on your legislative duties. Having regard to the number of the measures upon which you have deliberated and passed into law, the session cannot be regarded as a protracted one, and it would have been difficult, keeping in view the importance of the measures, to have curtailed your deliberations.

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

I thank you for the liberal nature of the supplies granted for the Public Service. The appropriations which will be made from time to time will be expended with a view of securing the very best returns to the public. The substantial increase you have made to the vote for Old Age Pensions will no doubt be appreciated throughout the country especially by that deserving class for whose aid the pensions are designed.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

The further provision you have made for Newfoundland's participation in the Great War in which the Empire is engaged reflects the universal desire of the country, and will be a fitting contribution to that splendid effort which Great Britain and her Allies are making towards the preservation of civilization and the establishment of permanent peace.

The satisfactory result of the seal-fishery is gratifying. The enterprise has not alone been remunerative to those of our people engaged in its prosecution, but must tend to stimulate the other industrial operations of the Colony.

In taking leave of you, I earnestly hope that under Divine Providence, Newfoundland may continue to enjoy that prosperity, with which of late its people have been so abundantly blessed, and that before we meet again the appaling War now devastating Europe may have terminated favourably to the Empire and our Allies.

After which the Hon. 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 fourteenth day of June next, then and there to be holden, and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly.

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY.
Motion for, 5.
Committee on, 24.
Draft, 38.
Debate on, 38, 58.
Presentation of, 172.
Governor's Reply to, 172.

ARTICLES OF COMMERCE POSSESSION BILL, 28, 29, 75, 81, 97.

BANK FISHERY BILL, 126, 280.

BILLS, DATING OF, 579.

BILLS, LIST OF, 582.

CURRIE, MR.
Seconds Motion for Address in Reply, 11.
Prohibition Bill, 554.

CONDOLENCE, RESOLUTIONS OF.
On Death Hon. J. Harris, Judge Emerson and Mr. Furlong, 26.

COMPANIES (GOVT. GUARANTEE) BILL, 322, 357, 362, 365, 368.

CONTROL OF TRADING BILL, 53, 58, 97, 174.

CARBONEAR REBUILDING BILL, 198, 210, 276, 283, 287.

CLIFT, MR.
On Address in Reply, 58.
Supply, 128, 159, 161, 185, 212, 213,311, 337.
Education Bill, 275.
Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 471, 492.
Ways and Means, 48, 482, 483, 484, 485, 503, 505.

Sawmills Bill, 539.
Municipal Affairs Bill, 559.
Moving Pictures Censorship Bill, 561.

CROSBIE, HON. MR.
On Sealing Bill, 391, 441, 452.

CODOIL BILL, 569.

CLAPP, MR.
On Supply, 131, 138, 179, 183, 187, 190, 194, 203, 371, 372.
West Coast Steam Service, 364.
Ways and Means, 531, 532.

COAKER, MR.
On Address in Reply, 42, 71.
Larcenies, 76, 93.
War Measures Bill, 78, 80.
Articles of Commerce Possession Bill, 81.
Supply, 110, 113, 122, 128, 129, 130, 132, 142, 143, 144, 158, 159, 160, 162, 178, 179, 180, 184, 185, 189, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 212, 213, 214, 215, 226, 232, 233, 247, 248, 250, 261, 307, 308, 309, 310, 331, 334, 336, 337, 372, 377, 378, 379.
Education Bill, 150, 163, 164, 165.
Pitprops, 172.
Passenger Accommodation Bill, 208.
Weights and Measures Resolutions and Bill, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 296, 536.
Bank Fishery Bill, 281, 282.
Mr. Morine's Resignation, 300.
Inflammable Oils Bill, 314.
Volunteer Force Bill, 316, 317.
Shipbuilding Encouragement Bill, 323.
Herring Fishery Resolutions and Bill, 325, 328.
Local Affairs Bill, 337, 338, 339, 345.
Pay to Sick Soldiers, 355, 356.
Northern Steam Service, 363, 436.
Sealing Bill, 384, 421, 428, 430, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 448, 449, 450, 452, 453.

Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 500, 501.
Timber Exportation Bill, 510, 540, 541, 547.
Treatment Naval Reservists, 510, 511, 556.
Rulings of Speaker, 512.
Ways and Means, 512, 513, 514, 515, 530, 532.
Sawmills Bill, 539.
Prohibition Bill, 549, 554.
Loan Bill, 566, 568, 569.
Codoil Bill, 570, 571.

COLONIAL SECRETARY, HON.
On War Measures Bill, 78.
Supply, 114, 121, 122, 128, 129, 157, 158, 159, 161, 162, 180, 185, 198, 199, 200, 206, 247, 251, 252, 256, 260, 261, 308, 310, 311, 375, 378.
Weights and Measures Resolutions and Bill, 234, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 288, 289, 290, 536, 537, 572.
Volunteer Force Bill, 316.
Municipal Affairs Bill, 352.
Pay to Sick Soldiers, 355, 356.
West Coast Steam Service, 364.
Northern Steam Service, 437.
Prohibition Bill, 549, 550, 554.

DEVEREAUX, MR.
On Supply, 218, 223, 228, 269.
Weights and Measures Bill, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 295.
Local Affairs Bill, 339, 343, 344, 345.
Sealing Bill, 388, 391, 416, 424, 430.
Prohibition Bill, 551.

DWYER, MR.
On Supply, 218, 335.
Weights and Measures Resolutions and Bill, 239.

DOWNEY, MR.
On Herring Fishery Resolutions and Bill, 325, 327.
Weights and Measures Bill, 361.
Sealing Bill, 430, 431, 434, 572.
Prohibition Bill, 552, 553.

Moving Pictures Censorship Bill, 562.

DEATH DUTIES BILL, 536, 562.

EDUCATION BILL, 28, 30, 75, 82, 146, 163, 195, 206, 275, 278, 287, 472, 507, 549, 572.

EMERSON, HON. MR.
On Mr. Morine's Resignation, 300.
Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 497.

FINANCE AND CUSTOMS, HON. MINISTER
On Supply, 87, 102, 107, 110, 112, 113, 129, 131, 138, 145, 152, 194, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 212, 213, 267, 274, 304, 307, 331, 336, 337, 369, 372, 374, 375, 376, 377.
Weights and Measures Bill, 296.
Ways and Means, 396, 473, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 512, 513, 519, 529, 530, 531.
Sealing Bill, 420, 421, 431, 432, 433, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452.
Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 493, 501.
Timber Exportation Bill, 508, 510, 539, 540, 546, 547, 548, 579.
Loan Bill, 564, 565.

GRIMES, MR.
On Supply, 131, 154, 156, 182, 184, 186, 255, 256, 257.
Local Affairs Bill, 338.
Sealing Bill, 393, 435, 450.
Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 470.
Prohibition Bill, 555.

GOODISON, MR.
On Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 490.

HALFYARD, MR.
On Reporting, 93.
Supply, 119, 129, 136, 137, 153, 154, 156, 157, 193, 201, 224, 274, 307, 373, 375, 376, 377, 379.
Education Bill, 165.

Local Affairs Bill, 339, 342, 343.
Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 455.

HIGGINS, MR.
On Supply, 183, 334.
Municipal Affairs Bill, 354.
Sealing Bill, 392, 434, 445, 451.
Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 494, 500, 501.
Prohibition Bill, 550, 552, 554, 555.
Moving Picture Censorship Bill, 560, 561.

HERRING FISHERY RESOLUTIONS, 5; BILL—302, 323, 329, 362, 365.

INFLAMMABLE OILS BILL, 152, 173, 276, 312, 363, 366, 369.

JENNINGS, MR.
On Address in Reply, 62.
War Measures Bill, 80.
Supply, 132, 162, 174, 185, 190, 199, 203, 222, 266, 267, 272, 336, 372.
Cutting Pitprops, 172, 179.
Weights and Measures Resolutions and Bill, 242.
Herring Fishery Resolutions and Bills, 326.
Local Affairs Bill, 338.
Sealfishery, 439.

KENT, MR.
On Motion for Address in Reply, 15.
Resolutions of Condolence, Hon. J. Harris, etc., 26.

LLOYD, MR.
On Motion for Address in Reply, 22.
Address in Reply, 38, 69.
Larcenies, 76.
Articles of Commerce Posssession Bill, 81.
Education Bill, 85, 146, 163, 164, 168, 195, 207, 275, 473, 507.
Supply, 103, 110, 131, 145, 152, 155, 156, 159, 162, 184, 186, 187, 188, 192, 195, 198, 199, 200, 201, 203, 204, 206, 213, 247, 254, 256,

260, 261, 306, 308, 309, 310, 311, 332, 333, 336, 337, 370, 374, 375, 378.
Control of Trading Bill, 168.
Statutes Consolidation Bill, 169, 170, 171, 172, 208, 279.
Weights and Measures Resolutions and Bill, 239, 240, 241, 242, 295, 537.
Union Electric and Power Co. Bill, 279.
Bank Fishery Bill, 282, 283.
Carbonear Rebuilding Bill, 283, 284.
Volunteer Force Bill, 288, 316, 317.
Mr. Morine's Resignation, 299.
Inflammable Oils Bill, 315.
Shipbuilding Encouragement Bill, 323.
Herring Fishery Resolutions and Bill, 327.
Local Affairs Bill, 337, 338, 339, 344.
Municipal Affairs Bill, 350.
Pay to Sick Soldiers, 356.
Prohibition Bill, 363, 394, 436, 549, 550, 552, 553, 555.
Sealing Bill, 382, 388, 419, 421, 427, 428, 432, 433, 434, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 447, 448, 451, 452, 574.
Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 471, 491, 496, 498, 499, 503, 505.
Ways and Means, 473, 475, 478, 479, 480, 481, 513, 514, 515, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533.
Sawmills Bill, 508, 541.
Rulings of Speaker, 512.
Timber Exportation Bill, 545, 546, 548, 579.
Moving Pictures Censorship Bill, 560, 561.
Death Duties Bill, 563.
Loan Bill, 565, 566.
Codoil Bill, 569.

LABRADOR RAILWAY BILL, 27, 29, 73, 78, 96.

LeFEUVRE, MR.
On Supply, 225.
Weights and Measures Resolutions and Bill, 243.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL, 254, 277, 317, 337, 358, 362, 472.

LOAN BILL, PUBLIC PURPOSES, 564.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, MINISTER.
On Supply, 129, 133, 137, 176, 177, 178, 184, 185, 250, 264, 267, 372, 373.
Passenger Accommodation Bill, 208.
Bank Fishery Bill, 281, 282.
Mr. Morine's Resignation, 301.
Shipbuilding Encouragement Bill, 322, 323.
Herring Fishery Resolutions and Bill, 323, 325, 328.
Local Affairs Bill, 339.
Sealing Bill, 381, 388, 390, 417, 419, 420, 431, 451, 453, 574.
Trawl Fishery Bill, 507.
Timber Exportation Bill, 547.
Codoil Bill, 569, 570, 571.

MORRIS, MR. F. J.
On Supply, 188, 312.
Volunteer Force Bill, 330.
Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 495, 496, 499, 500, 504.

MOULTON, MR.
On Supply, 188, 269, 273.
Weights and Measures Resolutions and Bill, 242, 243, 291, 293.
Mr. Morine's Resignation, 301.
Sealing Bill, 391, 434.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS BILL, 286, 303, 346, 506, 556, 580.

MARRIAGE FACILITY BILL, 287, 318, 346, 358, 472.

MORINE, MR.
Resigns Seat, 296, 301.

MOVING PICTURES CENSORSHIP BILL, 485, 506, 535, 559.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL, 53, 58, 87, 97, 102.

PRIME MINISTER, RT. HON. THE
On Motion for Address in Reply, 19.

Resolutions of Condolence, Hon. J. Harris, &c., 24.
Address in Reply, 67.
Labrador Railway Bill, 73.
War Measures Bill, 73, 79, 80, 81.
Salvation Army Incorporation Bill, 74.
Articles of Commerce Possession Bill, 75, 81.
Sealfishery Bill, 75.
Education Bill, 75, 82, 146, 150, 151, 163, 164, 168, 195, 196, 207, 275, 278, 472, 507, 549.
Larcenies, 76, 93.
Statutes Consolidation Bill, 85, 169, 171, 208.
Naturalization of Aliens Bill, 87.
Supply, 111, 112, 113, 123, 143, 144, 145, 155, 156, 160, 179, 180, 183, 184, 191, 201, 203, 212, 213, 215, 229, 232, 233, 249, 256, 308, 309, 331, 332, 336, 337, 377, 378.
Control of Trading Bill, 168.
Pitprop Cutting, 172.
Weights and Measures Resolutions and Bill, 242.
Bank Fishery Bill, 281, 283.
Carbonear Rebuilding Bill, 283, 284.
Trading with Enemy Bill, 284.
Mr. Moriñe's Resignation, 297.
Inflammable Oils Bill, 312, 314, 315, 366.
Volunteer Force Bill, 315, 316, 317.
Local Affairs Bill, 317, 338, 346.
Marriage Facility Bill, 318.
Municipal Affairs Bill, 346, 556, 580.
Northern Steam Service, 363.
Prohibition Bill, 363, 394, 436, 549 553, 554.
Sealing Bill, 417, 419, 422, 452.
Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 471, 489, 491, 505.
Ways and Means, 475, 483, 513, 514, 515, 531, 532, 533.
Sawmills Bill, 508, 539.
Timber Exportation Bill, 510, 543.
Treatment Naval Reservists, 511, 556.
Moving Pictures Censorship Bill, 559.
Death Duties Bill, 562.

Loan Bill, 566, 568.
On Dating of Bills, 579.

PUBLIC WORKS, MINISTER.
On Supply, 134, 187, 190, 193, 194, 195, 214, 217, 258, 307, 308, 335, 423.
Sealing Bill, 392, 419.

PATENTS BILL, 286, 303, 355, 363, 366, 369.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE, 126.

PASSENGER ACCOMMODATION BILL, 127, 203, 280, 287.

PARSONS, MR.
On Address in Reply, 60.
Volunteers, 574.

PROHIBITION BILL, 437, 453, 510, 549.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL, 538.

PETITIONS.
Abbott, Mr., 93, 98, 172, 174, 197, 233, 286, 319, 359, 368.
Bennett, Hon. Mr., 101, 321.
Cashin, Hon. Mr., 437.
Clift, Mr., 38, 54, 100, 126, 302, 395.
Clapp, Mr., 35, 55, 57, 94, 100, 152, 277, 302, 320, 360.
Coaker, Mr., 28, 35, 54, 57, 101, 320, 322, 437.
Currie, Mr., 233, 365, 486, 577, 581.
Devereaux, Mr., 93, 322, 367, 368, 511, 576.
Downey, Mr., 28, 33, 56, 97, 209, 285, 485.
Dwyer, Mr., 489.
Emerson, Hon. Mr., 54, 172, 577.
Grimes, Mr., 173, 364.
Halfyard, Mr., 37, 56, 151, 174, 276, 303, 395, 437.
Hickman, Mr., 286, 365.
Higgins, Mr., 28, 319, 368.
Jennings, Mr., 35, 38, 54, 94, 98, 126, 151, 234, 277, 302.
Kent, Mr., 28.

Lloyd, Mr., 57, 126, 234, 320, 321, 365, 575.
LeFeuvre, Mr., 209, 233, 486.
Morris, Hon. E. P., 55.
Morris, Mr. F. J., 321.
Parsons, Mr., 37, 98, 99, 364, 395.
Piccott, Mr., 34, 36, 98, 99, 100, 209, 357, 364, 395.
Stone, Mr., 35, 57, 173, 197, 234, 276, 286, 303, 321, 365, 368, 395, 453, 489.
Targett, Mr., 57, 277, 303, 368, 395, 453, 489.
Walsh, Mr., 93, 367, 576.
Winsor, Mr., 36, 94, 173, 253, 319.
Woodford, Mr., 319.

QUESTIONS.

Abbott, Mr., 58, 95, 246, 329.
Clift, Mr., 246.
Coaker, Mr., 30, 31, 32, 52, 95, 127, 197, 198, 212, 245, 246, 507.
Currie, Mr., 197.
Grimes, Mr., 536, 556.
Halfyard, Mr., 32, 95, 96, 102, 211, 286, 329, 416, 437, 438, 454, 536.
Hickman, Mr., 329.
Jennings, Mr., 94, 95, 329, 416.
Lloyd, Mr., 76, 77, 96, 245, 246, 253, 277, 303, 358, 437, 438.
Stone, Mr., 77, 246, 286, 303, 358, 453, 454, 507, 511.
Targett, Mr., 128, 278, 329, 358, 360, 454.
Winsor, Mr., 53.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL, 357, 360, 366, 381, 416.

RULES SUSPENDED, 535, 556.

REVENUE BILL, 555, 562.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE—Opening, 3; Closing 583.

SHIPBUILDING ENCOURAGEMENT RESOLUTIONS AND Bill, 302, 322, 362, 365, 472.

STATUTES CONSOLIDATED BILL, 27, 29, 85, 169, 208, 279, 287.

SEALFISHERY REGULATION BILL, 93, 94, 145.

SEALING BILL, 28, 29, 75, 82, 163, 357, 362, 367, 381, 416, 438, 473, 572, 580.

SALVATION ARMY INCORPORATION BILL, 28, 29, 74, 81, 96.

SUPPLY, 32, 53, 87, 102, 128, 152, 174, 198, 210, 247, 254, 277, 304, 331, 357, 369.

SELECT COMMITTEES,—
On Sealing Bill, 82.
Weights and Measures Bill, 296, 537.
Inflammable Oils Bill, 315.
Municipal Affairs Bill, 354.
Patents Bill, 355.
Education Bill, 549.

SAWMILLS BILL, 396, 438, 507, 538.

STONE, MR.
On Supply, 184, 189.

SPEAKER, HIS HONOUR THE
On Victoria Road Board Enquiry, 505, 506.
Gives Rulings, 511, 512.

TARGETT, MR.
On Supply, 135, 335.
Weights and Measures Resolutions and Bill, 245.

TRADING WITH ENEMY BILL, 198, 211, 276, 284, 287.

TRAWL FISHERY BILL, 276, 287, 485, 507.

TIMBER EXPORTATION BILL, 396, 438, 508, 539, 578.

UNION LIGHT AND POWER CO. INCORPORATION BILL, 92, 102, 172, 279, 287.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL, 198, 211, 276, 288, 315, 330.

VICTORIA ROAD BOARD ENQUIRY, 455, 489.

WALSH, MR.
Moves for Address in Reply, 5.
On Weights and Measures Bill, 294.
Sealing Bill, 450.

WAR MEASURES BILL, 28, 29, 73, 78, 96.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES RESOLUTIONS AND BILL, 27, 29, 173, 196, 234, 276, 288, 357, 358, 360, 535, 536, 572.

WAYS AND MEANS, 357, 396, 473, 512, 537.

WINSOR, MR.

On Weights and Measures Resolutions and Bill, 245.

Sealing Bill, 393.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

DURING THE

FOURTH SESSION

OF THE

Twenty-Third General Assembly

OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

1916

1919

NEWFOUNDLAND

OF

Twenty-Third General Assembly

OF THE

FOURTH SESSION

DURING THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS

PROCEEDINGS

of the

Legislative Council of Newfoundland

SESSION 1916

THURSDAY, March 16, 1916.

His Excellency the Governor having retired, the newly elected President, Hon. P. T. McGrath, assumed the chair, and his commission as President was read by the Clerk.

The Hon. President then informed the House that His Excellency had been pleased to open the Session of the Legislature with a gracious Speech from the Throne, which he then asked the Clerk to read to the House.

(Speech appears in first part of this volume.)

HON. MR. BISHOP—Mr. President, first of all allow me to congratuate you on having attained the verv high position of President of this Chamber.

It has fallen to my lot to refer in my capacity here to the demise of a number of past members of this branch of the Legislature.

Among them all no break, perhaps, was so unexpected, and certainly none created a deeper impression upon us than the passing of our friend, our late greatly respected President. It was during the last Session that we began to notice a slight change in our friend, less vivacity was noticeable, but none of us, I think,supposed that Mr. Harris was at all seriously ill. He had but reached the years of ripened manhood, the period when the aggressiveness of youth and vigor gives place to the more dignified attitude of experience, when the opinion or the council of men—especially of leaders of men—is sought after.

Mr. Harris deserved his universal popularity, he had won it by his manly qualities. Prominence he never sought, but his services when requested, were always available in the public interest, and any philanthropic enterprise or effort, particularly, found his time and his means cheerfully offered.

Mr. Harris gave much time and thought to civic problems, being for many years a member of the Council of the Municipality, and did much to bring about improved conditions in this city. In the business community no one maintained a higher standard of integrity and fair dealing than John Harris.

The older members of the Council, accustomed as they were for so many years to the presence in the Chair of Mr. Harris's distinguished predecessor, had barely become acquainted with Mr. Harris as President, and yet we all recognized that the quiet dignity, the ease and kindliness manifested by him in that capacity, demonstrated his fitness to succeed a gentleman who, by his pres-

ence and powers, would have graced any deliberative Assembly.

Whilst a devoted adherent to the tenets of his own Church, Mr. Harris was, we know, most tolerant to those who worship at other altars. We sympathize with the Church which, within a very short period, has lost with Mr. Harris a number of his compatriots, Newfoundlanders all, and each eminent in his own sphere.

Our deepest sympathy goes out to the families of these men, and we feel that Newfoundland could ill afford to lose such patriotic sons, or St. John's such exemplary citizens as Maurice Devine, John Henderson, Hon. John Harris, Martin W. Furlong and George H. Emerson. I beg, Sir, to move the following Resolutions,—

RESOLVED—"That this House hereby records its great sorrow for the death of the late Hon. John Harris, President of the Legislative Council, whose decease leaves a void not easily filled in the Legislature, Church, Commercial and Municipal Bodies, and the several patriotic societies with which he was so actively connected.

The deceased gentleman, as a member of this chamber evinced marked ability and financial acumen in the discussion of all matters of public interest; and whilst holding the highly important position of president of the Legislative Council, at all times displayed dignity, impartiality and sound judgment. in the duties of his office.

RESOLVED—That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the late Hon. John Harris, expressing sympathy of the Council with them in their great bereavement."

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE— I beg leave to second the Resolution so ably proposed by my friend. the Leader of the Government. We as a body mourn the loss of our late President, whose courtesy and capacity while in the Chair we all admired,respected and loved. I, as an individual, feel the loss of a good neighbour and kind friend. I feel assured from his many acts of charity, kindness and sympathy, that he has left behind him a memory which will be ever green in the minds of the community.

HON. MR. POWER—I would crave the indulgence of the House while I make a few sympathetic remarks in connection with the Resolutions so ably and fluently adanced by the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken. Being for many years associated with the late Hon. Mr. Harris in connection with the Municipal Government, I must add my humble tribute of respect to his memory and testify to his worth. He was a hard working, energetic member of the Council, and had done a lot in his time for the advancement of the City. I have observed the same admirable traits in connection with his work in this branch of the Legislature, and I do not think too much respect can be shown to his memory, both as a citizen and President of this Council.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I beg leave to support the remarks of hon. gentlemen which have passed here this afternoon in relation to Mr. Harris our late President.

HON. MR. SQUIRES moved resolutions of condolence on the death of Mr M. W. Furlong, Law Clerk of the Legislature.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—In seconding the Resolution so eloquently and feelingly put before the House by Hon. Mr. Squires to the late Mr. M. W. Furlong, I may say that I feel it will be useless for me to endeavor or try in any way to enlarge upon the subject or to express in the smallest way the great thought he has brought to bear upon the Resolution in question. We all know that the late Mr. Furlong in his time was one of Newfoundland's most brilliant men. and we all feel the greatest sympathy for those whom he has left behind, and recognize that Newfoundland is worse

off by the loss of Mr. Furlong and the talents he possessed,which were freely given when required to the service of the country he loved. As I said before I feel that it is impossible to further supplement the eloquent language used by my Hon. friend, Mr. Squires, in his appreciation of the deceased gentleman, the subject of the Resolution proposed. Mr. Squires has epitomized his career from the beginning. So that it only remains for me to express my great sympathy for his family, my sense of loss in his passing, and to observe that we here as well as those of the Lower Chamber will miss him, because his advice has been sought by almost every member on many occasions, and his opinions were highly valued as to Bills which he, from time to time, had to supervise. I beg leave to sec ond the Resolutions proposed by my Hon. and learned friend.

On motion, the Resolutions were put and carried.

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—Before proceeding to move the appointment of a Committee to draft the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency in opening the Legislature, I wish to take this opportunity, Mr. President, of congratulating you upon the position you have attained as President of this Council, and I am sure you will fill it with dignity.

It is a pleasure to me now to move that a Select Committee be appointed to draft the Address to which I have referred. It is not a lengthy speech. From the first to the fourth paragraph the Speech deals, as might be expected, with the present state of the war; a war that has now existed for over twenty months; a war which is filled with serious possibilities if not speedily stopped; a colossal struggle unprecedented in its magnitude and in the destructive engines used; a war which is being prosecuted by our enemies with an amount of brutality seldom exceeded and never in modern history; a war which now involves 13 nations and over 20 millions of fighting men and which makes one shudder to think of the awful carnage and the number of able-bodied, good men who must be destroyed, or a still greater number of whom will be maimed for life. It has been asked why should our nation be involved? It was for the purpose of upholding the traditions of our nation, of liberty, justice and honour, which impelled Britain to come to the rescue of Belgium. We came to her rescue and checked the designs of the Kaiser of Germany backed by a clique of military autocrats, whose unscrupulous conduct and wicked design was the consummation of the military conquest of Europe, who has treated Belgium in a manner that made every person, every Christian feel that it was his imperative duty to oppose his designs. Now not only has he treated Belgium in that manner, but Serbia and Montenegro have suffered similar atrocities and every Christian man shudders to think of the number of Christian people who have been killed, maltreated and ruined in Europe, as well as Armenian atrocities, and while Britain nobly comes to the rescue of outraged peoples in this war, it is much to be regretted that other powerful nations equally bound by treaty have failed even to protest. But while Britain's primary object in entering this war was to come to the rescue of outraged Belgium it was also an act of self-preservation, for had she held aloof, it would not be many years before she herself would have to face Germany, without any alliance, and face Germany strengthened by the conquest and the plunder of Flanders, France and other countries, and in the territory she would occupy would compel the people to serve in her army and navy. Never before has

there been such a war. Not only has it dragged multitudes into its sanguinary vortex, but has found a system of destruction of life unequalled in the history of the world. In the Old Country we find a lot of people cavilling at what has been done. But let us retrospect, take a glance at what she has done. She has checked Germany, deprived her of her Colonies, crippled her trade, locked up her fleet, and yet there are people who grumble and say that England is too apathetic to prevent Germany from getting what she wants. It is very pleasing to reflect that in this great war our little country is doing her full share, and doing her proper part. She may not be doing as much, numerically and proportionately, as her great neighbour, Canada. That may be the case. If we are not doing as much as we should, we must take into consideration the fact that here we have no floating population, no people coming to-day and going to-morrow, but I venture to say that more natives of Newfoundland have volunteered in proportion to population than in any other British Colony. But while so much has been done by our people in helping the Old Country, our men have honoured themselves by their splendid conduct at Gallipoli and elsewhere, both in the army and navy. The necessity has arisen and they have met the emergency nobly, and I feel certain that the further aid asked for will be forthcoming, and I hope soon to see a battalion formed of Newfoundlanders. It cannot be denied that it is a great strain on their patriotism. We find in the Old Country that those engaged in agriculture are,to some extent, exempted from serving with the forces. Here we have people engaged in our main industry who must sacrifice their stages and practically all their property if they enlist, and who when they come back will find that all is gone from them. It is a strain on their patriotism to join the ranks, but the inherent loyalty of the people will assert itself, and it will be done, and I have faith enough to feel that our people will come forward and make up a full battalion. It should be borne in mind that had Germany succeeded in carrying out her designs, it would not be long before the country might have become a German Province, and be compelled to face conscription in the German army and navy. It is a fact that people in the enjoyment of good health never appreciate it until they fall sick; so also we have the most glorious Constitution, and do not value as we ought that great privilege until we are deprived of it. If we were deprived of it then would we realize the value of it. Were we to think what the failure of the Allies would mean to us as a people, we would find that the great privileges we now enjoy (and for which we are indebted to the protection of the Old Country) would be lost to us forever, without our having appreciated their value. The next question dealt with is that of tonnage, a very serious one, affecting industrially the people of the country. Much has been said as to the possibility of a shortage in the food supply. I have no fear that food will be short to any great extent in this country. If it is, it will be really to our own discredit, in as much as the country we obtain our food supplies from is only seven hours' run from here, and surely we could get our food supplies easily. But the material point as regards possible shortage, is that we have not had tonnage sufficient to take away our produce, which has accumulated, and this may interfere with the marketing of next year's catch of fish, and also must be a great loss to the country by affecting the price of the new catch. When we look back and see how this tonnage business has been done, when all the

trade was done by vessels, either here or in connection with us in the Old Country, it is with regret that we see so many of our vessels gone. We see steam competition, also competition from Norway, where vessels are run much more cheaply and wages are much lower than ours. We now lack vessels in our trade and have this position that in the next coming year (freights are now more than double), they may then be treble what they have been. You cannot procure vessels now to go to Labrador and load, as usual, at about 22 shillings, indeed now they ask 51 shillings. Formerly they went when the fish was ready to ship, when they wanted to procure a cargo and would wait for it until ready. Now they can't do it and claim to be loaded at specific time, or they would come under demurrage, which now increases the charge on the freight of fish, and is a very serious thing to our fishermen, who have to pay all the charges incidental to the realization of it. It comes off the value of the fish, and there is another charge the shippers are insisting on viz: that they will not be responsible for weight. Most of the cargoes go to Gibraltar for orders. This is a free port, and it is a most extraordinary thing, but there have not been cargoes that have not turned out short weight this year. Some have been evil minded enough to say that this is done while the vessels lay at Gibraltar. However, it is extraordinary that in the olden times short weight was an exception. Some people think it is due largely to the quantity landed in Gibraltar. This is a serious drawback. It is a great pity that the ownership of the sailing vessels should pass out of the hands of the people of this country. Our people are now buying tonnage largely all over Canada, the United States, Great Britain and Norway, and it looks as if there will not be so great a deficiency in tonnage in future. The Government purposes bringing in a Bill to give themselves further power in trade matters. While it is not desirable that the Government should have anything to do with commercial matters, under existing circumstances something must be done, and I think the Government are wise in giving themselves power to interfere. They interfered in the coal business when it threatened famine and have relieved the people. In this case they were aided and assisted by Lord Northcliffe, to whom the Colony is greatly indebted for his kindness. For some time past fears have been expressed as to the supply of salt for the coming Spring. We all know that Newfoundland must have salt. A syndicate of gentlemen accordingly approached the Government, guaranteeing to get a certain number of steamers, provided the Government would protect them from the consequences of any Act of the Government, whereby salt might be allowed to be sold under a reasonable profit. As a result of these negotiations I understand that three steamers are now under charter, and further that the Government has secured two steamers to be used by Lord Northcliffe for carrying pulp, to bring out a cargo of salt each, so that all fears for the salt supply are at rest. Here again we are indebted to Lord Northcliffe.

The next paragraph deals with the question of revenue and the next with the industrial operations of the country. During the past year all the local industries and manufactures have resulted very favorably, and in most cases good dividends have been declared. This is very gratifying because the local industries are giving an immense amount of employment and expending a very large amount of money, so that a cessation of these industries would be a national calamity.

With regard to the fisheries, the lobster fishery has not by any means resulted in any great quantity being exported. due directly to the fact that the output was paralyzed in the Spring for fear that there would be no German purchasers. The herring fishery has certainly been a very large one during the past year, and it looks well for the future that the people are now adopting the Scotch cure, for we have the assurance of those who are selling the Scotch cure herring abroad that there is every chance of a large increase in this trade. But like every other commodity exported from Newfoundland it is absolutely necessary for the producer to pay particular attention to the cure of herring; as well as of all our produce. There is a big business for Newfoundland in herring if we could get the fishermen to attend to the cure. The salmon fishery has been almost a failure. The seal fishery, as we all know, was anything but a success; indeed it was almost a failure. So also was the whaling industry, which is now almost a thing of the past, although personally, I believe the whale fishery may be conducted at a profit in the future. Like all other fisheries in Newfoundland it has had its ups and downs, but the loss has been so great that of late years it has become almost extinct. It is gratifying to know that the Bank fishery on the West coast was a complete success. With regard to the codfishery, while the catch was a good average one, its value was so largely increased by the almost unprecedented prices that it has been a great source of wealth to our people. There is no labouring community in the world better off than our fishermen; indeed they are better off than many people of the better classes elsewhere, for not only have they a lot of money invested in the Banks, in Debentures, life insurance, and in their stockings, but they have free residences, free gardens, and, what is of more value, they are free from any direct taxation. I hope they will long continue to be free from direct taxation—please take note of that—while the price they have received for their fish in the past has been very high, for it has taken all the ingenuity of the shippers to realize the prices they have paid for it.

In connection with the new industries of the country, it is pleasing to note that in the district of Ferryland preparations are being made for the erection of a premises to carry on the fresh fish business, also for the manufacture of fertilizer, and I believe Bay Bulls is to be lit by electricity.

It looks as if the prospects for the coming year are very good. The Norwegian fishery is far behind last year's at this date. That will help us. Speaking of another industry, we find that the revenue of the past six months is likely to be supplemented by the increased export of iron ore from Bell Island. It is also pleasing to see the resurrection of the old Tilt Cove mine, which has been prospected during the past year, and from which I believe three cargoes of ore have been shipped, which must result in large profits to those who have invested their money in it, and I am pleased to see that the capital has been entirely supplied by Newfoundlanders. With regard to the shipping question we find that our steel sealing steamers have been all sold out. Speaking for myself, I regret that steam was introduced here, for I think that steamers have been a great evil for Newfoundland. Since their introduction the cost of the sealfishery has been much greater, whereas if we had the old sailing vesseis It would be an immense help to Newfoundland. A large number of tradesmen would benefit by the building of suitable vessels, ev-

ery trade getting some pull out of it, and while the cost of steamers has been very much greater it is doubtful if the results have been any better. Now that the steel fleet has been sold out I hope we shall see the old sailing vessels reinstated, for if the fishery were confined to sailing vessels it would give an immense stimulus to shipbuilding in this Colony, which, I regret to say, has fallen off in Newfoundland. There is no reason why in Newfoundland we should not turn out as good ships as they do in Nova Scotia. We have the men and the timber and should be able to do just as well as they do. And yet we find a large amount of money going out of the Colony for purchasing ships. I think it would be a wise policy if the Government would encourage the shipbuilding industry which has now almost altogether dwindled, by increased bounty.

There is another matter which is not dealt with in the Speech, and that is Agriculture. That, of course, is the industry that makes a country independent. In this Newfoundland of ours, any of us who have had experience in the past can recognize what great strides we have made in that direction of late years. Take the district of Ferryland for example. Anybody who has travelled down there, as I have, can count in one settlement as many as ninety horses, where, some years ago there were no more than two horses in the whole district. It is to be hoped this will increase, for nothing can build up a country more than its agriculture.

With regard to the Revenue, it is to be regretted that the shortage was so much for the past year, but that was almost to be expected. The war caused almost a cessation of imports amounting to practically $3,000,000. People naturally did not care to import for fear of what might happen in the future. But I think in dealing with the Revenue of the Colony a great mistake has been made in the past by avoiding the taxation of necessities. Any prudent Finance Minister should be careful to try and equal his estimated receipts with the expenditure. Luxuries have been taxed, and they ought to be taxed—but you cannot be certain of raising the revenues without taxing necessities. In the past the desire has been to free the fisherman from taxation, but these are the class of people who consume the necessities upon which you must rely for revenue, and should pay their share of taxation, and let those who use the luxuries pay the increased taxation. I look forward to the future with confidence that the estimated revenue will be exceeded. The trade is now pretty well bereft of stocks, there must be a new supply, and the fishermen are well able to purchase. There must be large imports, to say nothing of the quantity of alcoholic stimulants that will be imported during the next six months. All this will raise the revenue. Another thing is the fact that nearly all manufactured goods today are costing from twenty to fifty per cent. more than their value, and with an ad valorem duty, the revenue must benefit.

It is very gratifying to know that our sealers are now in the seals, and that already it is estimated that it will be an average voyage, notwithstanding the withdrawal of a number of our sealing steamers.

We are promised in the Speech that a proclamation will be issued with regard to Prohibition. While I express no opinion, I must congratulate the Colony upon the manner of the campaign, for it is a matter of congratulation that an election on such a question should have been carried out as it was; and also that in the recount the returns of the various returning officers have been so fully upheld. I only hope that it will

do all the good that the most sanguine supporters expect of it. I also wish to pay a tribute to those who have so honestly, ably and consistently worked for temperance for so many years. And right here I should like to say that when we contrast the conditions which exist here today with what they were, we can say that these people deserve all the thanks of the community. I remember when one of our near-by settlements was notoriously intemperate, the late Rev. Father Clarke took charge of that parish and as a result of his teaching he left it a sober parish.

It is men like these that we are indebted to for the great temperance wave which is evident all over the Colony.

Without any further remarks, Mr. President, I beg to move the appointment of a Select Committee to draft the Address in Reply to His Excellency's gracious Speech.

HON. MR. MURPHY—I rise, Mr. president, to second the motion made by Hon. Mr. Goodridge, but before doing so I wish to congratulate you on your appointment to the Presidency of the Legislative Council of the Colony and to wish you the enjoyment of good health to enable you to hold this dignified and honorable position for many years.

I think, Sir, we have reason to be thankful for our present position in this mighty war of nations. No man can say England had anything to do with starting this terrible war, as no nation in the world was less prepared for the big struggle on land when it began. But now, after eighteen months, we are equal if not superior, in men, money and munitions, to the nations who spent twenty years preparing for it. We have great reason to be both proud and thankful for the enormous amount of work done by the British nation in that very short time and all over whose head the British flag flies are helping and will continue to do so to the finish. Our own little old loyal Colony is taking second place to none. Our men were among the first to offer their services, both on land and sea, and, if necessary, they will be the last to lay down their arms while there is danger of any but the British flag flying over their Island home and the Empire's oldest dependency. Our men are volunteers, the real stuff, and they come in many instances from isolated settlements where the recruiting drum was never heard and where they knew but little of the dangers that threatened the dear old flag they loved so well. But as the call reaches them they come forward as they have been coming. In thickly peopled countries it is easy to get regiments together with all the facilities for recruiting and officers to train them, but here, with our small population scattered over this big Island, it is much more difficult to reach our young men and show them what is expected of them, but now that our young people are waking up to the seriousness of the situation and realizing that England needs men and plenty of them, they are rushing to the colors; and, though they may never be called upon to fire a gun, and I trust they never will, England must have the biggest army at the finish which will give her the power and influence with friends and foes to make such peace terms as will protect the small nations, protect her own interests, and protect the welfare of peoples the world over.

I know our young men, and have seen them under all conditions of working life. They are plucky, daring, ingenuous, enduring, equal to any emergency and always ready to risk their own lives to save others; so, it is little wonder we are getting such splendid certificates of the men and their conduct from others qualified

to speak regarding them. We rejoice in the heroism of Capt. Donnelly and the men under him who did such work at Gallipoli Hill. We are all proud of them and their heroic acts, and we know that hundreds of others of our boys will, if occasion arises, emulate them on the field of honor, and in whatever comes in the future of this great struggle, I am certain Newfoundlanders will not take a second place to any.

With regard to the tonnage problem, Mr. President, I am glad that the Government, merchants, and Board of Trade, have combined to solve it. It is rather a dangerous business for a Government to interfere with the commercial life of a country, but there are times when such is justified and the situation created by the war has been such that prompt and vigorous action by a Government is not alone necessary but commendable. It is certainly satisfactory to know that the efforts that have been made have had good results, and I trust that we have no further cause to apprehend further trouble in this regard. I am glad to see that the Government will be able to make both ends meet this year. That we had a shortage of $750,000 in last year's affairs owing to the shrinkage of over three million dollars in our imports was not surprising when we remember the effect which the early months of the war had on trade the world over, Now. though, our people are getting back to normal conditions and are importing as in the past, with the war taxation, there is evidently enough revenue in sight for all requirements. I rejoice that we have no direct taxation here, and hope we never will, and therefore it is all the more pleasant to note that our import duties are supplying enough money and that we may have a little surplus this year. Taxation has not hurt us as much here as other countries, and though it may hurt some classes such as Government officials, tradesmen, and shop hands, whose salaries have not increased, yet our fishermen are comparatively fortunate seeing that they are getting big prices for their catch and that they have mining, lumbering and other work to help them out in the winter months In Canada taxation is hitting certain interests very hard. For instance, all companies were taxed last year on their gross earnings whether they earned a profit or no, and this year they are being taxed on their profits, that is they are being taxed at both ends, and next year I expect they will be taxed in the middle. The great mass of our people, however, owning their own homes, having their own farms, getting their firewood for nothing and having a bit of money in the stocking or in the Savings Banks, will come out of the war a good deal better than anybody expected when it started. I agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Goodridge, that we have reason to be thankful for many blessings in connection with even this frightful truggle that is now devastating Europe and that it does not become us to grumble, even if we have to confront difficulties of various kinds, seeing how much better off we are than others.

Regarding the Prohibition election, I can only say that I was not here at the time and therefore did not take part in it. I have been for over forty years taking a glass of whisky, when I felt like it, but I will not feel it any deprivation to have it shut off, because; if I do find my digestive qualities affected, I can secure a prescrip tion from a doctor which will allow me to take as much as is good for my health and my pocket. I hope the new measure will have the effect its promoters expected for it. The battle between the "wets" and

the "drys" was peacefully fought, and it is to our credit that we were able to conduct this contest with so little excitement or contention.

With reference to our industrial operations, I agree that we have no reason for complaint as to the present conditions and the future outlook. Last year many people with money held on to it fearing the contingencies of the war, but now we have every reason to believe that there will be no further interference with our industries or with those of the countries with which we do business. At the end of 1914, when I went to Canada, I could get hundreds of men to go to work, but when I went there last December I could scarcely hire a man at any price, as all were so busy. We here are gaining greatly by that condition also. Large numbers of our men are finding employment in the coal mines and steel mills at Sydney. Bell Island mine is running full blast and there is abundant work for thousands in the lumber woods cutting pulpwood and pit props. In fact, I think it is any man's own fault if he is not employed at present. It must be of great advantage to have all the thousands of dollars going out to our own people this winter for work near their homes such as they get in cutting pit props and in mining at Bell Island. It is specially a great advantage to married men, for whom it is inconvenient to go outside the Colony to seek labour. Speaking as a result of very many years of experience in the lumbering industry of this Colony, I would like to say that I see no reason why we should not have a vast lumber development here from this time onward. Much of our timber is small, but that kind is now in demand for pulp wood and for pit props, and we should now prepare, so that after this war we shall be able to secure a share of the big trade that is going to be done in these two items. England, I think, will spend some of her millions over here instead of sending to Sweden and Norway as in the past for these articles when the Scandinavian countries have been doing their best to help the Germans since the war began. I do not see why something is not done to enable the Mother Country, the British Colonies, and the Allied nations to have an exchange of trade between them and shut out enemies and neutrals who are not inclined to support us. By such a step all the Allied peoples would greatly gain and much benefit would accrue to the different countries. I trust that our authorities will take this matter up in good time, and see that we get some of the capital from Britain which has been sent to other countries, so that British people in the various parts of the Empire, may all be able to derive the greatest benefit from the changed conditions which will follow this war.

In the future we must look for means to develop our resources. Good things will accrue from this war in some ways. If we get back to building sailing vessels here, we will see again great crowds of men employed at this work and also large numbers of good smart sailors who are now gradually dwindling away in this country. We should not let the Norwegian run in and take our trade with their little vessels, and run our shipping off the track, thus compelling our consumers to pay the piper, which occurs when flour and other goods run up to the prices they are at present. Meat now costs thirty cents, whereas a few years ago we could purchase it for eight and ten cents, and so it is with every other article we use. Our people, now so used to high prices, will not grumble when paying reasonable figures to give freights to our own shipping from which to pay our own men and run our own native built vessels. I beg leave to second the motion of Hon. Mr. Goodridge for the ap-

pointment of a Select Committee to draft an Address in Reply.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I desire, Mr. President, to refer very shortly to one or two matters informally suggested to my mind by the speeches to which we have just listened. The chief subject is that of Prohibition. The Governor's Speech informs us that it will be at once put in force through the agency of a Proclamation. Well, I want to express the opinion that now that Prohibition is becoming an accomplished fact, it is the manifest duty of the Legislature to provide compensation for any capital that may be destroyed by the deliberate adoption of this policy. Whether one is a supporter or opponent of the policy we must recognize that we are abolishing,in what is believed to be the general interests of the community, a legally established trade, a trade recognized by the Legislature and authorized under its laws, and when individual property has to be confiscated or sacrificed for the sake of the community, then the community ought to compensate, at least for the capital thus sacrificed. When I speak of capital sacrificed I refer particularly, not necessarily to good will, but certainly to money, cash actually invested in the retail trade in fixtures, utensils, etc., and to machinery and plant of the breweries. The cost need not be serious, the principal capital involved being in the breweries. Values could be arrived at by arbitration, and compensation paid for the plants taken over and payments in Colonial debentures. It is quite likely that these plants might be re-let or re-sold for making aerated waters or other purposes, and it is possible that the cost would prove to be trifling; but while I have been a strong supporter of the Prohibition campaign, I am equally strong in believing that the measure should be put through on a basis of justice and fair play.

A matter which I hope will be explained is the pit-prop situation. Last session the Legislature agreed to permit dry wood only to be exported from the three-mile limit. Permission has been since given to export green wood, and as it is a somewhat serious matter I trust a reasonable explanation may be forthcoming, as I have no doubt it will be. A most notable, perhaps the most notable lesson to be drawn from the war, is the ever growing emphasis of national education. The exhibition of its influence in Germany where its power has been deliberately directed to debauching a nation, and where it has been used and used successfully to stifle all conscience, all common sense and all individual conscience, is amazing, but it is also illuminating. If such effects are obtainable by its misuse, what may not be achieved through it in a contrary direction? I am well aware how difficult it is for a government here to make any real effort at economy, yet if real economies in the public service could be enforced, as they unquestionably ought to be under present conditions, and the saving invested in education, there need be no limit to the possible advancement of this Colony. Economy should be studied, too, because, as Hon. Mr. Goodridge has indicated, much of the increase in revenue is directly attributable to the increased cost of commodities, upon which the Colony collects ad valorem duties. To-day the enormous Government expenditures in Europe and elsewhere, and the inflation of currency, together with many factors which increase costs, have resulted in phenomenal prices. After the war the tendency may go the other way.

The introducer has referred to the Scotch herring fishery. While there are undoubtedly remarkable possibilities about this in connection with the Scotch cure, I am quite convinced

that the one way to develop it properly is to enforce inspection by competent men of every barrel, especially in the initial stages of the industry. Already inferior goods in inferior barrels have gone away, and these ruin the demand for Newfoundland Scotch cure in foreign markets, even of the good fish, whereas if every barrel were to be relied upon the article would immediately create its own demand, and establish a reputation and a permanent high value. The Government ought to reserve the use of certain trade terms such as the words Scotch, Fulls, Matties, etc., for the use of the official inspectors only.

I am glad to say that I think the Government have taken the right course in connection with the threatened shortage of salt, upon which the very existence of the Colony depends, by guaranteeing against loss those who have undertaken to bring here the very large quantity that is needed.

Reference is made to the tonnage question, and there has been a good deal of outside discussion, not I think, founded upon very sound considerations, regarding the sale of certain ships out of this trade. It must be remembered that so far as the public are concerned these ships were originally built by a number of private shareholders, who were willing to take risks involved as against the profit they hoped to make and under no special undertaking to the Government or the Colony, also that none of them, excepting the "Can't Lose," which was brought here with the intention of using her for coal and general local trade, were intended in the first place for use in this trade at all outside of the sealfishery. They were mostly too small to pay in this trade and were originally used principally in the American fruit trade and then in Hudson Bay, and only incidentally did they run in the Newfoundland trade at all. If they had been run through the Panama Canal none would have objected. Furthermore when the negotiations were entered into which resulted some time afterwards in the sale of the ships there was no reason to anticipate the abnormal conditions whi h have since arisen. None foresaw these conditions, and as a matter of fact, it seems to be evident now that, viewed solely from the point of view of the financial interests of the shareholders, it is exceedingly probable that they would have been better off if they had refused to sell them when they did.

I beg to support the motion before the House.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—It is not my desire to prolong the debate, but there are certain remarks of my hon. friend on my right which I feel I cannot allow to pass without a strong protest. I refer to his desire or plea for compensation in connection with Prohibition. I think that if any such plea had been offered to the country generally at the time of the recent election, it would not have been 25,000 but a great many more who would have recorded their vote against the traffic. I especially object to the form in which my hon. friend has made that plea. He asks for compensation for breweries. So far as breweries are concerned it seems to me that now is the golden opportunity for every brewery to reap a very handsome fortune. It is no very difficult thing for any such business to change the factory from alcoholic to non-alcoholic, and under Prohibition, we are presenting the manufacturers of soft drinks with an unlimited market for their goods, for something must take the place of intoxicating liquors. There will be individual cases of hardship in connection with the restriction. There are widows who have been running the business in the past and by it have been supporting their

children. With them I have much sympathy and if any compensation is to be considered, which I am not prepared to admit, only in such cases would consideration be even reasonable. There is no vested interest in the liquor traffic in this country. For the past 30 years the liquor traffic has been conducted under the dinging of the alarm bell. There is not a man who has been in the business in this country for the past 30 years, but has known that the day was coming. He has gone into the business with his eyes open. He has seen district after district giving up the business without compensation. There has been no claim, no argument for compensation so far as the outport districts are concerned, but now,forsooth, that the liquor dealers of St. John's are to suffer we are asked for compensation for fixtures and for breweries. I feel very strongly on this point. It would be a very dangerous thing if, at this the first session of this year, it should go broadcast through the and: 'Prohibition has been passed, an announcement has been made that a proclamation is to issue, and the Legislative Council has struck the note of compensation for the breweries. It is for this reason that I voice this protest to-night. My hon. friend, to use his exact words, asks that "everything be done upon a basis of justice." I don't want to give a perfervid prohibition speech, but I must say that if everything is done on a basis of justice, then by all means compensate the brewers and the saloon keepers, but do not do so until you have compensated fully and amply all the wrecked homes and all the ruined lives, and those whose tears are streaming down their cheeks to-day because of loved ones lying all too soon within the cemeteries. When you have compensated these, compensate the brewers, if you will. I voice this protest because I think it would be a calamity if it got abroad that at their first meeting the Legislative Council were asking for compensation for the brewers, and the saloon keepers of the city.

HON. MR. HARVEY—With the assent of the House I would like to explain in reply to Mr. Robinson that the terms I used were not compensation to the breweries, but compensation for capital destroyed, these were I think my actual words. I referred specially to the breweries because they were convenient for purposes of illustration, and because they probably represent the most important item in the account. If my hon. friend, with whose feelings on this subject I can sympathize, though I entirely disagree with him, is correct, and if we are improving their investment rather than otherwise, then obviously there will be no loss to the Colony in providing compensation for capital destroyed. I do not know anything about their business or whether their plants can be utilized as profitably in this way.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The President then nominated the following Committee to draft the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech: Hon. Mr. Goodridge, Hon. Mr. Murphy, Hon. Dr. Skelton, Hon. Mr. Anderson, Hon. Mr. Winter.

The Hon. President announced that permission had been granted to Hon. James Ryan to leave the Colony for the present session.

Hon. Mr. Bishop tabled the report of the C. H. E. Examinations for the year 1915; also the Financial Statement for the C. H. E. for 1915.

On motion of Hon. Mr Bishop the House adjourned till Monday at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, March 20th.

The House met at 4.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

ADDRESS IN REPLY DEBATE.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Goodridge, the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor at the opening of the House, was read a first and second time, passed and ordered to be presented to His Excellency by a deputation of the Whole House.

THE HON. THE PRESIDENT— Hon. gentlemen: I desire to thank those speakers who at Thursday's sitting offered me their congratulations on attaining to the chair of this House, for their very kindly references, and I also gratefully recognize the congratulations extended to me previously and since, by other members of this honourable House.

I need scarcely say that I deeply appreciate the honor of being chosen to preside over the deliberations of this historic body, the oldest Senior Chamber of the Parliaments of Greater Britain, as we know them today. I keenly realize the obligations imposed upon me in following in the footsteps of men like Lawrence O'Brien, a merchant prince of our Island Home half a century ago; of Edward Morris, a model of commercial and financial probity; of Edward Shea, a leader in our public affairs for a period outlasting many an honored life; and of the universally regretted John Harris to whom we paid the last tribute of respect only a few weeks ago— four men whose names comprehend the history of this Chamber for the past sixty years, and of whom it can truly be said that probably no better examples could be found in our colonial life than they were of the class of men whom a country delights to honour. Therefore, aware, as I am of the traditions associated with the position which these gentlemen have occupied, and the requirements it demands from its incumbent, it shall be my earnest endeavor to so comport myself in the exercise of the functions of this office as to maintain the high place it deservedly holds in the public estimation, and to see that its best standards are not impaired. In this endeavour I shall have the cordial co-operation of every hon. gentleman in this House, and I can assure you all that if there be any shortcomings on my part they will not be those of intention.

While I am proud—and, I trust, pardonably proud—at having been chosen for this high office, I unfeignedly regret the demise of my predecessor in this Chair, Hon. Mr. Harris, whom I had known for many years, for whom I held a sincere friendship, and with whom, moreover, for the past year or more, I was closely associated in the administration of the Patriotic Fund. In his business relations he was, of course, better known to many of you, but I am sure I voice your unanimous sentiment in saying that in these respects he was one who cherished a loftly ideal of commercial principle and who maintained it unyieldingly during a long and successful career. Of his relations with this House it will suffice tc say that for more than a quarter of a century, with unfailing courtesy, befitting dignity, and an impartiality that was beyond reproach, he participated in its deliberations, and, for the past four years, presided over its sessions. He was in some respects one of our most conspicuous public figures, and the sense of loss felt in his demise is deep and poignant. He was essentially a gentleman in his bearing; essentially an observer in his habit of life; essentially a student in his outlook of human affairs. Therefore, in a country like ours, the presence of such a man was an influence not to be lightly estimated. No man was bet-

ter equipped for a serene evening of life and its quiet retrospection than was John Harris, nor more hopeful of the morning beyond, with its re-unions and "adventures brave and new"; and now that the long day is ended, and his familiar figure will no more be seen, there will remain the memory of a good man, 'that blossom from the dust, whose fragrance turns the sense of loss to gain.' In this Colony's public affairs—national and municipal—he played a prominent and honorable part, and to the high place he held in this House for so many years he brought a personal dignity, a personal charm, and a personal influence for good that will not soon fade from the memories of those fortunate enough to have been associated with him. He was a true servant of the State, as zealous for the general public interest as any could desire, and yet wide-minded, free from all party prejudices,liberal in disposition, tolerant and sympathetic in his relations with his fellows, uninfluenced by love of place or prospect of personal advantage; rejoicing in the courage to be free and to keep his integrity and independence. Our regrets may find expression in Scott's lines from Marmion:

"Now is the stately column broke,
The beacon light is quenched in smoke
The trumpet's silver sound is still
The warder silent on the hill."

The Grim Reaper has also cut down the kindly, gentle, brilliantly intellectual Martin W. Furlong, our Law Clerk. He was a man who enjoyed a rare eminence amongst us as a genuine lover of literature, as a legalist of exceptional acumen, as a speaker, a writer, a student, a keen researcher among the almost forgotten annals of his native land. Among our legal practitioners he was easily a leader and one of the most successful at our local Bar. He had a wide commercial clientele and was counsel in many important cases. His industry and ability were pre-eminent in his day, his knowledge was wide and diversified; his analytical powers and his logical presentations were specially remarkable, and from a well-stored mind he drew treasures of legal reference to apply to every case in which he was concerned. But, apart from his legal career, he was an estimable citizen who never lost a cheeriness of disposition and a quality of good fellowship which made him a rare companion. He had in a special degree the faculty of making friends and retaining friendships. He was true as steel to his intimates and associates, courteous and considerate to all with whom he was associated in any public way, and a legion of friends will cherish the memory of one who, in good fortune or adversity, in private or in public life, was always the same loyal and kind hearted man to whom kindness was a second nature. His loss will be felt with a sense of personal bereavement far beyond the circle of his family and business relations, and to him may we fitly apply the lines of John Boyle O'Reilly:

. . . He lost no friend,
Who loved him once, loved on to the end,
He mourned all selfish and shrewd endeavour;
But he never injured a weak one—never.
When censure was passed he was kindly dumb;
He was never so wise but a fault would come;
He was never so old that he failed to enjoy
The games and the dreams he had loved when a boy.
He erred, and was sorry; but never drew
A trusting heart from the pure and true.
When friends look back from the years to be,
God grant they may say such things of thee.

Of another gentleman recently deceased, the late Hon. Mr. Justice

Emerson, who was for some years a member of this Chamber, and for twenty years an ornament to the Supreme Bench, one could truthfully say, that he was to be admired for his sterling honesty and uprightness, his devotion to duty, his fidelity to principle. He was in his political career one whose independence of thought and action made him a powerful influence for public good and a leaven that always worked for political freedom and our country's welfare. As a legal man he exhibited the same qualities; and the profession of law in this Colony has rarely, if ever, seen a more capable, courageous or high-principled practitioner. For many years I have known him and latterly was proud to be numbered amongst his closest friends. As such, it has been mine, as yours, to marvel at his courage in action, his farseeing public vision. A gallant fighter, he appealed to all with the fighting instinct and the quality of lion-heartedness he exhibited from the outset of a notable career as a legislator and a Judge, remained with him to the last. In earlier life he manfully assumed burdens which the vicissitudes of fortune imposed on him, and his finest epitaph might indeed be written in the way in which he bore these burdens and discharged the obligations they involved. In later years, as we all know, he battled against an insidious and enfeebling disease, never complaining, never repining, performing the tasks of his office under conditions that would have daunted all but the noblest spirits, until a few short days ago, God called him, and in the words of the American poet:

"He wrapped the draperies of his
couch around him,
And lay down to pleasant dreams."

If I may supply a further word as to George Henry Emerson, it would be that "he added to the sum of human joy, and were every one for whom he did some loving service, to bring a blossom to his grave he would sleep to-night beneath a wildernes of flower."

I take the liberty to express what I believe to be the sentiment of the whole House, that while we mourn those who may fairly be described as some of the leaders amongst us, we also mourn the others for whom our country wraps itself in proud grief in these eventful days—the gallant sailors and soldiers from our island home, who have given their lives in the cause of Country and Empire. The years, as they have passed in this Colony, have had many a tragic accompaniment, have been marked by many a ghastly ocean horror startling even the busy world abroad. Noble lives have vanished, gruesome incidents have occurred, and vivid still in our memories is the tale of the ice-floe horror of two seasons back. But a new sacrifice has been made by us in the months that have gone since last this Legislature met. The Oldest Colony has attained a new dignity, has won a new eminence among the daughter Dominions of the British Empire; has secured an honored place in the family of appanages consecrated by the blood of our fallen heroes and the sufferings of her wounded. In the perilous waters of the North Sea some dozens of our Naval Reservists have made the great sacrifice, and amid the hills of Gallipoli, where the gallant fellows of the Newfoundland Regiment proved themselves equal to the valors and the sacrifices of war, and the most exacting demands of the profession of the soldier, the unknown graves of our Terranovan warriors will ever remain to us as a priceless memory.

The present world war has brought about a new spiritual awakening, and compelled men to estimate life's values differently. To-day we have to consider new standards and measure successes,

not by the years that are lived, but by the purposes that are achieved. Often, as we discuss the war and its horrors, we speak of "the awful waste of life." We speak thus as we think of lives cut off ere the fulness of years, as flowers are cut off before they reach maturity. But do we speak wisely, after all? This is one of the mysteries human reason cannot compass, one that men of all times have felt as keenly as we do, but most of us have attained to a hope which they in the past failed to reach, the hope

"That nothing walks with aimless feet
That not one life shall be destroyed,
Or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete."

This reflection should be our standby when we think of the lives given up in far-off Gallipoli or the plumbless depths of the outer seas. This should sustain the friends of the splendid types of young manhood, before whom the future must have stretched so invitingly when they turned to the din and death of battle and eagerly offered "the last full measure of devotion" in the highest enterprise that man can undertake, gladly making the supreme sacrifice of facing the great unknown for the ideals of justice, righteousness and humanity.

Can we think of such lives as wasted, as, fighting and falling, with faces to the foes, they gave themselves for an ideal loftier than any that could have been achieved had they lived to the ripest age? Let us rather rejoice that our soldiers and sailors did not fail in the supreme hour, but maintained themselves as we, their fellow citizens, knew they would, when we saw them march from amongst us to the war. Out of that fact the Colony will derive the mournful pride that goes with valor and its dire penalties; to those who weep for their "deathless dead" the sincerest sympathy will extend from fellow colonists who realize how our liberties and privileges were so well maintained by the departed heroes, who have gone to their last home, by all their country's wishes blest.

In such times as the present, words are poor things to express the feelings of a country's heart, but our gratitude and admiration for those who have maintained our honor and our ideals should be as boundless as it is everlasting. We should never forget how nobly and unselfishly these Terranovan soldiers and sailors answered in their persons the question of Rupert Brooke, the poet-soldier of the Dardanelles, himself a victim of the war's ravages, the ennobling sentiment, "Who dies, if England lives?"

May I not say also that we are proud of those who are playing their part in the battle line across the water, who are carrying our flag and upholding our name. We are proud of them—proud to the very cores of our hearts! We are proud mainly that they have done their duty so faithfully ,but we are proud also of the fame which they have made their own and ours. We are gratified beond measure that to them should have fallen such an opportunity, that, going as our soldiers have done, without any training whatever, they have won the commendation of distinguished officers and the approbation of their comrades-in-arms from other climes. They have "quitted themselves like men,' 'and what is true of our soldiers is true of our sailors. It we have Donnelly and Green and Hynes winning recognition at Caribou Hill, we have Randell and Green gaining similar honors in the North Sea, and as the struggle continues we may confidently look to see others of our gallant fellows earning like recognition, and winning for Newfoundland an

enduring fame in the great struggle which must continue until our certain ultimate triumph occurs, until the battle for right and human freedom is won, and the dragon of militarism is crushed, until Germany's all-dominating ambitions are extinguished, and until the plots for the extinction of British ideals the suppression of British ambitions,and the substitution of servitude to Germany to which death would be preferable, have come to nought. Surely I may hope I but express the feeling of every hon. member of this House in uttering the prayer that before another session occurs, the blessings of an honorable and abiding peace will have again returned to the world, and that we may all be able to join in a hearty welcome back to our warriors of the Army and Navy and to prepare for the dedication of a monument worthy of their memory, to those who have fallen in the fight.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned until Thursday next, March 23rd, at 4.30 of the clock.

THURSDAY, March 25th.

The Council met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. Mr. Bishop tabled the annual statements of the Reid Newfoundland Co., for the year 1914–15.

On motion of Hon Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till Tuesday next March 28th, at 4.30.

TUESDAY, March 28th.

The Council met at 4.30 p. m. pursuant to adjournment.

SEALING PROSECUTION BILL.

HON. PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act further to regulate the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery," in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was then read a first time.

HON. MR. BISHOP—With the concurrence of the House I desire to ask that the Bill be given a second reading and put through all its stages so that it may become law before the return of the sealing steamers from the present voyage. The Bill is an amendment to the Act of 1915 to the effect that when the day for sailing falls on a Sunday the steamers shall be allowed to sail on the day previous. The defect in the Act was not noticed till this year, when the date of sailing fell on a Sunday. The Government, however, gave permission to sail on the day previous to that fixed by the Act and promised to indemnify all concerned from liability. It is now desired to pass the Bill before the ships return in order to prevent the possibility of anybody taking action against a master for a breach of the old Act for which a penalty of $4000.00 could be imposed.

The Bill was then read a second time and referred to a committee of the Whole House.

Hon. Mr. Angel in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, whereupon it 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.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

Hon. President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly that they had appointed a Select Committee to consider the Sealing Bill and requested that the Council should appoint a like Committee.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, for the appointment of a Select Committee the President nominated the fol-

lowing:—

Hons. R. K. Bishop, Jno. Harvey, M. G. Winter, M. P. Gibbs, A. F. Goodridge, P. Templeman, and J. J. Murphy.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, a message was sent to the House of Assembly acquainting them that this House had appointed a Select Committee to co-operate with the Select Committee appointed by them to consider the Sealing Bill.

MESSAGES FROM ASSEMBLY.

Hon. President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the following Bills, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council, viz:—

An Act to amend 3 Geo. V. Cap. 14, entitled "An Act for the construction of a Railway through Labrador;" an Act to amend the War Measures Act; an Act to enable the Governor in Council during the existence of a state of war to take possession of articles of commerce unreasonably withheld; an Act to amend the Act respecting the Naturalization of Aliens; An Act to Incorporate the Salvation Army.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bills entitled respectively, "An Act for the construction of a Railway through Labrador;" an Act to Amend the War Measures Act; an Act to enable the Governor in Council to take possession of articles of commerce unreasonably withheld and an Act to amend the law respecting the Naturalization of Aliens, were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Attorney General the Act to Incorporate the Salvation Army was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. President read letters of thanks from the relatives of Hon. John Harris and Mr. Martin W. Furlong for the resolutions of sympathy passed by the Council.

Hon. President informed the House that His Excellency would receive a deputation of the Whole House with the Address in Reply on Thursday at 4.30 p.m.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till to-morrow at 4.30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, March 29.

The House met at 4.30 p.m,. pursuant to adjournment.

LABRADOR RAILWAY BILL.

Second reading of the Labrador Railway Amendement Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The amendment to the Act respecting the construction of a railway through Labrador arises from a petition which has been received by the Government from John Foster and Thomas Skinner on behalf of the Corporation setting forth that while they have made considerable progress, they find it impossible to do much during the continuance of the war. They had arranged with a well known firm of railway engineers to proceed with the railway in Labrador, but these have now engaged on munitions work in Canada. What they ask is that the conditions of the Act passed in 1913 be allowed to continue during the duration of the war, and for six months thereafter. I do not know that it is necessary for me to say anything further for all hon. members will remember the Bill and to what it relates. It is a proposal by the Corporation to build a railway through Canadian Labrador and Newfoundland Labrador, to a point to be decided somewhere near Cape Charles. I beg to move the second reading .

The Bill was read a second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop

ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole to-morrow.

WAR MEASURES BILL.

Second reading of the War Measures Act, 1914, Amendment Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The War Measures Act which was passed last session of the House covered only specific articles; and it has been considered necessary to give it larger scope, and to permit the Governor in Council to deal as occasion arises with the question of tonnage, freight and other matters. While these are seriously affected by the war, it may be argued that they do not come within the scope of section six in the existing act. The amendment is to extend the measure for a period of six months after the war, and also to give it a larger scope and permit the Government to deal with any matters not included in the existing Act. I beg to move the second reading.

The Bill was read a second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on the morrow.

ARTICLES OF COMMERCE POSSESSION BILL.

Second reading of Bill to enable the Governor in Council during the existence of a state of war to take possession of articles of commerce unreasonably withheld.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill is similar to the last, Mr. President, and is intended to give the Governor in Council power to deal with any articles that may be considered to be unreasonably withheld from commerce. The Bill is before hon. members; the alteration is a simple one, and can be more particularly referred to when we meet in committee. I beg to move the second reading.

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 on the morrow.

GOVERNOR ASSENTS TO SEALING BILL.

His Excellency Sir W. Davidson having arrived in the Council Chamber, Hon the President instructed the Usher of the Black Rod to summon the members of the House of Assembly to appear before the Bar of the House, which they accordingly did, when His Excellency gave his formal assent to the Seal Fishery Bill, after which the members withdrew to the House of Assembly.

SALVATION ARMY BILL.

Second reading of Salvation Army Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. President: This bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Salvation Army," has for its object the creation of a corporation sole in the person of the General of the Salvation Army, to be known and described as "The General of the Salvation Army." In him is intended to be vested by this measure all real and personal property now legally held or used as the property of the Salvation Army in Newfoundland; likewise all real and personal property now vested in any person for the purposes of the Army. In the latter case a statement in writing must be signed by the person in whom the legal title to this property is vested, giving his consent to the application to the property of the provisions of this Act.

The General will have full powers usually incidental to the legal and beneficial ownership of property, subject, certainly, to any restraint, reservation or condition which may be contained in the document, under which the title to the property is acquired. No change in the personnel of the office of the General of the Salvation Army shall affect any real or personal property, or any interest therein, vested in the General by the

virtue of this Act, but such property, estate and interest shall vest in the succeeding General. It is expressly provided that the General shall have power to appoint an attorney to deal with all Salvation Army property in Newfoundland, subject to the powers stated in the power of attorney itself.

The present General of the Salvation Army is declared to be William Bramwell Booth, who is recognized throughout the world as being General of the Salvation Army at the present time. Upon the death or resignation of the present or any subsequent General, the successor to the deceased or retired General shall be deemed to be the General of the Salvation Army for the purpose of this Act, upon the recording in the Registry of Deeds for Newfoundland of duly certified copies of the documents purporting to be the appointing of, and acceptance of office by, the General of the Army. The person named in such accepted appointment, shall be deemed to be the General of the Salvation Army for the purposes of the provisions of this Act.

I am sure that this measure will receive the unanimous endorsation of this Chamber.

William Booth, the father of the present General, was born at Nottingham in 1829. At the age of fifteen his mind took a strongly religious turn under the influence of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, in which body he subsequently became a local preacher. In 1849 he came to London, but there found that his ambition for open air preaching did not have sufficiently full scope, with the result that he severed his connection with the Wesleyan Methodists and joined the Methodist New Connexion. He still felt that there was a wider field for activities than was permitted in the Methodist New Connexion, with the result that he left that body in 1861, and and engaged more vigorously than ever in what he termed "Travelling Evangelization."

In 1864 Booth organized in London a body first known as the East London Revival Society, and subsequently the East London Christian Mission. This developed into an organized Society as the Christian Mission, and, in 1878, the Salvation Army. The Salvation Army is a quasi-military organization, modelled by Booth on the orders and regulations of the British Army. His early campaigns excited violent opposition, a skeleton army being organized to break up its meetings, and for many years his followers were frequently subjected to fines and imprisonments for breaking the peace.

Booth himself was an indefatigable traveller, organizer and speaker, and in 1880 he extended the operations of the Army to the United States. In 1881 it was extended to Australia, and subsequently to the European Continent, India, Ceylon and elsewhere. His wife was also an evangelistic worker and public speaker. In 1860 she organized the Women's Mission, which subsequently became so prominent a feature of the Army's work.

The publication by General Booth in 1890 of his book, entitled "In Darkest England and the Way Out," excited much public attention and comment. He proposed a remedy for pauperism and vice, and made a vigorous attempt to put his principles into effective operation. Sums of money were freely subscribed, and a substantial part of the scheme was actually carried out.

The bitter opposition with which this work was met during the early years subsequently gave way to sympathetic consideration and respect. Towards the beginning of the twentieth century, King Edward gave practical encouragement to Salvation Army

Work, and in the year 1902 invited Booth officially, as General of the Salvation Army, to be present at the Coronation ceremony. The splendid reception given Booth in 1905 when he made a tour throughout England, indicated the completeness of the change which had been wrought by his genius. He was then received in state by the Mayors and Corporations of many towns, and was enthusiastically received and treated with every courtesy by many who had previously been scoffers and had reviled the work of the Salvation Army, treating it with derision and contempt.

I had the privilege of meeting the General of the Army during his United States tour. Aged and iufirm he was then, but the powerful personality of the man was indeed wonderful to behold. I attended a Salvation Army meeting, held in one of Boston's largest theatres, at which the General was a speaker. A substantial admission fee was charged, but an hour before the service was stated to commence, one had to press through the crowd to get to the ticket office to secure a seat. The building was literally packed with people, and while the General's voice did not have about it the ring of youth, it had the power and enthusiasm of that earnestness which literally compelled the crowd to surrender to him their wills, while he expounded to them the doctrines of evangelization for which the Army stood. At the close of his address he called for recruits for the Army and from all parts of the building responses came. Before the meeting closed hundreds stood around the stage offering to give their lives in the services of others.

Amongst the many experiences which I had in the larger cities of Canada and the United States, I have at this moment in my mind's eye a scene in a slum in Lower Broadway, New York City. The Salvation Army Officer in whose charge I was, took me to a long, low room in the centre of the slum section. As I stood in the doorway and looked about me, there was not amongst the several hundred whom I saw, one who from appearances could be classed as a decent citizen. On a platform was a man in a shabby attire addressing the crowd. There was no touch of culture about his appearance, his manner, his grammar, or his accent, but in his words there was a sincerity and enthusiasm which must have appealed to his hearers. He was telling his audience that but two or three weeks ago he was one of the degraded of the submerged tenth of that great city; that the Salvation Army had picked him out of the gutter, after his last nickel had been spent in a saloon; that he was now in a decent job and on the road to the recovery of those ideals which, as a young man, were the guide of his life. He told the crowd that he could see faces in the audience whom he recognized as former gutter chums, and appealed to them to join him as a chum in the brighter, cleaner life, which he was now leading.

From there I was taken to the massive hotel which was being run by the Salvation Army. There I saw the greatest practical illustration of the touch of kindliness and of love with which the Salvation Army unfurls the banner of the Christ in the degradation of slumdom. Thousands, nay, during the past years hundreds of thousands of outcasts have been helped in that one gigantic institution. When I reached the main corridors of the building, the prayer service was just being concluded,and as the army officers rose from their knees, they joined in that well known hymn:

"Rescue the perishing, care for the dying,
Snatch them in pity from sin and the grave;
Weep o'er the erring ones, lift up the the fallen,
Jesus is merciful, Jesus will save."

Leaving the building with the refrain of that hymn haunting my memory, I felt that I had witnessed the most practical exemplification of the doctrines of the Christ for the uplift of humanity that it had ever been my privilege to witness. This was but one illustration of hundreds of similar bodies of Salvationists doing equally important work for the advancement of the cause of Him whom they had given their lives to serve.

General Booth not only lived down the bitterness of the antagonism of his enemies; he not only succeeded in organizing and directing an institution which has done incalculable good for the moral uplift of the people with whom the Army comes in contact; he not only ranked as one of the greatest moral reformers and practical exponents of the doctrine of self-abnegation which the world has ever seen; but by putting the supreme emphasis as he did upon the idea of the sacrifice of self for the benefit of one's fellows, he did a service to the whole Christian world.

His death in the year 1912 was not merely the death of a good and a successful man, not merely the death of a man who had achieved much for the cause with which he identified his life's effort; but his passing was that of a conqueror of death and sin and shame. He laid down his body, worn out in the service of humanity, amidst a "blaze of hallelujahs and a roll of drums."

So that this Chamber may have an opportunity of considering the magnitude of the work of the Salvation Army in the world, I crave permission to submit the following statistics:—

General Operations of the Salvation Army.

Countries and Colonies in Which the Salvation Army are active	56
Languages in which SalvationArmy work is conducted	32
Corps and outposts	8,574
Social Institutions	904
Day Schools	512
Naval and Military Homes	13
Officers and Cadets including Social Service Officers	16,244
Persons without official rank wholly employed in S. A. work	6,269
Officers and Cadets engaged in social work	2,520
Local Officers (Senior and Junior)	56,867
Bandsmen	21,681
Periodicals published	73
Total copies of periodicals per issue	1,083,966

Social Statistics.

Number of Shelters and Food Depots (Men only)	84
Number of Shelters and Food Depots (Women only) ...	21
Number of Hotels for working men	103
Number of Hotels for working women	9
Total	217
Total accommodation for men	18,531
Total accommodation for women	1,934
Beds supplied during the year 1915	6,018,418
Meals supplied during the year 1915	10,799,599

Industrial Institutions.

Number of Homes	112
Number of elevators	13
Number of workshops	4
Number of wood yards ...	16
Total	145
Accommodation for working capacity	4,936
Men supplied with work during year 1915, temporary and permanent	59,743

Labor Bureau.

Number of branches	58
Number of applicants during the year 1915	85,509
Number of situations found for applicants during the year 1915	56,371

Prison Gate Work.

Number of homes for discharged prisoners	18
Accommodation	486
Ex-criminals received during the year 1915	2,270
Number passed out to suitable employment during the year 1915	2,075

Inebriates Homes.

Number of Branches	18
Accommodation	147

Children's Homes.

Number of branches	34
Number of day houses for children	25
Industrial Schools	12
Total accommodation	2,870

Rescue Homes.

Number of branches	116
Accommodation	3,111
Women received during the year 1915	7,078
Number passed out to friends or suitable employment during 1915	6,137

Maternity Homes.

Number of branches	21
Accommodation	358
Number of farms	17
Number of Slum outposts ..	147
Number of other social institutions not previously included	86

Work in Great Britain and Ireland.

Number of corps	1,447
Number of Officers	7,538
Number of bandsmen	14,034

Work in the United States of America

Number of corps	871
Number of officers	2,938
Social institutions	302

Work in the Dominion of Canada

Number of corps	506
Number of officers and employees	1,114
Social institutions	66

Work in Australia

Number of corps	1,250
Number of officers	1,663
Social institutions	85

Work in India and Ceylon.

Number of corps and outposts	2,530
Number of officers	1,490
Number of day schools	449
Social institutions	65

Work in Newfoundland.

Number of corps and outposts	137
Number of officers	150
Social institutions	2

Maternity Hospital and Rescue Home, Cook Street, St. John's.

Number of girls passed through home, 1915	60
Number of children born in home	62
Number of girls and babies returned to friends	29
Number of girls sent to suitable employment	18
Number of girls married from Home	4

Number of children adopted into desirable families ... 16
Number of girls now in Home 9
Number of babies 10

Food and Shelter Home, George Street, St. John's.

Accommodations 85
Total meals supplied for year, 1915 78,881
Total beds supplied for year 1915 22,242
Number meals free 5,321
Number beds free 2,013

Net value of property owned by the Salvation Army in Newfoundland—$110,500.

Mr. President: I feel that the magnitude of the operations of the Salvation Army in the world, the importance of their work in all large cities throughout the Empire, and above all the ideal of social regeneration for which the Army stands, entitles the term "The General of the Salvation Army" to a place in our statute books. I consequently move that this Bill, entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Salvation Army," be now read a second time.

The Bill was read a second time and on motion of Hon. Mr. Squires ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on the morrow.

NATURALIZATION BILL.

Second reading of the Naturalization of Aliens' Amendment Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The Bill which we passed last session in relation to the Naturalization of Aliens when examined by the law officers of the Crown was found to be somewhat different from the Imperial Act, while we adopted the Canadian Act, that Act specifically mentioned that it adopted part two of the Imperial Act and in the passing of our Bill we did not specifically state that it was an adoption of part two of the Imperial Act. It has been pointed out that this may give rise to doubt at some time; and so as to have entire uniformity between the Imperial Act and the Acts in other parts of the Dominions beyond the seas, we are amending by specifically stating that we adopt section two of the Imperial Act, and the only amendment we propose to make is by adding to section nine the words "which is hereby formally declared to be adopted by this Colony." I beg to move the second reading.

HON. MR. SQUIRES—As a further explanation of the objects of this measure I would observe that the object of the Imperial Authorities is to have the law respecting the Registration of Naturalization of Aliens throughout the entire British Empire entirely uniform. The law in Newfoundland may be construed as slightly different, and the object is to have complete uniformity throughout the entire British Empire.

The Bill was read a second time and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg to table the Interim Report of the Public Schools of Newfoundland under the Church of England Boards for the year ending June 30th, 1915. The object, I may say, of tabling this part of the report at present is that it has been thought by the Superintendent of Schools under Church of England Boards that it might be of assistance to the hon. gentlemen in considering the Education Bill now before the lower branch of the Legislature.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House then adjourned until to-morrow Thursday at 3.30 p.m.

THURSDAY, March 30, 1916.

The House met at 3.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournement, and proceeded to Government House to present

the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne.

Returning to the Council Chamber the Hon. President read His Excellency's reply, thanking the Council for their address.

LABRADOR RAILWAY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Labrador Railway Amendment Bill. Hon. Dr. Skelton in the Chair.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The report having been received the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

WAR MEASURES BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the War Measures Act, 1914, Amendment Bill. Hon. Mr. Knowling in the Chair.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The report having been received, it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

ARTICLES OF COMMERCE POSSESSION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee on the Bill to Enable the Governor in Council During the Existence of a State of War to Take Possession of Articles of Commerce Unreasonably Withheld. Hon. Mr. Harvey in the Chair.

HON. MR. HARVEY—With regard to section 1 of this Bill, we have here a reappearance of a section with which, as the House will remember we had to deal in another Bill last year, and to which I took strong objection, my contention at the time being supported by this Council. My objection was, and now is, to dragging down the Judges of the Supreme Court, from the particular work incidental to the high position they occupy, to arbitrate the price of commercial commodities. I object entirely to the apparently growing tendency that exists to call upon the Judges of the Supreme Court to say what is a reasonable price for certain articles of commerce, a matter utterly outside of their proper function. The Supreme Court should be held inviolate as a final court of appeal and their reputation and authority which should be our first consideration, should not be compromised in such ways. I contend most strongly and definitely that these matters of fixing fluctuating commercial prices are not subjects on which the Judges of the Supreme Court should be light-heartedly called upon to act, except as an ultimate court of appeal. Speaking for myself, as one who might at any time be concerned in commercial articles that may be dealt with under the Act, and simply as a matter of principle, I would much sooner see the Governor in Council fix these "reasonable prices," or appoint arbitrators, without having direct representation myself to fix them. I would prefer any method of securing these reasonable prices to having the Supreme Court derogate its functions to acts of this kind. As Chairman, I believe, I am in order in moving an amendment to this section. I therefore move as an amendment: "Such prices as may in default of agreement be decided to be reasonable by the Governor in Council or any body of arbitrators appointed by him".

HON. MR. BISHOP—I may say that article 1 is an identical copy of the Act of similar import passed in 1914. That may not be a reason why we should adopt the same language to-day, and it may be that the objections raised by you, Mr. Chairman, will meet with approval in the House. I would like to say, however,

that this is only an ultimate reference. Only in the event of "the Governor in Council being of opinion that any article of commerce is being unreasonably withheld from market, may he taken possession of any supplies of such article of commerce, paying to the owner of the same such price as may in default of agreement be decided to be reasonable, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, by arbitration, of a Judge of the Supreme Court, or of a Stipendiary Magistrate selected by the Chief Justice." It is apparent that the first attempt would be to agree with the owner of the article in a reasonable way. If an agreement could not be arrived at, and if it was deemed that the price was unreasonable, then it would be submitted to a Judge of the Supreme Court for his arbitration, or a Stipendiary Magistrate selected by the Chief Justice. If it is considered that any better way than is here provided for can be arrived at, I am prepared to have it considered, and I think that possibly as the question is raised it may be now desirable to raise the Committee, report progress, and see if anything can be arranged by next sitting to meet the views of the hon. gentleman.

HON. the PRESIDENT— Before the Committee is raised, I would like to point out that this Bill merely deals with conditions existing in war time. This is the all important fact which justifies its existence. The machinery provided here is only to be applied during war-time, and to meet extraordinary conditions, when alone would the Government be justified in interfering with the operations of private traders throughout the country. And if a Government, under such a stress,sets aside existing machinery and takes autocratic powers, it can best justify what it does by leaving the ultimate decision in the hands of a tribunal in which everybody has perfect confidence, such as the Supreme Court. Any other procedure will be subject to criticism and party agitation. For instance, in the recent attempt to deal with the coal problem there was a great deal of criticism of the course adopted and the price fixed, which would not have been made if some other organization than the Governor in Council had undertaken that effort. I do not think that you can devise machinery that will be an improvement on that embodied in this Bill. I fail to see that a Board of Arbitration will be more entitled to the confidence of the community, or can better conserve the public rights than a Supreme Court Judge. Moreover, this principle of endowing the authorities with extraordinary powers during the continuance of the war is universally recognized throughout the Empire to-day. One of the first Bills we passed in the Special War Session of 1914 was a Bill which suspends the Habeas Corpus Act,and gives the Minister of Justice the right to intern people and hold them during the war without even the courts having power to order their release. If you adopt that principle with regard to a man's person and personal rights, because the public interest requires it, you cannot make a mistake in giving the Judges of the Supreme Court the final arbitrament as to what are fair and reasonable prices for commodities seized by the Government, on the ground that they have been unreasonably withheld from commerce against the interests of the general community

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— This Bill follows the Act known as the Food-stuffs Act, Chapter 2 of the Statutes of the Special War Session of 1914. The principle of the bill is the same, likewise the form; it applies, however, to all articles of commerce, including food-stuffs and repeals the Food-stuffs Act. The 1914

Act was based upon an Imperial Statute passed early in August, 1914, which Act dealt with food-stuffs. The Imperial authorities found the scope of that Act too limited, and substituted therefor an Act dealing with all articles of commerce. This change is being followed by this local legislation. The Hon. Mr. Harvey feels that the price of articles of commerce taken possession by or under the authority of the Governor in Council by virtue of the powers contained in this Act should not be ultimately referred by way of arbitration to a Judge of the Supreme Court or a Stipendiary Magistrate selected by the Chief Justice. He suggests that the person by whose arbitrament the matter would be settled should be selected by the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council under the authority of this Act takes possession of certain goods belonging to a merchant on Water Street because the Governor in Council feels that he is charging unreasonable prices and improperly withholding the goods from sale. If the merchant and the Governor in Council are unable to agree as to the price to be paid the merchant by the Governor in Council then the person to decide as between the parties should be somebody removed from the influence of the merchant on the one hand and the Governor in Council on the other. A Judge of the Supreme Court is so removed from financial and political associations, and his training as a lawyer and experience and standing as a Judge makes him the most capable man in Newfoundland to deal with a conflict of this nature between a merchant whose property has been appropriated and the Governor in Council by whom the appropriation is made. It would be highly improper for this Act to leave this matter open so that the third party could be appointed either by the merchant on the one hand or the Governor in Council on the other; Mr. Harvey's suggestion being the latter. In my opinion, it is much better, in an unusual Act of this class affecting private rights in a way that would not be considered for one moment were it not for the special conditions which may arise because of state of war, to provide in the Act itself for the final arbitrament of the question rather than leave it a matter to be agreed upon between the parties. I consequently support the section in its present form, leaving to a Judge of the Supreme Court the determination of the amount to be paid to the owner of articles of commerce taken possession of by the Governor in Council by virtue of this Legislation in the event of the owner and the Governor in Council being unable to agree on the price to be paid therefor, or to a Stipendiary Magistrate nominated by the Chief Justice.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I am not interested in this as a matter affecting the competency of any tribunal. That the tribunal of the Supreme Court cannot be improved as a tribunal, I fully admit, but I want to say that in my estimation, other tribunals can be obtained. My point particularly is that I do not want the Supreme Court dragged into these matters; there is no necessity for it. Now, take the case just quoted by the Hon. President, where the Minister of Justice has the power, on his own authority, to deal with the Habeas Corpus Act. This is a case where he does not have to appeal to the Supreme Court at all. It is surely a strong argument against his own contention. This is the general principle for which I am contending, viz: to permit the Governor in Council to proceed on his own authority. There is no necessity to drag the Supreme Court into this matter. I feel strongly on the subject. It was only last year with the Labrador Bill as first introduced, that the Judges of

the Supreme Court were asked to deal —not as a final court of appeal for disputants—but ab initio with such a controversial subject as fixing the price of Labrador fish, a duty which I think is absolutely foreign to their functions. I do not know if Hon. members have seen the new Municipal Act. You will find there a section calling upon the Supreme Court to fix certain valuations. There is undoubtedly a tendency to shunt work of this kind on to the Supreme Court, and I trust that this will not be endorsed by this House. The tendency to bring this higher tribunal into these every-day matters,to bring them into the market places,is the principle against which I make my present protest and voice my firm opinion.

HON. the PRESIDENT—The reason the Minister of Justice is given autocratic power is that an enemy subject or a suspect may not be able to appeal to the courts and avail of the laws operative in peace times, because if he could shelter himself behind these laws in war-time he could continue to work against the public interest. This, however, is a different thing. This bill only relates to goods which any man may withhold, in war-time, for higher prices. We give the Government power to seize such goods and have a Supreme Court Judge to fix a reasonable price. My Hon. friend, Mr. Harvey, concedes that even the Arbitration Board he favours may involve an appeal. That appeal can only be to the Supreme Court. This measure merely puts the matter to that Tribunal at once and cuts out the intermediate stage he advocates. Therefore it is that I support the Bill as it stands.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I entirely concur with the position taken by Hon. Mr. Harvey. I do not consider it seemly that the Judges of the Supreme Court should be brought into such matters at all. It should be left to others to adjust the price of commercial commodities. In Manchester, for instance the retail prices of food stuffs is fixed every week by a Board of Arbitrators. As this is purely a matter of business the Judges of the Supreme Court should be kept out of it, as far as regulating the prices are concerned.

On motion the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

SALVATION ARMY INCORPORATION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Attorney General, the House went into Committee on the Salvation Army Incoporation Bill. Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Squires it was ordered the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Act to amend the law respecting the Naturalization of Aliens, Hon. Mr. Milley taking the Chair of the Committee.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House then adjourned until Monday next at 4.30 o'clock.

MONDAY, April 3rd, 1916.

The House met at 4.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the Labrador Railway Amendment Bill, the War Measures Act, 1914, Amendment Bill; the Salvation Army Incorporation Bill and the Aliens Amendment Bill were read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee stage of the Bill "to enable the Governor in Council during the existence of a state of war to take possession of Articles of Commerce Unreasonably Withheld" was deferred.

CONTROL OF TRADING BILL.

Hon. President read a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the control of trading in certain commodities" in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was then read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Bishop tabled the following reports—Reports of the Postmaster General for the year ending June 30th, 1915; Hospital Returns for the year 1915 of the International Grenfell Association; Report and Statement of the Permanent Disasters Fund.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines tabled the report of the Newfoundland Board of Agriculture for the year ending December 31st, 1915.

Hon. Mr. Anderson gave notice of question.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned until Thursday next at half past four of the clock.

THURSDAY, April 6, 1916.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received communications from His Excellency the Governor intimating that he had been pleased to grant to Hon. J. D. Ryan two months term of absence from his Legislative duties dating from the 6th inst.; to Hon. M. G. Winter for the remainder of the session and the same to Hon. Philip Templeman.

ARTICLES OF COMMERCE POSSESSION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Bill "to enable the Governor in Council during the continuance of the war to take possession of Articles of Commerce Unreasonably Withheld." Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I beg to move as an amendment to this Bill, that after the words "having regard to all the circumstances of the case" there be inserted the words "by the Governor in Council or by any Board of Arbitration selected by him." I will not go over again the remarks made by me at the last session when the Bill now before us was up for discussion. I want, however to point to another matter connected with this subject, and that is "the Act to amend the War Measures Act, 1914," which covers everything in this Bill Under the War Measures Act the Government can do anything it likes and can seize anything it pleases without reference to anybody. This Bill is a redundant Bill, and the position is that the Government can, if they like, ignore this Bill, and instead, under the regular War Measures Act, 1914, as now amended, they can proceed to seize any stocks they like, such as foodstuffs or anything they may wish, without reference to any Board of Arbitration. Why, therefore, should we, in this Bill, think it a necessity to drag in the Supreme Court. The Government is not likely to confiscate anyway, and they can easily find means to adjust valuations by other means, and in any case, the Government can ignore this Bill after it is passed. Why then, put the Supreme Court in such a position as this Bill would place it. Functions of this sort are outside of its proper scope. It is a matter of principle that we

here ought to be most jealous of the status, of the authority and the dignity of the Supreme Court; and if we are to drag them down unnecessarily into controversial matters of this sort, we are going to compromise the reputation of the institution, and I strenuously object to it and press my amendment.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I concur with the opinions and observations I have heard from Hon. Mr. Harvey. When questions of this kind arise they need not be submitted to a Judge of the Court, but I think to a Committee, such as they appoint in the Old Country. For instance, in Manchester, where the multifarious imports and exports of that country have never yet been referred to such authority, but a committee of competent men, well qualified to deal with such matters, would be of much greater assistance in arriving at a solution of the values than in the mode proposed.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I would like to say that this Bill is not identical with the War Measures Act. In one case, as remarked by the Hon. mover of the amendment, it is quite true that the Governor in Council may take possession of anything that may be required. This Bill is to deal with goods unreasonably withheld from sale, which is a different matter, and if goods are required by the public and unreasonably withheld from sale, then the Government may take possession of such goods and offer them for sale, paying the owner what is a fair and reasonable value. Every attempt should be made between the Government and the individual to arrive at a reasonable valuation,but in the event of them not being able to agree—and I have to say the Government gave a good deal of consideration to this matter—the unanimous opinion is that in questions of this kind no tribunal would likely be so satisfactory or so free from criticism, and if any occurrence should arise where it became necessary to put into force no Arbitration Board or Committee would be so free from criticism as the Supreme Court. I may say that I am in accord with keeping from the Supreme Court the arbitrament of ordinary matters of commerce, but this is not an ordinary matter, it is war legislation, and there is only the most remote likelihood of anything arising when the provisions of the Act would have to be availed of. I cannot accept the amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. Harvey, and I regret I cannot, because the amendments offered by my hon. friend are, as a rule, most sensible and made for the general good, and so I know he intends this, but I repeat I am sorry I cannot support it.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would like to say a word in reply. I must say that I hesitate to take a position contrary to the unanimous feeling of the Government, as expressed by its hon. representative, but I maintain that the Government is wrong in this. I do not argue that this Bill is identical with the other Bill in any way. It is not. But what you can do under this Bill you can equally as well do under the other War Measures Act, and you are not obliged to call a Board of Arbitration. The hon. leader of the Government has not suggested that under the War Measures Act, the Government are not at liberty to take goods without reference to a Board of Arbitration. He will not deny that. They can take them on their own responsibility. I do not know if hon. members fully appreciated the sweeping nature of that measure when it went through the House. It is the most sweeping Act that ever has come before the Legislature. I don't object to that, for I think in a state of war you require the most sweeping and extreme pow-

ers you can give your Executive, but under the War Measures Act the Government can seize any goods anybody has in town or country without asking leave of the Supreme Court or a Board of Arbitration. I say it is unnecessary in this as in the case of the Labrador Fish Prices Bill of last year, as in the case of the Municipal Bill where the Supreme Court are asked to fix valuations upon certain rentals. It is not the business of the Supreme Court. It is theirs to arbitrate between man and man, and I do say they are not the final Court of Appeal when brught down ab initio to fix values in this way on a series of articles of fluctuating values. The principle is wrong, and the Act is entirely redundant. I again assert that there is no real need of dragging the Supreme Court into this.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that it ought not be forgotten that this Bill is an enlargement of the scope of the original War Measures Act, which dealt merely with foodstuffs. This is more comprehensive and embraces commodities of every kind. I would also suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Harvey), that while, under the War Measures Act, the Government has authority to take people's property for the public use, he will surely not contend that the Government should do so without compensating those who own the property, be it foodstuffs or anything else. There is surely an implied understanding, if not an expressed contract, that the Government will pay for articles commandeered under the War Measures Act, on the ground that they are being unreasonably withheld from public use and consumption. Therefore, machinery is provided by which the value of the property is to be fixed by an impartial tribunal, and that valuation will be paid to the owner and the goods sold to the public in the general interest of the community. Moreover, all of these Acts, arising out of the war, that we have been passing at the various sessions since the war began, are based upon and virtually identical in their terms with Acts passed by the Mother Country and Canada. These would not have enacted such measures without a necessity for them, and while the necessity has not yet arisen here and may not arise at all, yet it is as well for us to be fortified against all contingencies by having them on the Statute Book. I think my hon. friend will find that all these Acts are transcripts of imperial measures dictated by new conditions and amended and enlarged as circumstances developed after the war began which rendered these changes necessary. My hon. friend has said that he would prefer to leave the whole matter to the Governor in Council to take the property and pay their own price rather than have the Supreme Court brought into this matter, but I do not think that would be a fair position, either to the Government or the owner of the goods, because the Government would probably be subjected to bitter criticism in every case where it took such a step, and there might be conditions under which the power would be misused. My hon. friend also suggested a board of arbitration, but difficulties are frequently found in choosing such boards, and especially in choosing umpires, and the usual practice in such cases is to provide that the umpire shall be appointed by the Supreme Court or a judge thereof. Again, when awards are unsatisfactory and appeals are made on questions of law or of fact, these appeals have to be taken to the Supreme Court, so that ultimately the Supreme Court has to deal with most of these matters. Now the present Bill, which is an extraordinary measure occasioned by the war, creates a special Tri-

bunal consisting of a judge of the Supreme Court to deal with extraordinary matters, and I know of no tribunal whose intervention in these matters would be more acceptable to the public, or guarantee more confidence in its decisions, than the tribunal here created, namely, a judge of the Supreme Court to decide this matter.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—This Act as it appears to me is different from the War Measures Act in this respect. The original Act was an Act to meet the emergencies that may arise in the conduct of the war from an imperial standpoint. But in this Act we are dealing with questions wholly of a domestic nature, questions that may not affect the Empire, but things that affect the Colony. If there is one thing that should be avoided it is "red tape" and this section in the new Act avoids that effectually. I am sorry to hear my hon. friend opposite urging a Board of Arbitration. If the Governor in Council were given such powers as the hon. mover of the amendment suggests, it is opening the door to delay, and would not tend to public confidence. The executive should not be the arbitrator of trade disputes. I admit it may be derogatory to the Supreme Court to have to meddle with the prices of provisions and other commodities such as we heard of last year in connection with the price of Labrador fish. That is not within their province under ordinary circumstances. But here we have a local question arising entirely out of the state of war. Surely then the best way to avoid red tape, the best way to ensure promptness of action, the best way to ensure the confidence of the public is to leave this in the hands of a Supreme Court Judge. It will be time saved and confidence inspired. Moreover, there would be troubles with Boards in the outports. Are we to have separate Boards for them? Under the Act we have powers granted the Judge to appoint a Magistrate to act in his place, not necessarily the local magistrate, but the magistrate best qualified. I hope that the section will be left as it is, and the amendment not proposed, or if proposed, not carried.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—The explanation given by the Leader of the Government as far as I am concerned throws a little more light on the subject. It may be true that if other arbitrators are appointed, there might be difficulty in getting them to deal with such questions. In thinking over the matter again, who could you find in the country better fitted for this matter than a Supreme Court Judge? I hope there will be no occasion either in the city or outports for any goods of any description to be seized or held up waiting for a rising market, but all commodities will remain at a reasonable price. So with the consent of my hon. friend opposite I think he might fall in line.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Nothing that has been said has changed my views on this matter. It has been said that this is the practice in England, but I put this matter to the Minister of Justice the other day and said, "Do you know if the prices of these things are fixed by the Supreme Courts in England," and he said, "No they are not." Then I say his case falls to the ground. I also differ with my hon. friend on my left. The Act to amend the 1914 War Measures Act gives unlimited power, and anybody who thinks as my hon. friend on my left thinks as to the functions and powers of Governments ought to have protested against the 1914 Act. I do not believe any Government is going to step in here without making compensation; I am sure no Government would be so idiotic as not to. They will probably arrive at a proper price by arbitration. I am quite willing, as one who may have goods seiz-

ed myself, to allow the Government to fix the price themselves; I am sure they will treat a man fairly. The difference between this Act and the original Act is that the latter enables the Government to do anything it likes, simply on its own initiative, whereas this Act drags down the Supreme Court to determine what shall be reasonable prices.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I would just like to say that the point I was making was that the machinery we are creating here for dealing with these cases is identically the same as in England and Canada. The Supreme Court here is our only Court. In England they have many courts, and in Canada likewise.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I understand in England it is not done by Courts at all, but by Boards.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I think these Boards there are of a semi-judicial character, which makes them practically equivalent to a Court or Judge. Every Board or Tribunal has at least a leading K.C. at its head. To support my point I would call the attention of my hon. friend and likewise of the House to the statement of the Hon. Mr. Tennant in the House of Commons the other day, when in reply to the charges that a number of airmen were being killed through inefficiency on the part of the authorities, he stated he would refer the matter to "a small judicial committee." There is a case in point. If my hon. friend will inquire into the matter he will find that the Tribunal is judicial or nearly so in all matters of war, even in the case of the "Lord Derby Act." The Lord Mayor of London, and the Lords Lieutenant head them in the counties and from these tribunals there is an appeal to the High Court. Here we cut out the intermediate tribunal and leave it to the Supreme Court at once.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment which report was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

CONTROL OF TRADING BILL.

Second reading of Bill "Respecting the Control of Trading in Certain Commodities.

HON. MR. BISHOP—It will be within the memories of hon. members that the Governor in Council has found it necessary during the past few months, since the last meeting of the Legislature, to act arbitrarily in the matter of coal and it became further necessary some time ago to take action as to salt, another very important commodity, and as there is a possibility that the acts of the Government may be questioned if their acts were not supported by legislation, it has been deemed wise to bring in the Bill we now have before us.

It provides for the ratification of the government's action in

(a) The taking possession of supplies of coal and salt and of premises for the storage and distribution thereof;

(b) The regulation of the sale and distribution of such coal and salt and the fixing of prices therefor; and

(c) The interference with or prevention of the fulfilment of previously existing contracts for the supply of coal or salt;

the idea being that this Legislature would ratify the action of the Governor in Council in this respect. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Bishop tabled the Report

of the Newfoundland Savings Bank for the year 1915; also the Report of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board for the year 1915.

QUESTIONS.

HON. MR. ANDERSON gave notice of the following questions:

Loan B. (third line)—Funded Debt 1914–15, $9,963,351.96; Funded Debt 1915-16, $8,990,268.63; Difference—$973,333.33—3 1-2 p.c. increased to 4 p.c.

Loan A. $135,250. Is this a floating loan—4 1-2 p.c.?

Temporary Loans—5 1-2 p.c. Extension Telephone System $150,000

Extension Light Houses 100,000

$250,000

Is it the intention of the Government to improve the Telephone System at an early date? Has a temporary loan been raised for this purpose? Or is it the intention of the Government to offer these two Temporary Loans $250,000 at 5 1-2 per cent. to investors.

Under Act 4, Geo. 5th. Cap. 23.—Railway Loan $973,333.33. Is this the amount taken from the Funded Debt 1914–15. Original Railway Loan Act 3 1-2 per cent., increased to 4 p.c., and now provided for at 4 per cent.

Under Act 4. Geo. 5th, Cap. 23. On Balance of Railway Loan $973,333.33. Has this amount still to be raised, and in the meantime provision is made for the interest—5 per cent? If this is so I believe the Government has acted right by increasing the interest to make this full loan uniform.

Under Act 4. Geo. 5th. Cap, 24.

Extension of Telegraphs $140,000

Erection of Light Houses and Fog Alarms 45,000

Constructions and Improvements public buildings .. 175,000

$360,000

Is this a floating loan, or a loan to be raised at 4 1-2 p.c., or has the loan been raised and become part of the funded debt?

Under Act 5. Geo. 5th. Cap. 90.

Volunteer Force Loan $491,582.48 @ 3 1-2 per cent.; Volunteer Force Loan $512,280.70 @ 4 per cent.; Volunteer Force Loan $1,000,000.00 @ 5 per cent. Are these three amounts Imperial loans?

Under Act 6. Geo. 5th. Cap. 22.

Public Service $500,000 @ 5 p.c. Is this a floating loan? If so, will it be offered to Investors?

Sinking Fund $27,740. For what purpose is this being put to a reserve fund?

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House then adjourned until 4.30 p.m. to-morrow.

FRIDAY, April 7th.

The House met at 4.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

ARTICLES OF COMMERCE POSSESSION BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg to move the third reading of this Bill.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Mr. President, I wish to bring my amendments again before the House, so as to get it in the records.

The amendment being put was lost on division and the original passed.

The Bill was then read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

CONTROL OF TRADING BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Bill Respecting Control of Trading in Certain Commodities.

Hon. Mr. Goodridge in the Chair.

On motion the Committee rose and

reported the Bill without amendment.

On motion the report was received and the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House then adjourned until 4.30 p.m. to-morrow.

MONDAY, April 10th, 1916.

The House met at 4.50 pursuant to adjournment.

CONTROL OF TRADING BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill respecting the Control of Trading in certain commodities was read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

MESSAGE FROM ASSEMBLY.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT intimated that he had received a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the following Bills in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

(1) An Act for the protection of persons engaged in Trawl Fishing;

(2) An Act to amend and consolidate the law relating to Education;

(3) An Act respecting Trading with the enemy;

(4) An Act to amend Cap. 44 of the Consolidated Statutes,2nd Series, entitled: "of the rebuilding of Carbonear;"

(5) An Act to amend Cap. 115 of the Consolidated Statutes, second series entitled "An Act respecting Passenger Accommodation on board steamers and sailing vessels."

(6) An Act to revise and Consolidate the general Statute laws of the Colony, and for the publication of the same.

(7) An Act to incorporate the Union Electric Light and Power Company.

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. Bishop the House adjourned till to-morrow at 4.30 p.m.

TUESDAY, April 11th, 1916.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

TRAWL FISHERY BILL.

Second reading of Trawl Fishing Protection Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill is what has been previously known as the Bank Fishery Act. It is simply a consolidation of the old Act with some slight changes by which it is extended to those engaged in trawl fishing. There was a defect in the old act which became demonstrated in recent years, in as much as while the Bank Fishing Act mentioned fishing on the Newfoundland Banks only, all the vessels or a great many of them go to the Gulf and on the West Coast for their fishing trips, and the men are subjected to the same dangers there as when on the Grand Banks. Only last year there has been a case where some men lost their lives while engaged in trawl fishing on the West Coast, but under the provisions of the old Act the relatives of these men cannot recover the award or allowance which the Act gives as in the Act it was stated that the fisherman must be forty miles from the coast to entitle them to avail of the provisions of the Act. It is now intended that whenever fishermen engaged in trawl fishing lose their lives they shall be entitled to their proportion of the contribution that comes from the fishermen All vessels of twenty-five tons and upwards shall be eligible for admission and the crews shall pay the contribution of fifty cents per man before obtaining a clearance from the Customs authorities. It is not expected that any vessels of less than twenty-five tons would equip for this fishery. That is the only object I understand of having it limited to vessels of 25 tons

and upwards. The working of the Act has been found very beneficial and satisfactory in the past and should become more so now that its scope is extended. I beg to move the second reading.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I have very much pleasure in supporting the second reading of this Bill. It is one which will, I think, commend itself to every member. I think it might even go further and extend this opportunity of insurance to every fisherman engaged in our fisheries. I think I was present when the original act was passed, and to some extent this is a considerable improvement on that. The Act provides that the Government should assume that responsibility now and become the underwriters of the fishermen. The act provides that if there be a surplus the contribution should be reduced. I would prefer to see the solatium increased in that case, out of any excess that might be derived, I know myself from experience that the original Act has been of great service, and $80 which relatives of deceased fishermen have received has been of great assistance.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I foresee a great many serious difficulties in the way of this Bill. Part of the duties of the Marine Disasters' Committee is to carry out the provisions of the Act of 1913, and at the present moment we are faced with a very peculiar position of affairs, upon which we have consulted with the Government but have so far failed in getting any definite answer, and many claims are hung up in consequence. Under the act the relatives of any fisherman who might be lost at sea may claim a sum of $100, if they are in need, and if they were dependent upon the deceased. In other words, it is a gratuity, not an insurance. Under the Bank Fishing Insurance Act by a payment of fifty cents a year every Bank fisherman is insured for a sum conditional on the annual revenue, but in no case to exceed eighty dollars. Frequently the $80 maximum has not been reached. Away back in the musty past, I happened to hold the position of Colonial Secretary, and this question came up. The exact amount that was due under the provisions of the Act was about twenty-five or twenty-six dollars. The Government before that time, at that time, and since, right up to the present day, have paid eighty dollars no matter whether the amount due under the Act was only 25 or 30 dollars. The payment has been illegal, done on executive authority, it was illegal when done by the Government of which I was a member. In other words, the maximum was made the definite figure. Now the positions is this: William Smith is a banker and is drowned, and his relatives may claim the eighty dollars, and then under the 1913 Act may claim an additional $100, so that the dependents of the men who is a banker or trawler gets $180, whereas those who fish off the Labrador or the shore receive only the $100. In other words, there is discrimination between those of our fishermen who are bankers or trawlers and those who go to the Labrador. Now, it may be argued, and it is argued, that the relatives of these men are collecting their insurance, and that insurance should have no connection with a gratuity. That is perfectly true, if only the legal insurance is collected, but why give the privilege of State-added insurance to one class and not give the same privilege to the other? Why discriminate between fishermen in one class of vessel and another? Now, take the position as it was not as it is, may be, but as it may occur again. Suppose that there are insufficient funds to pay the $80 and that $25 is the proportion that should be paid. To make up the $80, the balance or $55 becomes a gratuity, not insurance.

In other words, the relatives of the fishermen who go to the Bank fishery may ,under certain conditions, get $155 as a gratuity, not as insurance, be it remembered, whilst the fishermen who engage at the Labrador voyage receive only $100, and have not even the privilege of insurance. Surely there is injustice possible under that Act, but even if there was no injustice possible and the whole $80 was raised why discriminate between the different classes of fishermen? With the principle of the Bill we must all agree; but this discrimination is unjust. In recent years the $80 may have been earned under the insurance scheme, but it is evi dent that at any time we may be iaced with the same position as we have been in the past when the legal payment did not exceed $25 or $30. I do not oppose the Bill; indeed I would like to see its principle extended; but point out inconsistencies and difficulties which have arisen in the past and may arise again. We are discriminating under this Bill, and that is unfair. The dependents of our fishermen are entitled to the same privileges, no more and no less, no matter in what branch of the fishery they engage.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I feel that I must point out to my hon. friend that his argument is hardly fair, and that there is no discrimination under the Bill. It provides for a scheme of insurance pure and simple. Paragraph 7 distinctly sets out that the men contributing to the measure only receive from these the maximum sum. The Government are giving no gratuity. It is quite true that they did up to the time of the passing of the Act which provides that every fisherman engaged in the trade of the Colony, losing his life, shall receive from the Colony the sum of $100, it being proven to the satisfaction of the authorities that such person left dependents who were in need. The first was a gratuitous act this is distinctly an insurance scheme, and it is quite true that Bank fishermen losing their lives are entitled also to the provisions of the Act providing $100, that is after their dependents have gone through the $80 received and are dependent upon some source of charity for their maintenance. I think we should all recognize the advisability, if a workable scheme can be found, of bringing the whole of the fishermen under the scope of this or a similar Act. But it is more difficult to get all the fishermen of the Colony to contribute than it is to get the Bank fishermen to contribute, as the fishery is differently conducted. Every vessel before clearing at the Customs must be surveyed and provided with the equipment called for, and the Bill provides that the master must pay a contribution to the funds of this scheme. The Bill in no way conflicts or interferes with the Act which covers the $100 gratuity, only that where men lose their lives in trawl fishing vessels and leave dependents they shall also be entitled to receive the $100.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

TRADING WITH ENEMY BILL.

Second reading of Tading With the Enemy Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill is introduced at the request of the Rt. Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies, who drew our attention to the Act recently passed by the Imperial Parliament, entitled "Trading with the Enemy Extension of Powers Act, 1915." It is now proposed to extend its provisions to Newfoundland. As there is nothing of importance that need now be said of this Act or the necessity of the last Bill, any questions regarding it can be an-

swered in committee. I therefore beg leave to move the second reading.

The Bill was accordingly read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

CARBONEAR REBUILDING BILL.

Second reading of Carbonear Amendment Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—The necessity for this Bill arises out of the recent fire in the town of Carbonear. It has been found that the records do not agree with the existing line of street and it is simply to rectify this that the Bill has been introduced. It is a simple matter and requires no consideration. I therefore beg leave to move its second reading.

The Bill was read a second time, and was ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

PASSENGER ACCOMMODATION BILL.

Second reading of Passenger Accommodation Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—This Bill provides for no change whatever, except that the Bill, as it stands, refers only to steamers and sailing vessels and it is intended to enlarge the scope of the Act by adding as an amendment, the following as section 12:

"All provisions of this chapter applying to steamers shall, with such modifications as the Governor in Council may from time to time prescribe for the purpose of adapting the same thereto, apply to ships or boats propelled by any mechanical power, as distinguished from sailing vessels."

I beg to move its second reading.

The Bill was accordingly read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

CONSOLIDATED STATUTES REVISION BILL.

Second reading of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd series) Revising and Publication Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I beg to move that this Bill entitled, "An Act for the Revising and Consolidating of the Public General Statute Laws of the Colony and for the Publication of the Same," be now read a second time. There was a consolidation in 1872, a further consolidation in 1892, and there should have been a consolidation in 1912, but the work was not undertaken until the spring of 1913 when a Commission for this purpose was appointed by His Excellency the Governor in Council. Since that date the entire statute law of the Colony has been revised and consolidated up to and including the Acts of 1913. The result has been published in the form of a report of the Committee. The report has been laid upon the table of both branches of the Legislature. It is not complete; it is rather in the nature of a draft consolidation. Reference to it will show that statutes in which there were no changes were not reprinted at all, but merely referred to and in statutes in which changes were but slight reference was made to the changes only. The effect of this Bill is to approve of the work of the Committee to date, to authorize them to include within the scope of the consolidation the statutes of the years 1914, 1915 and this present year, to revise, improve and amend, and if necessary rearrange the draft consolidation and generally to put it into final shape; and to cause the same to be printed and ready for the consideration of the Legislature at its next session. This Act does not attempt the enactment of any provision which would have the effect of putting the consolidation into force as law, but such an Act

must of necessity be introduced at the next session of the Legislature. It is hoped that the completed work will be ready to table at the opening of the Legislature in 1917, so that the members of both branches may have a full opportunity of examining the consolidation and if any amendments are necessary therein, these amendments can be put into the form of an amending Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

UNION POWER CO. INCORPORATION BILL.

Second reading of the Union Electric Light and Power Co. Incorporation Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The object of this Bill is to incorporate a Company to be known as the Union Electric Light and Power Company, the purpose of which is the lighting of the streets and buildings of Trinity, Catalina, Bonavista, and adjacent towns and settlements by electricity. The scope of the Charter includes the operation of street-car service and other purposes. The Bill follows the lead of the United Towns Electric Co. Act, passed a number of years ago and some subsequent legislation on behalf of other proposed electrical companies. The capital of the Company is named at $200,000, in shares of $10 each; the shareholders having the right to increase capital within the provisions of the charter. The Company is authorized to construct, lay down and establish all necessary cables, wires, &c., for the generation, accumulation and distribution of the supply of electricity for lighting and power purposes. The Directors have full powers to make by-laws for the management of the Company, the allotment of shares, &c. Provision is made for the issue of bonds, debentures and other securities. Under section 14 of the Bill the Company is granted, subject to the provisions of the Crown Lands Acts, the exclusive right to use the waters of a lake or pond known as Diamond's Long Pond, situate near the South-west Arm of Trinity. It has the exclusive franchise for the lighting of the towns mentioned and neighborhood for a period of twenty years from the date of the passing of this Act. There is a provision that the Government or other body having charge of the affairs of the towns of Trinity, Catalina and Bonavista, may at any time after the passing of the Act purchase the rights and privileges of the Company, upon giving the Company twelve months notice of their intention so to do. The Company is exempt from taxation under section 15, except taxation for water rates on lands and buildings owned by the Company in the aforementioned towns. Under section 20 all plant, machinery, rolling stock, &c., necessary for the original construction of the lighting, heating, power and street railway systems, &c., shall be admitted into the Colony free of duty.

The Bill follows the line of company incorporation current in Newfoundland for many years. There is just as much reason why Messrs. White, Perry and Guppy whose names are used as the promoters of this Company, should be granted this concession as there was that similar concessions should be granted to others who have applied to this Legislature and secured privileges. The policy is open to exactly the same class of attack as has usually been made against such organizations. A very large proportion of the speeches which were made by members of the Opposition at the last session of the Legislature against the Newfoundland Products Co., as far as the principle of the measure is con-

cerned, may be used against this; but just as I supported the concessions of the Nfld. Products Co. in the hope that large develcpments would follow —as they certainly will follow if the operation be undertaken—so I support this Bill because of the great advantages which will accrue to Trinity, Catalina, Bonavista and adjacent places if the gentlemen whose names are mentioned as promoters succeed in scuring the financial backing to make this undertaking possible. It is undoubtedly a bad policy to have the names of promoters rather than those who are financially responsible included in a measure which comes before this legislature. That very matter was bitterly attacked by the Opposition in connection with the Newfoundland Products contract, but as that has been the policy of very many years, and as a Company may be incorporated at the office of the Registrar of Deeds to-morrow with three names as promoters only, there is no reason why exception should be taken to this incorporation.

This is not a Government measure, but on being asked to take charge of the conduct of the Bill through this Chamber I readily assented, because I firmly believe in the policy of giving reasonable concession to any men who, with any show of reason, make a propsition the working out of which will give labor and tend to develop the country. Newfoundland needs the establishment of business enterprises, and the Legislature should be ever ready to give reasonable concessions to induce commercial operations to be undertaken. In Canada and the United States of America, states, counties and cities vie with each other in offering privileges to induce commercial enterprise, and in my opinion reasonable concessions in lands, minerals, water powers, free customs entry and like privileges ought always be granted by us, if by doing so there is an opportunity of fostering the development of undertakings. If by the concessions given under this measure an electric light company is started at Trinity, Catalina and Bonavista which will provide electric light and power for these and adjacent settlements, then something worth while will have been accomplished.

I have much pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Hon. the President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly intimating that they had passed the Bill, "An Act to amend and continue in force the Volunteer Force Acts, 1914-1916," in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, at 4.30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, April 12.

The House met at 4.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

TRAWL FISHERY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Trawl Fishing Protection Bill, Hon. Mr. Angel in the Chair.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—While on section four I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill that the really vital principle of the Bill is to save life. The

original bill was brought in many years ago by Sir Edward Morris as a result of frequent disasters on the Grand Banks, with the idea of providing for the families of men who lost their lives thereby. But this Bill merely holds the master of the vessel liable to a fine of $25, without any imprisonment at all, if he fails to see that what I consider the vital principle of the Bill is carried out, viz: "that each dory before leaving the said trawler for any purpose whatever, has on board a reliable compass, and a hermetically sealed supply of food and water sufficient for two men for at least four days." If the master fails to provide these he gets off with a fine of $25, but in the section above if the owner fails to have a supply of medicines, fog-alarms and life belts on board in accordance with the act, then he can be fined $100 or may be sent to jail for a month. Why the lesser dereliction carries the greater penalty I cannot understand. The owner is liable if he does not put these things on board, and the captain faces similar punishment if they are not kept in good condition, but there is no provision for imprisonment—merely a nominal fine if the master fails to see that these articles are in the dories. I think we should at least increase the fine to $100, and provide alternative imprisonment. In my opinion no offence is worse than the master failing to see that these necessities are on board the dories

HON. MR. BISHOP—The hon. gentleman must remember that some responsibility must rest on the dory's crew. They must value their lives sufficiently to see that they have food and a compass in their dory, and it ought not to be the duty of every master to have to go to every dory every morning to see if these things are there. The owner is first of all liable to a fine of $100 if they are not placed on board, but his responsibility ceases there; then the master is to see that all dories are equipped with compasses and food cans under a penalty for every offence, but information could not be given against him, except by some member of his crew, and they themselves should see before leaving their vessel that they have not forgotten their compass or food cans. This $25 fine would seem to me to duly meet the case.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—It seems to me that this is going to be hard on the masters of these banking vessels. Under no circumstance. even to save life, may a dory leave a ship without a compass on board. Then the fine is to be paid to the member of the crew who complains. Two or more members of a crew may conspire together to steal away the compass from a dory and then complain and recover the fine. There is no liability whatever on the man who leaves behind these things. He is protected and yet he can complain against the master and recover the fine. It is quite right that if he neglects his duty he should be fined.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I do not exactly agree with the hon. member who has just spoken. The master is in charge of the ship, and the men are under his control. Their actions, whatever they may do on that ship are subject to the dictation of the master. They are not free agents, and unless the master be held responsible for seeing that these articles are on board the dory, who are you going to hold responsible? The men themselves may be ordered to go out in a dory and have no choice but to go and do what they are told. They may say they want those articles on board and the captain may say: "It is not necessary, you will be back in a few minutes," and the fog may suddenly come down on the water and the men

may not be able to get back to the ship. Somebody must be held responsible, and that somebody is the person who is in charge of the ship and property and evereything on board. The men have no power to direct the master; they are really not free agents. He is the person who is and must be held responsible.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—With reference to the point raised by the hon. gentleman who opposes my views, will anybody contend that the master of the vessel will not see every morning that the dories' crews have everything needed for fishing on board? Do you think he will be content with merely giving orders and not inspecting the boats himself? I do not agree with the argument that the captain should not be held liable. I think we ought to have a more stringent penalty enacted and see that such is carried out. I am assuming that the vital principle of this bill is the saving of the men who are out in these dories on the Grand Banks. Our experience of the sealing disaster of 1914 was that witnesses were called before the tribunal and testified on oath that the compasses which they had and which they were supposed to take with them, had been left in their bunks. Now that has happened and may happen again. I do not press the point but it seems to me that in order to ensure the effective carrying out of this Act you ought to put a more stringent penalty on the master.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The hon. President scarcely understands the matter fully. These food cans are hermetically sealed and are put in the dories in the spring and remain there day and night throughout the season. They are not food for each day's use, but are there day by day. The compass is in a man's pocket, and each man has one there. Now I submit that it ought not to be necessary for the captain to get out of his bed at daylight and examine every dory or make every man pull his compass out of his pocket to see if they have it. The owner is under a heavy penalty to see these things are put on the ship, and the master sees they are given the men to put in their dories, and surely it ought not to be incumbent on the master to examine every dory every time it leaves the ship to see if they are there. I agree that there ought to be a penalty on the men to see that they do not leave the ship without compass and food cans.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I merely point out that if the case is as my hon. friend states, that the food cans are in the boat and visible, it is no great effort for the captain to see they are there.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the remainder of the order paper was deferred until to-morrow.

MARRIAGE FACILITY BILL.

Hon. Mr. President read a message from the House of Assembly, informing the House that they had passed the accompanying bill, entitled, "An Act to facilitate the marriage between British subjects residing in this Colony and British subjects residing in the United Kingdom, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop this Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

Hon. Mr. President read a message from the Assembly that they had appointed a Select Committee on the Municipal Affairs Bill, and requested the appointment by this House of a similar committee to confer with the

aforementioned committee. Hon. Mr. President appointed the following:—Hons. Bishop, Angel, Knowling, Harvey, Gibbs, Robinson, Power and Blandford.

On motion the House then adjourned until to-morrow at 4.30 o'clock.

THURSDAY, April 13.

The House met at 4.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

Committee on Trawl Fishing Protection Bill, and second reading of the Education Act, 1916, Bill deferred.

TRADING WITH ENEMY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Trading With the Enemy Bill, Hon. Mr. Robinson in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

CARBONEAR REBUILDING BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Building of Carbonear Amendment Bill, Hon Dr. Skelton in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and on motion of Hon Mr. Bishop it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

PASSENGER ACCOMMODATION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Passenger Accommodation Bill, Hon. Mr. Knowling in the Chair.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I would like to ask if the provisions of this Act are to apply to ordinary motor boats engaged in the coastal trade, boats which may be as low as 10 tons. I would like to know if they are to comply with the requirements of this Act or not. I have in my mind a motor boat of this class in which I am personally interested, my namesake, the "A. F. Goodridge," which carries passengers occasionally; possibly such boats would not carry ten passengers in a year, but as it looks to me it would appear that this clause (12) would apply to such a boat as I refer to.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Act relates only to the carrying of passengers not coastwise, for any distance but to and from the Labrador, and is not intended to apply to small boats going from harbor to harbor and taking one, two or three passengers. I cannot see how it could be made to apply to any small motor boats, though it may apply to motor ferry boats, but not for the casual carrying of passengers at all. However, it is subject to such provision as the Governor in Council may prescribe for adapting it to local requirements. It cannot be held to apply to ordinary motor boats picking up persons here and there, and conveying them short distances. I think this is safeguarded in the provision that the Governor in Council shall make regulations from time to time.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—That may be the intention, but this Act certainly does apply to motor boats.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I agree with Hon. Mr. Goodridge, for as far as I can see the one interpretation of the Act is that it applies to ships or boats propelled by mechanical power as distinguished from sailing vessels.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I think it would apply to ferry boats, whose business it is to carry passengers, but cannot be made to apply to ordinary motor boats that carry a man here or there, and the regulations or machinery which will be prepared by the Governor in Council will exempt from a penalty any man taking another

a short distance, such as to Blackhead or Petty Harbour.

HON. MR. HARVEY—While on this subject I would suggest that these Regulations should be published without delay. Under the Act as it stands there can be no doubt, that it applies to every boat which takes on board a passenger free or paid. If it is not intended to bring every boat under the Act, the regulations modifying it should be gazetted immediately, because as the matter now stands every motor boat comes under the clause.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—As I am informed outside, this amendment has been proposed in anticipation of the contingency that vessels will be fitted with motor engines for passenger and other business, and it is desired to be in a position to require such vessels or boats to have the semi-annual survey that is required at present for steam vessels. Moreover, there are getting to be around the Island, as at Bay of Islands, large motor ferries carrying a lot of passengerss. I have in my mind's eye one that plies between Norris Arm and Botwood which carries a lot of passengers, and connects with every westbound express from here. You get off the train at the station at Norris Arm and join the motor boat, which takes you to Botwood in 40 minutes. I travelled in such a boat a couple of years ago, and boats like that should certainly be inspected, and the authorities should see that they are in good order and condition as common carriers. But it is not contemplated, I think, no matter what the phraseology, that it will be put into force against small boats We may leave it to the Governor in Council to apply the authority given here, with some discrimination.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

UNION POWER CO. INCORPORATION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Union Electric Light and Power Company Incorporation Bill, Hon Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, it was ordered the said Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL.

Second reading of the Volunteer Force Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—Mr. President, this bill is mainly to continue in force the act of last year, with very slight amendment. Section two provides that instead of the words "Lieutenant Colonel" wherever they occur in the bill the word "Colonel" only be used. Some slight amendment to section three provides that any person who for the object of enlistment leaves his employment shall not be subject to penalties for so doing. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. MILLEY—Mr. President, I would like to say a few words upon this bill, and I will also use the opportunity to make a few remarks upon several matters of general interest.

I am aware that our military activities are costing us quite a little and I would not hint for one moment that there should be any let up in them, but I do think that our people would be willing to cut off root and branch quite a few of the expenses which, at the present state of local, national, and world affairs, could easily be left over for another year. The war now being waged is costing sums of money almost beyond computation,—a reckoning must

come some day; and wise will be that country or government which has protected its people by careful and economical expenditures prior thereto. There is one matter that must be taken into account this year and that is the fact that after Jan. 1st., 1917, there will be no duties collected on intoxicating liquors. I have no doubt that the increased earning power of our people and consequently their increased spending power will after a year or two bring back to the Colony, in revenue, more than it can lose by prohibition, but for the year immediately ahead of us, it seems to me we shall need to be careful, that we do do not authorize expenditures that we cannot see our way clear to pay. I have no doubt the members of the government and the Finance Minister have given this matter more consideration than I have, and are satisfied that the estimates now before the Lower House are the best possible; at the same time I cannot but regret that they did not see their way clear to considerably reduce them. In England, as is well known to all, retrenchment and economy are the watchwords, and great care is given to the consideration of all expenditures which are for purposes other than military or naval. Being so far removed from the European battlefields, we are too apt to think that we are not concerned in the awful tragedies that are being enacted there and we are only too willing to live on in luxury and comfort—that is luxury and comfort compared to what our fellow citizens in other parts of the empire are enjoying—with the idea that still brighter and better times are in store for us when the war is over. Having just returned from a six weeks' visit to England where I have had opportunities of hearing many of our leading men in commercial and political life, I feel that I am only doing my duty in sounding this note of warning to those who will be responsible for the conduct of our finances for the next year or two. All expenses incident to the successful carrying out of our obligations in connection with our volunteers should be cheerfully voted.

Our boys both on land and sea are doing their bit in order to safeguard our beloved Empire, but they are doing far more than that, as I shall endeavour to point out before I take my seat.

I am well aware that this Chamber has no right to alter or amend the Estimates sent up by the Assembly, I think, however, a word in season will do no harm in view of the fact that supplemental supplies will probably be asked for near the end of the present session.

And now I want to refer as briefly as I may, to another matter which is giving considerable thought and anxiety to the leading men of our Empire.

There is an old adage which says, "In time of peace prepare for war." How truly the German Empire believed in that has been well demonstrated to the world long ere this, for her preparedness is now accepted as a true and awful fact by the whole world. But there is another adage far more acceptable to us at any rate, and that is "In time of war prepare for peace."

There are vast numbers of men who cannot, owing to age, etc. do any actual fighting either on sea or land, but it is not for them—or for us, shall I say?—to sit idly by and wait for victory to crown our arms; no, it is ours to see to it, that while our brave men are sacrificing their all for the Empire, we have our work done so well, that the end of the war will not find us wondering what to do next, but will find us fully prepared

to practice the arts of peace in a way that will make our victory more far reaching and beneficial than was ever dreamed of.

It was my great privilege on Jan. 31st. last to attend a meeting held in the Guildhall, London, and presided over by the newly elected Lord Mayor, Sir Charles Wakefield. The object of the meeting was to discuss "Trade and employment after the war." A series of resolutions had been carefully prepared and were introduced by some of the foremost commercial men of the Empire, the meeting was non-political and was attended by men of all shades of politics. The resolution which interested me most was proposed by the Right Hon. Lord Desborough, K. C. V. .O., President of the British Imperial Council of Commerce, and seconded by Rt. Hon. Lord Hollenden, President of the Wholesale Textile Association. The resolutions read thus:—

"That steps be taken by means of close co-operation to improve the Commercial relations between the United Kingdom, His Majesty's dominions beyond the seas and our Allies, and also to make certain that Germany and her Allies shall not be able again to acquire an undue influence upon trade and employment in the British Empire."

In moving the resolution Lord Desborough said that we were up against the economic system of the Central Powers of Europe controlled by Germany, and to fight that, we must set up a Western System controlled economically not merely by Great Britain but by the British Empire assisted, as it could be, by the mutual co-operation of our Allies. "If we continued to be fools commercially," said he, "and allowed ourselves to be cheated by the wiles of our enemies, we deserved to be, and would justly be dominated by a nation which would never learn to be gentlemen."

Seconding the resolution Lord Hollenden said:—

"That it was now many years since they had been called a nation of shopkeepers. He personally, was proud that he was one of those shopkeepers, because he felt that Commerce had raised this country to the proud position she now held. The Germans were among the first to realize how much Commerce had done for England, and they sent their young men to this country to learn the A B C of the business. We had reecived them into our business houses, and had, he thought, been too kind to them. Years ago he was sitting next to Mr. Gladstone at lunch when this subject of the employment of German clerks came up for discussion, and Mr. Gladstone expressed the fear that it would be a great danger to us in the future if it continued. The danger seemed to be so remote then that no action was taken. He thought that if Mr. Gladstone were alive and asked those at the meeting what they felt about it, they would agree with what he said. These young men then returned to Germany and with all the tricks the Germans could employ, had tried to steal our business from us. We were too self-confident—or should he say lazy—to try to prevent it. The war had now opened our eyes and we saw that we must put our house in order. It could only be done by a united effort, by combining with our brave Allies, and especially with our kindred across the seas. The people in the Dominions had already held their meetings and come to their decision not to hold any further commerce with Germany and not to allow any German goods to be dumped on their shores. If we were patriots first this combination should enable us not only to regain what we had lost in Trade and Manufacture but make this country stronger still than it had been.',

The addresses by the Rt. Hon. Gentle-

men named above were clear and concise and I came away from that meeting with the firm conviction that Newfoundland ought to reap the benefits which will surely be derived by a union of all the over-seas dominions, with England and her allies on a matter of such vital importance.

I said a few moments ago that our brave lads were doing more for us than safeguarding our Empire and I mean it, for do you know, Sir, that Newfoundland, which has hitherto been known mainly because of her disasters and misfortunes now takes an altogether different place in the eyes of the outside world, thanks to the splendid courage of our boys and to the fact that we can rise above our disasters and misfortunes when dangers of such vast dimensions are threatening the very life of our Empire.

Our boys are well aware, and they appreciate the fact, that their personal comforts are being well attended to by the Women's Patriotic Association and other kindred organizations, as well as by the private donations of their "many friends" and relatives. They speak very highly of these tangible evidences of good will which reach them from time to time.

I have no hesitation, Mr. President, in saying that our volunteers and naval reservists have done more for Newfoundland than all our delegations, conferences, and advertisements combined, and I say again that it is up to us to show those of them who come home (for alas some will never return) that we have not been idle during their absence, but that we have laboured to make this Newfoundland of ours (and theirs) a land united in more ways than ever before to the other parts of our Empire as well as to those of our Allies whose cause was common with our own.

What I am leading up to is this. Now that steps are being taken to bring about better and lasting trade relations between the various parts of our Empire and our Allies, we should demand that we have a share in them. The fact that we are such a very small part of the Empire will never again prevent us from being included in any arrangement which may prove beneficial to us,for I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time Newfoundland is a very bright jewel in the crown of our Empire.

I am convinced that as soon as possible after the close of the war, if not before,arrangements will be made to carry out the principles laid down in the resolution I have read to you, and I think representatives from the Board of Trade, the House of Assembly, and this Legislative Council should meet together and make representations to the homeland in order that we may be able to take our place when called upon to do so.

In my opinion the great marketplace of the world for the years immediately following the war, will be London, and I have no hesitation in suggesting that this country should hereafter be represented there by some man thoroughly acquainted with Newfoundland affairs. The products of Newfoundland are worthy of far more attention on the part of the outside world than they can ever obtain by our present methods of marketing them. Buyers from all nations represented in the Union outlined in the Guildhall meeting will go to London and there be met by our representative. In this way markets will be opened up by us which up to now have never handled a penny's worth of our products; in the same way, market will be found in Newfoundland for wares and merchandise which hitherto were unknown to us.

I think it is an open secret that the good prices now paid for our fish is due to the fact that the Norweg-

ians have been disposing of their fish to the Central Powers, thus eliminating the competition which has always had a tendency to lower the price. When the war is over this fish will no doubt again compete with ours, and fortunate will we be if we have been able to secure other markets through such an agency, which will always be alive to our best interests.

It is time now for this country to rise above the petty political and party considerations which seem to actuate all movements undertaken here. The welfare of our island home is becoming of less and less importance; and the success of this or that politician, or party, is becoming the all important topic. To one who has travelled, the narrow and bitter personalities that obtain in this little place are nauseating in the extreme, and it is high time that our people refused to tolerate it any longer.

In all lands there are, and should be, honest differences of opinion between public men on questions of public interest, but it seems to me in this land you must either not express an opinion at all, or be willing, if you do, to have the bitterest personal attacks made on you that it is possible to make.

In closing, might I just say that if the idea of an agency in London should be favourably considered, I hope that the appointment of a suitable representative will not depend upon the fact that he worships at this Altar or that Altar, nor upon the fact that he is a supporter of this political party or that political party, but wholly, and only, upon the fact that he is the best representative that it is possible to secure.

The duties of such a representative would be many. It was only a day or two ago that a recent exchange announced the fact that the Canadian representative in London has succeeded in placing large quantities of Canadian fish for consumption by the Australian troops. Perhaps this would have been Newfoundland fish if our representative had been on the spot to offer it.

It is quite apparent that all the Overseas Dominions will be well represented when the proper time comes, and I hope that our poor old land, "the sport of historic misfortune," will awaken from her slumber and be up and doing before it is too late.

It must be borne in mind that Newfoundland has other products to place before the world's buyers besides fish, and I feel confident that the, as yet, undeveloped resources of our country will in future bring us handsome returns when we become interested enough to see that they remain no longer undeveloped.

It might be interesting to some hon. members to know that I was informed when in England by one who is "in the know" that the boots which came from Newfoundland for certain military purposes were the best that had been sent in, and that if someone had been acting in our interests at headquarters when the orders were issued, instead of the paltry order given us, we would have received one calling for large quantities and extending over a long period, thus giving us an advertisement which would help us in placing other lines in years to come.

I cannot refrain from mentioning here a matter which has given me much thought and annoyance.

When in England it was very noticeable that references to Newfoundland and its work for the Empire were very rare indeed. Every day I was there, I heard and read, times without number, about Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and what they have done and are doing for the Empire, but never a word about Newfoundland and the "bit" she is doing.

The limit, however, to my patience,

was reached when I read the report of a conference held in the Prime Minister's private office in London early in March. A deputation of business men waited upon him with the object of discussing the advisability of establishing a Ministry of Commerce, and the question of Imperial commercial relations between the United Kingdom, our Dominions and the Allies. The published report under the headlines,

"Dominions Must Be Considered,"

quotes Mr. Asquith as follows:

"It was most desirable, that we should hear and consider what the great Dominions of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa have to say, and be prepared in any conference or negotiations that may take place on the subject to act not merely as the spokesmen of the United Kingdom, but of the Empire as a whole."

I have no hesitation in saying that if Newfoundland had a representative in London he would probably have seen to it that some of those who composed it were interested enough to let it be known that there is a place in the Empire called Newfoundland, and that in proportion to her means and population she was doing her share in this world struggle, and that she deserved a kindly reference now and again on the part of the Empire's leading men.

It is not my intention to detain you any longer at the present time. I hope, however, that what I have said will start the ball rolling, that it will grow bigger as it rolls, and that when it rolls up against some of us it will either bowl us over, or awaken us to a sense of the duty we owe our native land.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—Mr. President, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has struck a note that is much needed at present. I do not say that I agree with everything he has said, but with the main principles enunciated, I am in entire accord and feel sure that they must appeal to every section of this House. We here know—and I say it with strong conviction—that we do not, as a people, realize the gravity of the responsibility that it is ours to bear, both now or later. Would that the slogan might be shouted throughout the land, "In time of war prepare for peace." It is not the idea of the hon. member, as I understand it,that war-time affords the opportunity for aggressive commercial ventures. By "In time of war prepare for peace" he rather means that preparation which shall consolidate and conserve what our brave lads, with the rest of the Empire are now gaining for us. We do not want to emerge out of this tremendous world strife enriched at the cost of the blood of our brave lads but what we do want to do is to requite these lads for their services by being true to our trust. They are there enduring hardships and facing death that the Empire and we who stay at home may live. They are as the hon. member said offering their lives. risking their limbs, doing all they can to maintain the integrity of the Empire we all so love, and to assure a continuation of the glorious liberty and freedom which as a nation, we all enjoy. But there is another side to their devoted services. They are, albeit unconsciously, eloquent and insistent advertisers of the Colony, the custodians of her honour, the advance agents of her trade. They do not know that they are doing this work, but they are doing it, and doing it well. The question is, are we prepared to take advantage of what they are doing? They are demanding for Newfoundland due recognition of her merits. It is true that there is a great deal being done in a small way, but are we rising to the occasion? Do we realize what this means to us?

Is there not a danger that we may be content to let our soldiers and sailors do their part,and fail to do our own? May it not be that we are too prone to consider first what we desire, rather than what the needs of Newfoundland and the Empire may be? What are we? But a few years and we are gone. The best, the healthiest, the strongest of us has only a few years to live. The question that we should ask ourselves is: "What are we doing for those coming after us, for those lads whom we hope soon to welcome to their homeland, the young men who will be the fathers and leaders of the country in a short time? Are we doing our share? I leave the question there; let each of us answer it for himself.

What the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Milley) has said should ring through out the Island. His remarks will appear in Hansard and will be pubiished in the newspapers, but are well worthy of circulation in pamphlet form from one end of the Colony to the other. His words will help to wake us up, as a people, to a due realization of our duties, a realization which as yet we have not achieved. With all the hon. gentleman has said I cannot concur. His remarks suggested serious and undeserved reflection upon some of our statesmen on the other side, though happily, they are qualified by the statement that whatever failures there were the fault was the nation's, and the responsibilities its citizens, including ourselves. He questions whether Newfoundland is receiving that recognition to which she is entitled. That may be open to doubt, but if not, the fault is due to ourselves. Have we seen to it that Newfoundland's position as an independent Colony, as a small Dominion, has been properly safeguard ed. Of this, I am sure, that the one desire in the Old Country is to give every possible credit to this little Newfoundland of ours for what she has done. We must not forget, when we talk about Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa that they are great Dominions, whilst we are a very small Dominion. The great Dominions talk in millions both of population and means. Ours is but a quarter of a million of population, indeed many Crown Colonies,with semi-representative Government, are larger than this small Dominion of Newfoundland. I am sure that Mr. Asquith could not have had the smallest intention of slighting Newfoundland. Numbers of letters come by every English mail from people of the Old Country, and they have one sentiment in common, and it is in praise of the work done by this little Colony, little in size, little in population, but large of heart. We may not have done as much in some respects, proportionately, as other countries have done, but the fault is not the fault of the people of the country, it is the fault of us here in St. John's. This is the centre of the Island, the capital of the Colony. From St. John's radiates every movement, and what have we done? Whilst in other Dominions, every town and village rings with patriotic addresses, gatherings, and recruiting campaigns, here we have had but one brief campaign. One of our boasts—and one of which we may well be proud—is that despite the little that has been done, our boys have joined the services in cold blood, and actuated by calm reason, volunteers in the very best sense of the word. They have come here, joining the navy and joining the army, not through emotionalism, not as a result of impassioned appeal, but because of their strong personal convictions. They go into battle knowing what they are going for, and this is something that we may be well proud of, and it is something that the Empire generally cannot fail to appreciate.

The same thing may apply in other countries. Volunteering in the Motherland has been stupendous, and in the great Dominions superb, but we have not had the spectacular recruiting campaigns in Newfoundland that they have had elsewhere. Emotionalism does count. After all, khaki and brass bands, are the best recruiting agents.

May I, in conclusion, Mr. President, express personal thanks to the hon. member for giving us, one and all, here in this House and throughout the country, a reminder of some things we have unfortunately a tendency, due to our far removal from the scene of strife, to overlook or to forget.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be submitted to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

MESSAGES FROM ASSEMBLY.

Hon. President intimated that he had received from the House of Assembly a message acquainting the Council that they had passed the Bills, entitled respectively: "An Act to amend the Laws relating to Weights and Measures, the Inspection of Lumber," and "An Act relating to Local Affairs," in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop these Bills were read a first time and were ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. MR. BISHOP—In moving the adjournment of this House, Mr. President, I desire to offer my sincere congratulations to the hon. gentleman opposite (Hon. Mr. Milley) who has entertained us and instructed us this afternoon by his fluent address. I concur fully in the remarks of Hon. Mr. Robinson in respect of that address. It is not often that the hon. gentleman addresses the House, but I am sure we will all agree that when he does, he always has something worth saying. I will not now detain you further, and beg to move the adjournment.

The House adjourned till to-morrow Friday, April 14th, at 4.30 p.m.

FRIDAY, April 14th, 1916.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Trading with the Enemy, Rebuilding of Carbonear, Passenger Accommodation and Union Electric Light and Power Company Incorporation Bills, respectively were read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

EDUCATION BILL.

Second Reading of the "Education Act, 1916" Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—It is desirable where we have two or more Bills on the Statute Book relating to the same subject that a new Bill should be framed and enacted consolidating the various Acts and putting them in such shape that the citizen of ordinary intelligence may understand them.

It often appears to the layman that the deliberate design of the legal profession, who prepare Bills preparatory to legislative enactment is to surround the subject with verbiage so intricate and ambiguous that the more one attempts to unravel it the more confusing it becomes, and when one seeks explanation we are directed that for the meaning of Section 5 we must read Section 11, in connection with sub-section B of Act Victoria, Cap. 2, and so forth. The year in which Act 4 Victoria or any Act was passed, it would be, I assume, unprofessional to insert.

There are upon our Statute Book at present several bills relating to Education, and the Bill now before

us for consideration is a consolidation of these various Bills. Judging from the bulkiness of the document, and if consolidation implies condensation, we must all be impressed with the necessity for the bill before us.

When the Bill reaches the Committee stage I shall endeavour to point out the changes that it is proposed to make, and from the great attention which all Bills are receiving in the Lower House we might assume this Bill, because of its great importance, and touching as it does, the whole population of the country, has been very carefully scrutinized and requires at our hands little if any amendment.

This subject is an exceedingly important one. More important, I submit, Sir, than is realized by our people generally. In fact, Mr. President, I doubt if any of us, not even our Inspectors of Schools, the Inspectors of Education or the Principals of our Colleges have fully realized how highly important is the better education of our young people.

We are learners, Sir, as our years increase, but it has taken the conflict in which we are now engaged to demonstrate to us the great advantages of education and the superior advantage possessed by the nation which has taught its people to attain the high state of efficiency to which the German people have been brought in arts and handicraft, in industry and frugality.

What we need, and will more than ever need at the termination of the war when our valiant lads return to us, are night schools in all our large settlements during the winter months and in St. John's all the year through, which will afford the chance for every young man who has passed the ordinary school age to obtain education, particularly in mechanics, which will make for his efficiency in whatever line of work in which he may engaged.

We have already in St. John's, thanks to a few public-spirited citizens, among whom the hon. gentleman on my left (Mr. Harvey) has been prominent, made an excellent start in technical training of young men by evening classes, but we need this work extended, and in this way, Sir, adopt the slogan pronounced by Hon. Mr. Milley yesterday, "In time of War prepare for Peace."

We cannot, Sir, give too much attention or too much help to the subject of practical education for our young people.

I beg leave to move the second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—The honourable leader of the government in the House has cultivated in recent years a delicate sarcasm, which I am sure every hon member appreciates. I am very much interested in his allusion to the great care and attention given to education, in the other chamber and perhaps to a certain extent it is true this year. In previous years however, Education Bills have gone through with apparently little interest and less comment. But this year there has been some discussion on the Bill and at least one objectionable feature has been eliminated, and that amendment was to reinstate a Section which has been operative for 18 years, and has resulted in a continuous stream of new blood in the various Boards. In so far as this bill is a consolidation, I think that the gratitude of the whole country is due to the Superintendents of Education, who must have put a vast amount of effort into their work. In this respect it will be a very great advantage. As the hon. leader of the government has intimated, it has been almost impossible for a layman to keep in touch with the innumerable educational Amendment Acts

which adorn, or otherwise, our Statute Books. Indeed I don't know that it has been altogether a simple matter for some lawyers to understand what the multiplicity of words really imply.If we look at the last paragraph in schedule M. we see that no less than nine Acts have to be repealed as the result of this consolidation. As I have said our thanks are due to the Superintendents for the untiring energy they have displayed, but Sir, our thanks are not due them for having brought before us a Bill, which, emphasises many of the objectionable features of our Educational System What is the use Sir, of us closing our eyes to the facts which are staring us in the face? What is the use of our praising up the alleged wonderful progress in our educational system? There was a census taken in 1911. Are hon. members aware of what that revealed? That told us in so many words, or figures, that there were 242,-619 people in Newfoundland; that 32,476 of these are below the age of 5— (and we do not expect anyone below that age to be able to read and write). There are, therefore 210,143 people who ought to be able to read and write, but the census states, and hon. members will hear the figures with surprise and regret that not less than 74,148 people of this country above the age of 5 are illiterate. Thirty five per cent of our population over 5 years of age cannot write and in face of this, we pride ourselves upon our wonderful educational progress. It is humiliating. Instead of priding ourselves on what we have done we should clothe ourselves in sackcloth and ashes and mourn for what we have not done.

It is not my intention, whilst the second reading of the Bill is under discussion to speak other than generally. Some of the weak points I hope to take up in Committee, when I purpose, though I admit, with very little hope of success, to introduce certain amendments if for the only reason that it may be made clear that there are some, at any rate, who are not prepared to encourage a continuance of a system which has been so barren in results. The system that I am referring to specially is that which is adopted by and involved in the constitution of the Council of Higher Education: I am credited with being very hostile to that Council. That, Sir, is incorrect. I am not hostile to the Council, but I am very hostile to the methods adopted by that Council. I wish to see a Council of Education in the country and not a Council of Higher Education. It is more decorous, and certainly more wise, before we don silks, satins and velvets to see to it that we are properly and decently clothed otherwise. The implied rebuke:

> Beggar pride defrauds her daily cheer,
> To boast a splendid banquet once a year

has more applications than one. It is a nice thing for us to tell the world of what wonderful progress we are making with certificates, diplomas and higher education, but the pleasure is spoiled by the shame that impels us to keep in the back ground, the fact that over 74,000 of our people who should be able to do so, cannot write Some years ago a couple of men came into my office to ask me to draw up a "protest" in connection with the loss of a vessel. They were two as fine men as one could wish to see; intelligent, and one of them master of the vessel, the other a member of the crew. I knew where they came from. I knew that the place from which they came had had schools, and presumably efficient ones from the day that they were born. I knew moreover, that there was no division of the grants because everybody there belonged to the one denomination. I

knew that there was no possible excuse for these men not being sufficiently educated to read and write. When I had finished the protest, and read it in their hearing, I handed the document to the skipper, saying, "Captain. You will please sign here." "I can't write Sir" he replied "What, you can't write?" "I can write my name," was the rejoinder. "Well," I said, "write your name." He managed to get through it, but the process was a labourious one. The other young man was about 20. I said to him, "Surely you can write?" "I can't write or read" he answered. This is only one instance of hundreds, one out of 74,000. Have we reason to pride ourselves on this? Is it not our duty to search for the weak spots in our system?

On the question of sectarian or denominational education I have always endeavoured to be clear and explicit in what I have said in this House, and I say it again now, that so far as I am concerned, I have no desire to ask for, and no intention to support any proposal to amalgamate the Protestant and Roman Catholic grants. Twenty years ago I thought otherwise, but a discussion of the subject with one whose memory should ever be held in honour in Newfoundland, I refer to one whom I was privileged to call my friend,—the Hon Maurice Fenelon—convinced me that I was wrong, and that enforced union would involve injustice and a disregard of the convictions of others. I need not go into the reasons that with the invariable courtesy that characterized him, he placed before me. I simply say that I was and am satisfied of the impropriety of any such a policy. But there is no principle involved, and no justifiable reason that I am aware of—and I have gone closely into the question—to justify what is known as sub-division, the splitting up of the Protestant grants. I am well aware that many clergymen and ministers of the Island favour the present system of sub-division. I am also aware that many do not, and that, especially amongst the younger men there is a strong desire, in the interests of education, for reunion of the grants, and the greater efficiency which must necessarily result.

As for the laity, I believe, Sir, that if this country were canvassed and a plebiscite taken on the question as to whether there should be a union of the Protestant grants, the vote would be overwhelmingly in favor of union; and one of the things I complain of in the consolidation which we have before us is that there is no hope held out for anything that will help in this direction. Some years ago I was in a little place—I think, Sir, I am not exaggerating when I say that there were no more than thirty families there—and in order that any member may verify my statement I shall mention the place, Frenchman's Cove, about three miles from Garnish. In that little settlement there was a Church of England School, a Methodist School, and they were about to establish a Salvation Army school. The result was that about half a dozen pupils attended each school, and three or four very inefficient teachers spent three or four months out of the year there. The children were growing up very ignorant, and, though they might have been fairly taught, were allowed to drift along. I brought the attention of the authorities to the matter; there were promises made,but I do not think anything was done, at any rate not for some years. Frenchmen's Cove is but a type of scores of settlements in this Island. I was talking to a gentleman yesterday about another place. He said: "We have united our grants; that is not exactly united. All the people there belong either to the

Church of England or Methodist denominations, and we open each school for six months." Is not that absurd? Could not the one with the fewest numbers have been broad enough to let the one with the biggest numbers conduct that school for the whole year; or could not the one with the largest numbers have been big enough, generous enough, or sufficiently magnanimous to allow the other to run for the whole year? How, Sir, we have narrowed in this country! We have been simply steeped in sectionalism. It has long been a marvel to me that we have not ere this had an agitation for sectional penitentiaries

And now, Sir, with reference to the Council of Higher Education. I have said that I hope to see the day when we shall have here an educational council which shall be an advisory body. When complaints are made in connection with the C.H.E. we are told two things: first, that those in that Council give their valuable services gratuitously, devote a great deal of their time to the work, and that their splendid citizenship should exonerate them from criticism. I am not going to question that. They have given valuable time and devoted their best energies to the work, some of them. I do not criticize the members, but the system, and affirm that the constitution of that council is not what it should be. Is there such a thing as a council, or is it a head with a very long tail, and the tail of very little use? In the bill before us the futility of that council, as at present constituted, is emphasized. Whilst in this Bill special provision is made for the proper conduct of the smallest board in the smallest outport, the principle is continued in a more objectionable and offensive form to render entirely negligible the powers of this council. A new section is put in,—I am not saying it is not a proper one, I heartily accept it,—that a quorum of the boards of education in this country shall be a majority of the board,—a very proper principle; and yet, what do we find? When the C.H.E. is formed it shall consist of thirty-one members, of which a quorum shall be seven. Under the old Act it consisted of 30 members, six of whom were government employees, and to make a quorum the six government employees. the six most directly interested in perpetuating existing methods, had only to get one other man to have a quorum, and transact any business they wished. We go further in this Act, and put seven Government employees on it; now, forsooth, the Government Analyst is added, and a very excellent man he is, and one who knows a great deal about education, and no man is better qualified, perhaps. But who is to say what the next Analyst is going to be? Are we sure that this Government Analyst is going to be here indefinitely? I hear he is doing excellent work, and hope he will be here for a long time to come, but here you are, laying down that the Government Analyst, who may know no more about education than I do about seal-killing, is to be a member of this Board. If he goes there to analyse their work, all right, but here we have seven only necessary to form a quorum, and seven who are government officials. Not that I mean to insinuate that any government in the past, present, or I fear in the future, is going to interfere, either directly or indirectly with the decisions and desires of the Superintendents of Education—and as to the Council, as things now are, they cannot even advise.

The second point that I object to is that when alteration of methods is suggested, and when the C.H.E. is asked to do certain things that may tend

to the improvement of education, we are told they have no power, they are only an examining body. Well, Mr. President, if it is only an examining body, in that case what do we want thirty-one men for? For conducting examinations? What are the Superintendents for, if not to examine the schools under their jurisdiction? There have been men on that board, there are some men in this room at present, I dare say some of what I say may be taken exception to by them, perhaps all, but I say that men on that board have done all in their power to get certain improvements effected, and every time they are told: We are powerless, this is an examining body only.

What I want to see, Sir, believing if we could only see it, it would be a matter of very great benefit to this Island, educationally, and, therefore, commercially, politically, socially and every other way, is a council of education, the six Superintendents of education on that council, and others who would not be figureheads, but would be there with some power and not subject to a quorum of officals; men who would form an advisory Board to His Excellency the Governor in Council, on matters educational.

I said just now there are 31 members on that council. May I just point out one more fact? There used to be 26 and the quorum was seven, and now there are 31 and the quorum is seven, and if there were 99 the quorum would still be seven, and as things are it might as well remain so. Are we awake to these things? Do we realize them? I think we do not! The fact of the matter is that education in this country has become purely the province of a few. We are afraid to tread over the threshold of the sanctum. If anyone dares to criticize he is up against all sorts of trouble. It is the story of the line of least resistance. It is so much easier to accept things as they are, and not to kick. I do not think I have the reputation of being much of a kicker, but if there is one thing I do kick against, it is against a system under which Newfoundland has 74,000 of its population unable to write.

There is another thing I wish to draw attention to in connection with the composition of that board. We are asked here to appoint the headmasters of four colleges to that board. That has always been done, and I do not know of any better men. But what a manifest absurdity it is. A man is brought here to take charge of a college. He knows absolutely nothing of the requirements of Newfoundland; he has not even proven a success; he may be a blank failure, and yet untried, wholly inexperienced, when it is not known even if he is going to be here for a month, he is made a member of the Council. Surely there should be some limitation; surely he should be given an opportunity to learn something about the country and its requirements, before his appointment. If there were vacancies in all our colleges here at one time, what would be the value of these men on the board?

I do not intend to say anything further at the present time, but when we come to discuss the sections dealing with the C.H.E. I intend to propose amendments, the object of which will be to provide for the establishment of a Council of Education; to extend to the Council advisory, but not executive powers. If that is done —of course I have not the slightest hope it will be— then that body might be of some real value, and when the census of 1921 is taken we may not have to face such a damning statement that thirty five per cent of the people of Newfoundland who

ought to be able to write are illiterate.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I merely rise to say one word in connection with the Council of Higher Education. With the general remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down I think all must agree. I do, certainly. I felt all the time, as I listened to the very inspiring address given from the opposite side of the House yesterday by Mr. Milley that the one thing that the Colony ought to work for in time of peace, is the improvement of our educational system. The weak spot, in my opinion, is the status of teachers, not necessarily the question of the C.H.E. There are no prizes in the teaching profession: the teachers, underpaid, neglected, in many cases starved, are given very little chance to make themselves fit to carry on their work. However, I am not going to discuss that now. I agree in the main with the remarks of my hon. friend who has just sat down, but with all due respect, as regards the personnel of the C.H.E. and their actions, I think he is mistaken. I myself was a member of the Council for several years, and only recently ceased to be so. The hands of the C.H.E. are absolutely tied. The words 'Council of Higher Education' are a misnomer. Every member is interested, I think I am safe in saying, less as regards Higher Education than as regards Primary Education; teaching to read and write. That principally is the work to which the time of the C.H.E. is today largely devoted. As regards the idea of a quorum, I do not know why seven was put in but as a fairly regular attendant who was unable to be of much use there, a layman really cannot do much because of the Act, which prevents anything but examination work being done, I must say the attendance was generally very good, and I should think, speaking from memory, must have averaged fifteen to twenty. The Council met regularly, and the work was closely followed. I doubt if there is any board in the country which has a better attendance or whose work is better followed by the members than is that of the C.H.E. They get no credit for it, in fact they are constantly in hot water, but I can assure the House they work for Primary Education. Their efforts in the Primary schools are honest, and it is unfair to suppose that the Council themselves are to blame for the system, or that their intention is to skimp the three 'R's." and devote themselves to higher and hitherto impossible education. The real trouble lies in the undertraining of teachers.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

CONSOLIDATED STATUTES BILL.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice, the House went into Committee on the Consolidated Statutes (3rd series) Revising and Publication Bill.

Hon. Mr. Murphy in the Chair.

On motion the Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment and it was ordered that it be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on "The Volunteer Force Acts, 1914-16."

Hon. Mr. Gibbs in the Chair.

On motion the Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

MARRIAGE FACILITATION BILL.

Second reading of Marriages Between British Subjects Resident in Newfoundland and United Kingdom Facilitation Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In moving the second reading of this bill, I beg to

point out for the information of the Council by way of explanation for the introduction of this measure, that in May, 1915, an Act was passed by the Imperial Parliament to facilitate marriages between British subjects residing in the United Kingdom and British subjects in other parts of His Majesty's Dominions. Under Imperial Law the publication of notice of marriage or of banns is, under certain circumstances, essential. In many British Colonies it would appear that the publication of notice or banns is also essential under certain circumstances. In Newfoundland this is not required except where one of the intended contracting parties is a minor, in which case the publication of banns or consent of parents is required.

Under the Imperial Act of 1915 publication of notice or banns in a Colony would not be accepted in the United Kingdom as authority for the celebration of a marriage in the United Kingdom between a British subject residing in the United Kingdom and a British subject residing in the Colony, nor would the publication of notice or banns in the United Kingdom be accepted as authority for the celebration of marriage in a colony between a British subject residing in the United Kingdom and one residing in that colony.

The object of the Imperial Act of 1915 is to make publication of notice or banns in Great Britain's colonies sufficient authority for the celebration of marriage in the United Kingdom, and, conversely, it is suggested that the publication of notice or banns in the United Kingdom should be treated as sufficient authority for celebration of marriage in British Colonies.

The object of this bill is to make valid in the United Kingdom a notice of marriage given in Newfoundland by publication in the Royal Gazette in two consecutive issues, and a certificate of such publication, issued by the Registrar-General of births, marriages, and death, for the purpose of the marriage in the United Kingdom of a resident of Newfoundland, who had published such certificate; and for the purpose of reciprocity the Act provides that a certificate for marriage issued by the proper authorities in England, Scotland and Ireland shall be accepted in Newfoundland in lieu of the publication or notice or banns in Newfoundland.

So far as the use of certificates in Newfoundland issued in England is concerned, it can apply only where one of the contracting parties is a minor, because in this country no publication of banns or other procedure is necessary. So far as our Statute Law is concerned it does not in any manner interefere with the laws or regulations of the different churches in relation to marriages.

The Bill was read a third time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MESSAGES FROM HOUSE.

Hon. President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly intimating that they had passed a Bill for the encouragement of Shipbuilding, and a Bill respecting the Herring Fishery, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, these Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time tomorrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House adjourned until Monday next April 17th, at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, April 17.

The House met at 4.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the

Consolidated Statutes (3rd series) Revising and Publication Bill, and the Volunteer Force Acts, 1914-1916, Bill were read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the said Bills without amendment.

TRAWL FISHERY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Trawl Fishing Protection Bill, Hon. Mr. Angel taking the Chair of the Committee.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—(On section 10)—Before the Bill goes through I should like to explain why I am not introducing the amendments I proposed. The last time this was discussed the question came up as to the Customs Trust Fund, and I have been informed by the Leader of the Government in this Chamber that the amount now appearing on the books is placed to the credit of the new fund. If that is done, then in view of the first section, third paragraph, I think the difficulty which I feared might arise, will not arise. I will just ask the Leader of the Government to say if that is correct.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct. The sum, $3,400 about, as shown on the accounts, will be transferred to the new fund which this Bill calls the Insurance Fund.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—May I ask whether that $3,400 includes the accrued interest?

HON. MR. BISHOP—It does not, and really there would be no accrued interest if the old fund were to be chargeable with the overpayments in some years.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—(On Section 4)—I do not agree with this section. Section two provides that no clearance shall be granted to any schooner unless she has on board certain things; the third section makes the owner liable to a heavy fine for not putting these necessary things on board; four puts a penalty on the master to see that they are actually used, and there is no liability placed on the fishermen to carry out the intention of this Act, but the penalty is placed on the captain if the members of his crew neglect to carry these things on their dories for the protection of their own lives. It should be a member of the crew who would be responsible for the neglect of providing for their own protection, and yet the captain is subject to the fine, and the fine is to go to the informer. The only party that can give information must be a member of the crew. Now I think that is most objectionable, and I beg to move this amendment, that the words 'by any person who may sue for the same' be stricken out.

HON. PRESIDENT—I would like to point out that evidently there is some misunderstanding in regard to these fines. At the last sitting the Hon. Mr. Gibbs ventured the opinion that the parties taking action would get half, if not all, the fines, but on looking over the Bill after we rose, I observed that under section 10 all fines imposed under this Act shall be paid over to the Minister of Finance and Customs for the purpose of this Insurance Fund, so that if that be so fines could not go to the informer, either wholly or in part, but to the Minister of Finance for the purposes of the Fund, and therefore my hon. friend's argument in so far as that goes falls to the ground Now he takes the very contrary view to me in regard to fining the master in that I believe we should increase the fine, instead of $25 making it $100. He thinks it should not be obligatory on the master, but I beg to point out the sequence of these sections. Section 2 provides for the clearance not being granted if certain

things are not put on board the vessel; three provides for the owner placing these things on board and for a fine if he does not do so; and four requires that the master of the vessel shall see that the dories shall each have compasses and food cans, or he is subject to a fine. I submit that that is a logical sequence, a fair position to put forward, and as to the fact that the men themselves shall assume some responsibility, in as much as these men are subject to authority, and act in certain capacities on the command of the man in charge of the vessel, I do not see how it can be contended that negligence on the part of the men should exempt the master. I think there is just as strong a reason that the master should see that the men carry a compass and food cans in their dories as there is that the master on his own account shall see that they have the necessary equipment with them to conduct fishing operations.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I do not at all mean that the master shall be free of responsibility or not be liable to a fine, but I think the men should bear some responsibility at least. It is clear this section requires amendment. It says clearly that the fine may go to any party who may sue for the same, and under section ten there is a contradiction, and therefore these words I have proposed should be ruled out.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I entirely concur in the remarks of the last speaker. These are important regulations and are being made for the benefit of the crews of these vessels, and I don't think it fair that the masters should be liable to all the penalties. I think that some penalties should attach to the members of the crews themselves together.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—There is presumably a strong reason why these words appear in No. 4 section, and why they are not in No. 3. Possibly the hon. member in charge may be able to tell us.

HON. MR. HARVEY—If the Committee is to rise, I would suggest that this matter of the hermetically sealed tins be reconsidered. I think generally these vessels carry tins with seven tops on them and these, of course, are not hermetically sealed. If they take hermetically sealed tins, the water may be held for such a long time in such receptacles, but how long would it stand? I would suggest if the Committee is to rise that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries be asked to investigate the point.

HON. MR. BISHOP—A hermetically sealed tin is absolutely impracticable. The water will spoil after one week or be unfit for the use of man. With regard to the penalty for not having the required articles on board dories, I would put a penalty on the men also, and would see that the crew all filled it at least once a week and that the men should not leave the ship without these on board their dories.

It is useless, I think, to accept the verbiage of the Act as it stands. The proper course is to allow them to use the seven top can they are using now, which can be filled at will.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

EDUCATION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee on the Education Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I am going to ask the indulgence of the House while I refer to some thoughts which have been suggested to me by the Chairman, Mr. Milley.

The subject of Education is, in the opinion of many of us, both inside and outside this House, by all odds, the

most important thing in the world, and essentially the road which every nation must travel if the problem "what must be done in War to prepare for Peace" is to be effectively solved. May I be permitted, therefore, before we take up the individual sections of this Bill in detail, to pursue the line of thought that has been to a great extent, focussed in our minds by the address of the Hon. Mr. Milley and the speeches of the Hon. Mr. Robinson in seconding that address, and upon the second reading of this Bill.

Hon. Mr. Milley referred, as many of the speakers in both Houses this session have referred, to the need of economy at this time—public and private economy. Is economy being practised? Has the Government given a lead? Perhaps they have tried. What must be the result of a continued neglect of organized economy? I reply —bad times to the fisherman, the merchant and the Government, and an increase in taxation. Seriously increased taxation, if laid upon the great mass of the population, would be dangerous and would tend to drive many of the most ambitious and active away from our shore would encourage them to emigrate where their industry and ambitions would find a more congenial field. On the other hand, heavy taxation on capital is likely to be equally injurious. It is quite certain to prevent the influx of new capital and to cause the withdrawal of old capital (so far as it can free itself) to move elsewhere, and develop prosperity and enterprise in some other country. This would reduce employment and speculative competition for the Colony's products, and the result would be disastrous and would bring the same result, public poverty, commercial stagnation, and depopulation.

It is quite possible that some day in the distant future the present capitalistic framework of society and industry may be superseded by some other scheme, but this will be a matter of generations, and today there is in sight no alternative principle. There can hardly be a doubt but that for the near future no country, especially an undeveloped country, can hope to prosper or even to get along at all without reasonable encouragement to capital both to enter and to remain.

It may be that this forecast of the effect of a complete failure to adopt conscious economy may be incorrect or exaggerated. I speak from my own convictions. There are two distinct and opposite views firmly expressed today by economic writers and thinkers. There are those who believe that the destruction both of material and of men through the war, the suspension of activity in agriculture and manufacture, must be followed by a period of extraordinary activity and an enormous demand for men and merchandise, which will bring a great boom when the war is over. It is possible that this may be so. It will depend upon a solution of the financial problem. But even this convalescing period of activity must be followed by a fierce competition. Production will be stimulated by a kind of organization and of personal efficiency, such as has never been experienced before. Eventually over-production combined with over-competition will certainly tend to bring on bad times. In other words, even adopting the theory of a boom after the war, this boom probably will be temporary, and the reaction must follow before long.

The other school of thought, which I personally believe to be the correct one, looks for great depression almost as soon as the war ceases. The abnormal currency inflation is based, in every belligerent nation, except England, upon what under ordinary circumstances would be considered unsound finance. The unprecedented ex-

penditure of borrowed money must bring a collapse of commerce and credit and prices at the end of the war, as far as most of Europe is concerned.

It is possible that this may be modified by international acceptance of some new form of fiduciary currency. I think the economic world is sooner or later not unlikely to arrive at something of this kind. There seems no particular reason why the medium of exchange should forever be based upon gold although to-day all international differences must be settled in that metal; and it seems as if under the gold regime trade must become, as between Europe and America, enormously restricted, with depressing effects upon both sides. Some substitution for gold, perhaps in the shape of a paper medium guaranteed internationally by Governments and bankers, and based upon the actual wealth and assets of each nation, may eventuate and under some new devolopment of the differences between nations, thus stimulating international commerce, upon which ,to so large an extent, the future of civilization depends.

However, this development must, even if practical, be a matter of slow growth, and it can only come as a result of difficulties made evident and solvable through hard experience. However this may be, we have at the present time an enormous increase in borrowing by all European Governments, and a large amount of this borrowing is done through the agency of Great Britain she being either the actual lender herself, or being the guarantor of such loans.

I must pause here one moment to note how absolutely marvellous are the activities of that little Island in the North Sea, which we call the Motherland, how beyond all imagination is the effort that has been put forth. We hear much of the extraordinary doings of Germany. They are extraordinary, but does her accomplishment distantly touch what England has done? Positively, no. In genius of race the Germans are nowhere. After forty years of concentration and stealthy effort, directed to one object, Germany has finally essayed the sudden destruction of the world dominance of the Anglo-Saxon race. That race was unprepared, unorganized, unsuspecting, unready, tramelled and hampered by weaknesses inherent in its constitution and character. Those weaknesses the nation itself admits, and indeed in some instances,they are infirmities in which it can glory. But they still are or appear to be real weaknesses when confronted with stark brutality, ruthlessness and dishonor. That nation is to-day policing and protecting every peace-loving community, every ocean, every continent. It is not only that England has created her new armies, not only that she dominates all the world with her ships, that she still carries most of the commerce for every nation, but that nearly every country in Europe is being financed by her. Her credit is bearing it all, and her credit will continue to do so until the war is over.

How will it be after that? To-day Great Britain enables France, Russia, Italy to buy and trade. That she and they can buy and trade keeps Spain and Portugal solvent, and enables them to buy and trade. When the inflation stops, when the process has to be reversed, when the task is accomplished ,and this credit has to be withdrawn what will be the position, particularly as regards the Mediterranean countries. There must be great depression, and that depression must affect this side of the world, and especially such countries as Brazil. I think it may become difficult for Portugal, Spain, Italy, and Greece to find money to pay for imports,including even im-

ported food stuffs, such as fish; and although the difficulty will have to be got over in some way, it is likely to bring about a lowering of values and many difficulties. This is one of the directions in which Hon. Mr. Milley's proposal of a Trade Commissioner in London may be of great service to us. It is pretty certain that after the war there will be some preferential trade arrangements made between the allied nations in which Italy and Portugal will be direct participants. Furthermore, a partial commercial union between these allied nations will probably tend towards arrangements with other countries also, one of which will probably be Spain, and another possibly Greece. The Colony has only to ask, to be admitted indirectly (possibly directly) into such post-war negotiations. Even the French attitude to British fishery products may change. The value of a competent representative resident in the heart of things is likely to be of great importance to this Colony in the near future. Much, of course, depends upon the right man. If he can be obtained we certainly ought to have him.

But taking the post-war problem more generally, the one great question is really Education, the subject with which this Bill deals. Given any community economically sound, and sufficiently conservative to maintain economic soundness as a first principle, there remains always one great thing—Education. It covers every other field, it controls and creates the future. The educationalist is the most important factor in the community.

It is easy to criticise of course. There is great genius in Newfoundland for criticism. The Colony ought to economise. It is not easy, but it ought to economise to prevent any necessity for such a rate of taxation by and by, as will tend to drive out either labor or capital; and secondly, in order that we may have the wherewithal to increase our expenditure upon education. This is a proposition with which nearly everybody will agree. The question is the old puzzle —how? Well! that is a question that I do not pretend to be able to answer, but thinking along Mr. Milley's lines this occurs to me: Would it be possible and is the time opportune, to appoint a commission to study the broad problems of the Colony, with special reference to the economising of its resources and to the development of its education? If it is, then I submit to the opinion of hon. members whether such a commission, with full powers of investigation and examination,and with means placed at its disposal to do its work thoroughly, might not help to solve our problem. The work would have to receive the fullest co-operation from the Government departments and officials, and the Commission should have the right of access to departmental records and employees. Its report should be assured of a sympathetic and interested examination by the legislature, indeed provision should be made that, upon the presentation of a report, the definite proposals of the commission should be formally moved in the shape of Resolutions, in order to insure full consideration and discussion, even if they were likely to be rejected. I am sorry to say that sound work on the part of committees is now often lost through want of general interest. How many of the reports laid upon the table of the House are ever read and studied? I have in mind for instance, the educational reports such as that of the joint committee upon the fisheries tabled last session, such reports as those of the commission on public health, a careful and thoughtful perusal of which would, in my opinion, have saved the Colony considerable expenditure. I think that most of the more

important reports presented here, the educational reports, the report of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, the report of the Marine and Fisheries' Department, etc., should be introduced and spoken to, even if done briefly, by someone for the Government, so that hon. members, even if they do not trouble to study them, shall at least know something of their contents .

If such a Commission, as I undersand Mr. Milley also has in mind, were appointed, it should be small in numbers and at the same time representative. There should be an appointed member for each House, a commercial man, a representative of the Fishermen's Union, a journalist, and an educationalist.

It seems to me that there is a chance that some solution of the problem might be worked out by such a body, and it would at least be an intelligent effort in time of war towards preparation for peace .

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—I beg to move that in section 6, sub-section E the last eight words be omitted so that the section will stop at the word "remedied." This section defines carefully the functions and powers of Boards of Education. Many of the duties are of a character that financial reasons render it impossible to carry out but I presume the object of this section is to provide powers which the Board may be called upon to exercise in the near future and so obviate the necessity for amendments hereafter. In sub-section E is laid down distinctly and broadly that one of the duties of the Board shall be to prepare and to transmit to the proper Superintendent correct annual returns of all schools under its control together with a detailed statement of its accounts duly audited according to Schedule C of this Act. There is a penalty attached to it, a most reasonable one; any Board neglecting to transmit such returns and statement of accounts on or before the first day of September in each year shall, on the recommendation of the proper Superintendent, whose duty it shall be to make such representation within one month of the said date, be precluded from receiving further payments until such defaults shall be remedied. That,Sir, is a very reasonable condition. In other words, you must either give a return of your accounts properly audited or get no more grants. I think that a most fair provision; there is nothing arbitrary about it. If there is any difficulty, any special reason for delay, the Superintendents have discretionary power. Now the conclusion of the section is "unless the Governor in Council shall otherwise order." Why should the Governor in Council have this power? I think the Governor in Council has sufficient to do already, and it would tend greatly towards the lessening of efficiency if a rule of that kind were made hard and fast. Let the accounts be sent in or the grants be withheld. If there is any reason for delay, the Superintendents of Education have discretionary power. I regard these words as unjust to the Governor in Council and as opening of the door to abuses.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I understand the hon. Mr. Robinson intends to move other amendments to other sections of this Bill ,and to facilitate the passing of the Act, and also for the better information of hon. members, it appears to me desirable that we should know what his other amendments may be before we vote upon any particular section, and I move that the vote on this section be deferred and we proceed with the Bill until we learn what other amendments are to be proposed.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—On subsection W., Section 6—I am not going

to propose an amendment to this section but would draw attention to the fact that this section is imperative. How could the chairman of a Board in a small place, provide a place in which to keep title deeds and properties belonging to the Board? Would it not be wiser and more effectual if it was arranged to have such deeds sent up to the Registry in St. John's to be kept in safety there? Perhaps the hon. leader will give this some attention with a view to having it better arranged. Sub-section x—if these were not war days, when this Colony like other parts of the Empire is faced with very serious problems I should have introduced a sweeping amendment to that sub-section. I think that it is the inalienable right or should be, of every child in this country, to receive the rudiments of education free, and as a complement to that I think it is imperative that compulsory education, so far as elementary subjects are concerned should be introduced. My sole object, then, for not bringing in an amendment to this section at the present time is that it would upset educational finances, at a time when instead of increasing expenditure we should be retrenching to make up for deficiencies in the general revenue. Therefore I shall content myself by introducing an amendment which I think will commend itself to every member in this Chamber. I propose that Section six,sub-section x be amended as follows: Insert after the word "provided," page eight, fourth line, the words "that fatherless children shall be exempted from the payment of fees in all public schools and provided further." Heavy burdens are placed on the widows and there are so many widows in this Newfoundland of ours, sixty or a hundred every year paying "the price of Admiralty." Generally these widows are treated by the Boards kindly and generously and their school fees are remitted but under this section they can only be remitted on the ground of poverty. The term "poverty" is a very elastic one; different people have different views of what poverty means. I am perfectly aware that some may say that no cases have happened in which poor widows have been charged with children's schooling, but I can assure you,Sir,there have been cases. It would surprise this House to know there are cases where children who are recipients of assistance from the Marine Disasters Fund find their small gratuities lessened by the amount of their school fees. I do not suppose many members can believe that that is so, but I can assure them from personal knowledge that it is so. There are cases where people in this country, and outside it, have liberally subscribed to relieve the burdens of widows and help them to educate their children, and local school boards in some few—happily very few—cases have not been willing to share the burden of helping to the extent of the remission of these fees. Surely it is a heavy enough burden for a widow to bear the loss of the bread winner, without finding it necessary to have to pay for their children's education. In this matter is it not a privilege as well as a duty for Boards to stand in loco parentis? And surely it is not necessary to saddle such people with the name of "poverty." I claim for the fatherless children of this country, if the parent desires it, the right of free education in all the public schools of the Colony. I am saying nothing about high schools; I am talking about the public schools as defined under this Act, and beg to move the amendment.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I assume it is the intention of the hon. member to make it obligatory upon the Board to charge no fees for the children of

widows who are in poverty, because there may be widows who may be abundantly able to educate their children. I have sympathy with the idea that needy widows should be entitled to free education for their children,but the amendment of the hon. gentleman would have the intention of having all children of widows, no matter what their circumstances may be, educated free.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—In the outports of this country there are very few widows left behind with little children who are in a position to bear that burden. Those who are well-to-do I am not pleading for; they will have their children very quickly availing of the higher education. All I plead for is the three R's. If the amendment can be changed in any way so as to define who are rich and who are poor, all right, but I claim, not as a privilege, but as a right, free education for the children of poor widows.

On Section 17, I have two amendments to offer to that section, (1) that the words "shall not be established without the approval in writing of each of the proper superintendents, and" be stricken out, and that the words "six months" be changed to "twelve months." As the section now stands, it is giving something with one hand, and taking it away with the other. Section 16 says if any boards decide they want a common school they can have it; section seventeen says they cannot have it without the permission of the Superintendents of education. There are many places in Newfoundland where schools might be established, if the will of the people were accepted, that are disallowed by the will of the authorities I am sufficiently democratic to believe that the people of a community know their own requirements. If they desire to have one school and can come to an agreement to have it, they are the ones to have it, and should not be tied up to the will and pleasure of any outside parties. I know I am getting on very dangerous ground, and I shall be told I am preaching non-sectarian schools. I am doing nothing of the kind. I am preaching what has been on the Statute Book for many years, but has been a dead letter.

I am not going to push these amendments at the present sitting. I have other amendments to offer and I hope hon. members will think over the matter seriously and this would apply most particularly to those places where there are various members of the Protestant denominations. As I said I recognize the fact that we will not get Roman Catholic and Protestant Schools to unite unless in extremely rare cases; but there is no earthly reason for throwing obstacles in the way of the Church of England, Methodist,Presbyterian. Salvation Army or Congregationalists having a united school if they want it. This Act in its present form makes that exceedingly difficult; it overrides the provisions of Section 16 by section 17, and the desires of the people are left to the decision of the very able Superintendents, who necessarily may have views in connection with the subject, right enough from their standpoint, but which will militate against the interests of the small places concerned. I also ask that 12 months be substituted for 6 as the necessary notice for reversion to the separate schools, where joint schools have been established by consent.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I have been informed that the establishment of one school in localities where it was desired that amalgamation, denominationally, should take place, was decided upon after conference and consultation with the heads of the different religious denominations. This section 17, and the other connected therewith, were adhered to as a result of the

agreement arrived at. I submit it would be unfair to us to be a party to a breach of this agreement made as a result of the mutual understanding arrived at. It would be injudicious on our part to set aside the arrangement made and observed up to the present. There is no public request or demand that the arrangement should be altered, and I consider that it would be going contrary to the expressed desire of those in whose hands rests the proper direction of our educational system. Education is a question of very serious moment, not alone to us, but to all people no matter where they may reside, because upon its proper development rest the foundation of law, order and morality, the relations between man and man and nation and nation. Everything should be done to uplift it, keeping in view, however, not alone the material, but the moral aspect of it as well. If we fail to keep both before our minds when dealing with the question, then it may become a curse instead of a blessing. One of the difficulties connected with education in this country, is that our people have not appreciated to the fullest extent the absolute necessity of it. Until the population of this country in every hamlet and settlement recognizes the great value of education, we are not going to have that interest taken in its growth and development so necessary to its success. The first essential for success is that the community as a whole should have a thorough estimate of the nature and advantages of education—"Has the community as a whole formed a thorough and proper estimate of the value and necessity of it?" We are forced to answer in the negative. This accounts in a great measure for the neglect of education in certain portions of the country. We can only adjust matters, not in a violent way, but in such a manner that the people will not feel that they are being driven to it. Our duty is to bring home to the minds of the people the necessity for greater growth and development.

The Honourable member on my left has stated some facts connnected with illiteracy existing in this country, which are not at all creditable to us, but I do not think the facts stated by him lead to the conclusions that he deduces. He read an abstract from the census returns and showed that the number of children between the age of 5 and 15 is given at 60,540 and 40,247, as attending schools, whereas the number of children attending during the school year of 1911 was over 50,000, so that the actual figures are that a little over 10,000 children throughout the Island were not attending school, and not 19,823, as recorded in the census. Another feature in this connection which calls for comment is that the casual reader of the census figures would infer that the number given as not attending school means that such children had not and have finished with it. In fact, I need hardly point out, that in the city of St. John's itself, numbers of boys who are able to compete in school subjects with most boys of their ages anywhere are at work in offices, factories, stores or machine shops, before having completed their fifteenth year. Then, again, it is a well known fact, especially in this country, and in many others, that many children of the age of five years are not able to read nor write, and consequently starting from five years is not a fair way to estimate the standard of the country from an educational standpoint. It follows, as matter of logic, that if you take the number of children from five to seven, or from five to six, who are not attending school, you will get a very much less percentage than that referred to by the Honourable member, which is not a fair test to apply.

Then, again, there are numbers of people between the ages of fifty and over ninety who in their young days did not have any facilities afforded them to obtain an education. If, therefore, you look at the numbers of people who are old, and of the children between the ages of five and seven, you will find that the figures quoted by the Honourable gentleman are not accurate. They are accurate from his standpoint because they are taken from the census, but I have shown that the census returns are incorrect, and I think that a comparison of the school attendance in this country will compare favourably with that of any other. I make that statement without fear of successful contradiction. According to the figures given in the census the percentage of population on the school roll for the year 1911 would be 18.78, but according to the school reports the correct percentage for that year was approximately 21.07. In the Province of Alberta the percentage is 16. 53 of the population. British Columbia is 15.08, Manitoba 15.7, New Brunswick 19.16, Nova Scotia 21.12, Ontario 18.22, Quebec 21.13. The percentage attending the local schools also compares favorably with many of the European countries. The greater number of peple unable to read and write are to be found among the older class, because at the time when they came to the country, or were born here, conditions were such, as did not demand of them that they should be educated. They settled in remote parts of the country, made a good living, some of them accumulating large sums of money without the aid of education, and as a result the necessity of it was not brought home to their minds, because of their associations, environment, and ability to earn a living without being the possessors of education. To that in a large measure is due illiteracy from an educational standpoint in this country among a number of people.

The Hon. member cited a case of men coming to him to have a protest drawn up, and when asked to sign it, they stated they could neither read nor write, but that in the place they came from there was a good school which they might have availed of, but did not. That bears out my argument, that the necessity of education has not arisen to the same extent in this country as in others, and that its essentiality has not been brought home to the minds of the people as fully and completely as it should be. All of us are responsible in a certain measure for the indifference which exists in certain parts of the country with regard to this matter. What we want is a campaign for education. My Hon. friend, Mr. Harvey, conducted a very successful campaign of education here a few years ago, against tuberculosis, for which he deserves the thanks of the community, a campaign that brought home to the people the necessity of doing certain things, whereby the health of themselves and their offspring may be better conserved and their lives made more happy. What was the result? There was a complete revolution from one end of the country to the other in the treatment and care of tuberculosis. That is only an illustration of what can be done by individual effort.

I went among the laborers of this city some years ago and organized them into trades and labour organizations, and after I had welded them together and secured concessions for them, I found I had to stay with them, and why? Because after the organization of different Unions, I found that large quantities of Socialistic literature was coming into this country from the headquarters of International Socialism in the United States and was finding its way into the hands of the

workmen and into their homes. As few of them understood the aims of Socialism, I foresaw that the reading of such literature would arouse unjust antagonism to capital, and be a menace to law and order. I felt it incumbent upon me as a well-wisher of the present order of society, week after week, month after month, and year after year, to explain to them by addresses and lectures the aim of socialism, the principles that underlie it, the danger to the State if they adopted it, and the evil effects upon society at large, the danger from a moral standpoint. If I had left those men to be the prey of Socialists and to become inoculated with the virus of Socialism, I would have felt all my work had been in vain, and that labour organizations, instead of being a blessing, would prove a curse. I only point this out as an illustration of what can be done by conducting a campaign of education upon certain lines of thought and upon subjects that we should all understand. If we were to undertake a campaign for education's sake, to point out to every boy and girl the necessity of going to school, we would very soon have an educational standard of a very high order. Some think our present system is not all that can be desired, that there is room for great improvement. This none will deny. The weakest spot, however, is the lack of properly qualified teachers and until we have made up our minds to have them, and are prepared to pay the price, we cannot expect a great improvement. By our own actions, educationally, we fix the standard of remuneration of a school teacher. Suppose that any Honourable member were to select some qualified person to teach his children, would he give him as great a wage as the accountant in his office, or the wharfinger on his premises? He would not. The accountant would perhaps get double or treble the salary he would give to the person in whose hands he places the development of the intellect of his children. We thus, fix a lower standard of remuneration to the persons who are moulding the lives of our future citizens. A great deal of criticism is heard with regard to the educational standard of boys and girls who are attending school and who leave it. We are not the only ones backward in this way. The same thing applies elsewhere, where very large sums of money are spent on education. It is only a couple of days ago I happened to take up a report of the address by the President of the New York Board of Education, in one portion of which he says—"There never was since the nation was born so widespread and definite a protest against the failure of our schools. Cities misgoverned, public lands stolen, whole precincts selling their votes, juvenile crime increasing, colleges bending their necks for the yoke of the rich man's foundations, periodicals reeking with salacity; the drama smothered with sex-madness, and prominent employers informing the newspapers that the school children can neither read nor write nor spell, heads of state departments of education confessing that the 'lives of school children are wasted'— all these things are weakening the American faith in public education."

This is the report of a portion of the address of the President of the Board of Education of one of the richest cities in the world. These are his strictures upon education there, where they spend more money upon it than perhaps any other part of the world. The same thing applies in many other places as well.

The President of the College of Texas writing in the New York Times a couple of months ago in response to a circular sent out by that jour-

nal to the different educational institutions of the United States for the purpose of finding the weakness in the system of that country, says:

"The most serious defect I have found in the training of preparatory students is in English composition. Very few students that enter college know the mechanical side of English. I am sure there is a need for more English composition and theme writing in the later preparatory years. The most general defect of secondary methods of instructions is the failure on the part of the teacher to recognize the relative importance of the subject matter. For example, about equal stress is given in geometry to the proposition that will not recur again in the student's school life as to the proposition or theorem that he will meet repeatedly in his higher mathematics. History, Latin, and the other subjects are taught with about the same lack of relative importance on essentials. The result is that the student comes up to college with no knowledge of perspective. This makes college subjects difficult and is responsible for many failures in the freshman year."

There is another complainant, the Founder and Executive Secretary of the National Association of Corporate schools of the United States, who said recently "that lack of general knowledge on the part of apprentices is appalling. In one examination a telephone girl wrote, that Philadelphia, Buffalo and Massachusetts were the principal cities of New York State. Another noted down in response to a question that the principal product of New York was rice, while a third gravely stated that the Erie Canal was constructed to give a shorter route to the West Indies." These answers were given by applicants for positions. I do not think that the average boy or girl attending school in this city and in the principal outport schools would show less proficiency, in fact I am convinced they would show greater.

It will be observed from the foregoing extracts I have read that we are not so backward, educationally, as some imagine, more especially, if we look at the matter from the view-point that the countries referred to are spending enormous sums of money in trying to better their system of education If we take the trouble to institute a comparison between the amount of money spent upon elementary education here, with that spent in some of the Canadian Provinces, we will see how small the amount is and what great value we are getting. The expenditure upon elementary education in this country is but $1.22 per head of the population. In the German Empire, to which the hon. the leader of the Government has referred the amount is $2.56. In Great Britain it is $3.24. In the Canadian Provinces, Alberta,the amount per enrollment is $33.81, and per head of the population $5.58. In British Columbia, per school enrollment $77.18, per capita of the population $10.26. In Manitoba per school enrollment $33.97, and per capita of the population $5.59. In the Eastern Provinces such as New Brunswick, they spend per school enrollment $13.63 and per head of population the expenditure is equal to $2.67, more than double ours; but nevertheless our school attendance is as great proportionally, and in some respects greater than many of the places named. For instance in the Provinces of Alberta the average attendance is 52.08 of the population, Saskatchewan 53.06, ours is 59 per cent. Ontario, schools of all classes, 60.84. Quebec 77.53. So that in point of school attendance

we can boast of a much greater attendance according to population than some of the Provinces of Canada, where they are spending five and six hundred per cent. more on elementary education than we are. It may be asked: "How are we able to get so much done upon a small per-capita grant?" The reason is that so many people in this country, notably, the clergymen of the different denominations give their time and attention to the cause and advancement of education without remuneration. The work done by the people, generally, in the building and equipping of schools is free. If we had to pay the expenses connected with this and for the services rendered, it would mean a very large annual outlay upon the part of the state, in addition to that already spent. Very few of us take into consideration the splendid work done by school boards throughout the Island, the emulation and rivalry that exist among all classes of people for building better schools and helping along the cause of education generally. If we abolish those boards, what have we to take their places? True, we could provide machinery, but it would be very expensive, and we would not alone have to make provision for the School Board, but shoulder the cost of building and equipping schools throughout the island, work which is now largely done by our people free. To give some illustrations of how much is being accomplished with so little money, take the denomination of which I am a member. In Harbor Breton the total school grant there is $1,328, and with that they must maintain nine schools and nine teachers. Notwithstanding the smallness of the grant, the schools are well equipped and in first class repair. A couple of the school teachers are of the higher grade, and the schools are kept open throughout the whole school year. With the grant of $1,328 they have maintained, not alone the schools themselves but during the past few years they have erected school buildings at a cost of not less than $5,000. Another place is , Port au Port Peninsula. I know the locality very well. The grant for that place is about $1,400,and out of that they have to maintain eight schools and pay the teachers. Notwithstanding the smallness of the grant, this is done, and in addition, buildings costing not less than $6,500, have been erected within the past few years. In the Bay of Islands there are eleven schools maintained upon a grant of $2,500 and the school buildings are in first class order suitably equipped, and in addition nearly $20,000 have been spent in the Bay upon the erection of new school buildings. I am now speaking of the work of the religious denomination of which I am a member. The reason we are getting so much value out of so little money, is because of the fact that we have so many people who are giving their time, energy and money, free, to promote the growth of education. That we are not spending sufficient money upon education, none can deny, and if we want a higher educational standard, we must be prepared to pay the bill. Personally, I would like to see every poor boy and girl in this country, if they so desire. getting the benefit of a University Education, but this is not possible and not probable in the very near future. In the country, where the hon. member, Mr. Anderson, came from, Scotland, every boy, no matter what the circumstances of himself or his parents may be in life, can get a University Education free. It is because of the advanced system of education in Scotland

that we find that this country is at least a half a century ahead in this particular, of either England or Ireland. If schools were made free, and we had University Education, such as they have in Scotland, then if a boy be bright and clever, neither the poverty of himself nor his parents would debar him from qualifying for the higher professions, and I hope to see the day when this will be the case We require educated men in every walk of life, no matter whether they be fishermen, or mechanics, we want them in the public life of this country. It is a good principle to start with that every boy and girl should know the three R's., but if we stop there, our standard of education will be very backward. The education of the youth of the country must not stop with a mere knowledge of the three Rs.; we must and should aim higher. In developing the human body, if you develop the arms and the legs solely, and leave the other parts of the body untouched, you will have an ill-developed, ill-shaped being. So it is with education. If you only develop the lower structure of education, that is a knowledge of reading, writing and arithmetic, and do not go higher, then we will have an ill-developed system of education. The brain, so to speak, is the part that radiates through the whole of the body. It directs and controls the movements of every limb and muscle; so it is with the college or the university. The higher branches of studies taught in them direct and control the world's movements, industrially and commercially. The way in which we treat educational matters, shows that we do not appreciate it to the extent we should and this applies to all classes, to those who are supposed to be educated as well.

I remember not very long ago, the Government wanted to get an office for the Paymaster of the Newfoundland Contingent whose work consisted solely in paying the members of the regiment their weekly pay. On looking around for an office they came to the conclusion that the office of one of the Inspectors of Schools would be a suitable place. The Inspector was to be turned out and the Paymaster of the Regiment installed. It never occurred to the members of the Government that this Inspector was attending to the wants, educationally of hundreds of schools, some sixteen or seventeen thousand pupils; while the Paymaster of the Regiment could do the work required of him in about ten hours a week, and the paying of the men would not take two hours. Of course, it was want of thought or appreciation of the fact that the School Inspector is one of the most valuable servants of the country. It did not occur to them that the work he was conducting and the correspondence he had to carry on, the records he had to keep in order that his work might be well and effectively done, rendered an office absolutely necessary. I merely mention this to show that we do not appreciate what is required with regard to this grave public matter. And the same thing may be applied to each of us individually. Ask ourselves the question, "Are we doing our part, individually, in advancing the cause of education here?" and if we are not, then what should we do in order that it may be elevated to a higher standard? We should first be prepared to pay a higher bill and the investment would be a good one. We should commence at once the campaign for education, and if we do, then we will get the people as a whole, to appreciate the fact that education is absolutely necessary, almost as necessary as the air we breathe. It is

only by bringing this fact home to their minds as forcibly as possible that we will get that higher standard referred to by hon. members.

No one doubts the sincerity of the hon. member in moving the amendment. and his desire to improve matters educationally. He has had a long experience and from his experience and knowledge he sees the weak spots in our system, and while I do not altogether agree with all he says from an educational standpoint, yet no one questions his good motives, but the wisdom of making an amendment of this character is, in my opinion, not warranted by the circumstances.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

Hon. President acquainted the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly a - quainting him that they had passed the following Bills:—The Companies (Government Guarantee) Act, 1916, Bill; the Inflammable Substances Bill; and the Patents (Operation) Act, 1916 Bill, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion, these Bills were read a first time and were ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—I beg leave to suggest that to facilitate the despatch of the business of the Chamber, that in future the sessions open at 4, instead of 4.30 p.m.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till 4 p.m. to-morrow, Tuesday, April 18th.

TUESDAY April 18.

The House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

MARRIAGE FACILITY BILL

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Marriage of British Subjects Facilitation Bill, Hon. Mr. Goodridge in the chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—This Bill is intended to carry out an idea which has prevailed for some time, that districts in outports should have the right to elect their own Boards of Control of public funds. For a number of years past in the district of Burin they have had local Councils which have worked admirably, and there is less friction in that district over the expenditure of public funds than in any other part of the country. It is to be hoped that with the provision which is now made, that all the districts and settlements which have the authority, will select the best men to manage their public affairs and expend public moneys ,and if it results as well as it has done in Burin, it will be found to be a very excellent Bill. I beg to move its second reading.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to be submitted to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

SHIPBUILDING BILL.

Second reading of the Shipbuilding Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—This Bill is really a very important measure. The building of vessels in this country in recent years has fallen away tremendously, so that scarcely a vessel has been built during the past three or four years, and a very large sum of money has been leaving here annually for the purchase of vessels of medium sizes from the neighboring Provinces. It is considered that it is a great misfortune that this be so, and that a very earnest attempt should be made to induce people to engage in

shipbuilding on perhaps a larger scale than heretofore, by establishing shipbuilding yards. The provisions of the Bill are, at first sight, perhaps rather striking, and the encouragement which the Government has decided to give to those prepared to engage in it, is very great, and if the inducements offered in the Bill do not result in a considerable number of vessels being built hereafter in this country, then it certainly will not be for lack of sufficient encouragement. The bounties which are available at present are ,according to the Bill, being doubled, whereas the better class of vessels subject to the bounty heretofore, have been passed by surveyor and entitled to a bounty of $8 per ton, they will now be entitled to $16 per ton. In addition to that the material required, plank, spars and other outfitting material, will be admitted free of duty. Furthermore, any persons or company establishing shipbuilding yards will upon the capital embarked in the enterprise, up to the amount of $30,000, receive a guarantee from the Government of 7 per cent .upon the capital invested for the term of 15 years. As I remarked at the first, this appears to be drastic, but it is for a specific purpose, and in the hope that many thousands of dollars leaving here for the purpose of getting vessels from Nova Scotia will remain in this country, and it will afford employment to our people, and that they will turn out the necessary number of ships for the prosecution of our fisheries.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—It affords me great pleasure to support the second reading of this Bill, which I regard as being one of the greatest importance. I have always been an enthusiastic supporter of local shipbuilding, but this Bill has exceeded even my expectations. In my opinion it goes to extreme lengths, but I am not inclined to alter that in any way, but it appears to me that the Government assumes a great responsibility in granting 7 per cent. for 15 years. In the old days considerable shipbuilding was done in Twillingate, which I had the honour to represent. They were then satisfied with a moderate bounty, one half of what is now proposed. It was not the bounty that was the drawback, but the fact that shipbuilders had to pay duty on their materials. I see this Bill goes much further, and not only doubles the bounty, but allows building materials in duty free. I suppose this is a matter which we have no right to amend in this Chamber. I reiterate that the Government has gone to extreme lengths in its liberality and I only hope that all that we had in former days will be restored by this legislation. I see no reason why we cannot build all the ships for our requirements as well here as in Nova Scotia. We have just as good facilities here, and I am told by those who know, that we have some material which is just as good as British oak and will last as long. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of this measure.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I might say with regard to the importation of articles used in shipbuilding, we have included here on the free of duty list, a number of articles which might be made in this country. I have very little faith in shipbuilding in this country, for nearly everything necessary has to be imported. I noticed in to-day's "News" a letter relating to shipbuilding in 1793, and even then they had to import spars and planking of various kinds for those vessels, and if they had to do so then, what must it be now when our forests have been depleted of nearly everything necessary to build anything like reasonably sized vessels. I think the Government are acting extremely lib-

eraliy and are making a bold attempt to encourage shipbuilding in this country, and the attempt is certainly a laudable one, but as to its being a success, I have my doubts, owing to nearly everything we need having to be imported. Machinery can be bought in Nova Scotia for half what it can be got here. Amongst the articles given full importation in section 7 are windlasses. Now for years past firms here have been engaged in the manufacture of windlasses, etc., and why should they be allowed in duty free when pumps are not? Why should there be discrimination there? The only articles dutiable are wooden pumps and blocks. I do not see any serious objection to it, but I imagine all these things could be made here, although, of course, it costs more to manufacture here than anywhere else. You cannot get pig iron here as cheaply as you can in Montreal or Nova Scotia, and then coal, too, is a serious item which enters largely into the manufacture of these things. It appears to me, however, everything manufactured here should be used.

HON. MR. HARVEY—With reference to what the hon. gentleman has just said about the free entry of these things such as windlasses, it occurs to me there is practically no shipbuilding in this country to-day; it has died right out. Now, if anything will revive it this Bill will. It is the most extraordinarily favourable Bill it would be possible to pass, and what I would point out to the hon. gentleman is that if it results in the starting of one or two or half a dozen shipbuilding yards in this country, it will create a demand for windlasses and other things, and the time will then come when the manufacturer of them can be protected, and there will be more demand for his employment than at present. The amount of assistance given here is really quite extraordinary. I am not objecting to it, but it really is extraordinary. At first there is a guarantee of seven per cent. on capital, then a bounty of $20 on the vessel, and when you reckon that the cost of building in Nova Scotia is $70 to $73 per ton, and this bonus is $20 per ton, that means nearly thirty per cent. of the total cost of the ship, and then the dividend is guaranteed also. There is one aspect of the shipbuilding situation which I would like to refer to very shortly, and that is lumber. Shipbuilding, if it is to be of real value to the country, must go hand in hand with the development of the lumber industry. I am of opinion that the lumbering laws of the country need overhauling. I have had great hopes that my hon. friend, Mr. Murphy, who has great experience in lumbering, would have made it his business to overhaul our lumbering and timber laws and try to evolve something more practical than they are at the present moment. There is no question at all that the supply of large timber has become somewhat depleted. There is no doubt that if a great deal of the small wood were cut out scientifically it would improve the growth immensely. If cut scientifically you could go on cutting indefinitely without in the least depleting the forests. Now a man wants to go in the country and cut so many spars, knees, &c. If it is not cut in a properly developed lumbering country, it is going to cost him several times more than if he were entitled to go and cut these things intelligently. He could bring out a certain amount of pulp wood, and a large amount of material which at present he is unable to bring out, and thus cheapen the cost of the wood in shipbuilding. I am safe in saying you cannot separate this Bill entirely from lumbering, which is at present very unsatisfactory and discouraging to people who have tried to develop our forest wealth. It is not possible to

deal with this at present, but it ought to be borne in mind.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I take exception to the first section of this Bill. I should like to know by what force of reasoning section 2 has been arrived at. No amount within reason with respect to the encouragement of shipbuilding can be objected to, but so far as my memory and knowledge goes, no company has ever been subsidized in this country before to such an extent. I speak subject to correction. I do not know why we should depart from this now. The atmosphere has been made blue with shouts about "grab-alls," "greedy capitalists," those making money out of the people of the Colony. Now a guarantee of 7 per cent. on capital for a large number of years is proposed. Why? I venture to say, Mr. President, if this Bill was introduced here or in the Lower House in the interest of any of the so-called "graball merchants" of the country, or any of the established institutions of the Colony, it would have no chance whatever of passing, but would be denounced in all the moods and tenses of vituperation. I do not denounce the Bill on that account, I say give all the encouragement you can to shipbuilding, but I do strongly protest against granting such a rate of interest which is not warranted by present circumstances, a rate more than double that given by the Government Savings Bank. It seems to me a most extraordinary proposition to make to a legislature. I shall ask the Leader of the Government when we come down to-morrow whether he can tell us of any other capitalistic industry in this country subsidized for a larger amount than five per cent. There may be, but I do not know of it. Being a money bill, I presume it is impossible to bring in any amendments to it, and with the principle of the Bill I am in full accord, but I do not think we should allow a Bill of this kind to go through without some protest against this guarantee of 7 per cent. to anybody. It is a very serious precedent to establish, and if once carried you will have to do it right along. We have enough to face now. I think all the Bill aims at will be gained without placing on the Statute Book a precedent which will be availed of in other years by other concerns.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on the morrow.

HERRING FISHERY BILL.

Second reading of the Herring Fishery Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—It is intended by this proposed legislation to effect a means whereby we may hope to extend the operations of the herring fishery and make it a much more profitable enterprise than it ever has been. Markets can be found for very large quantities of herring if packed, cured and shipped by what is known as the "Scotch method." An attempt was made several years ago with varying success. Some who tried this business had to abandon it, and no money has been made by packing herring by the Scotch method down to the present time. There are, however, a few packers in the country who have stuck to this business for several years, and who are now, I believe, in a fair way of making it a successful venture. During the past season owing to war conditions and the almost entire cessation of the herring fishery around the coast of England, very few herring were available for exportation to the United States, which uses that fish in immense quantities. The imports therefore into the United States during the past year have been trifling as compared with previous years. This would seem to be a favourable opportunity for the fishermen to embark much more largely than before in the catching and preparing of herring by the Scotch method and many

thousands of herring were caught and packed during the past season. It is regrettable therefore, that in the majority of cases, the quality of the fish was found to be entirely inferior in many ways, and the result has been that they have been sold at prices which, if it left a profit to the fishermen, which it did in most cases—and the loss did not fall on them—caused a serious loss to some person connected with this fishery. That, however, has not been the most serious part, for Newfoundland Scotch cured herring has obtained a bad name in consequence, and many thousands which ought to have realized in the American market ten dollars per barrel, have been seling for five to six dollars, and I know of one instance where 500 half barrels of Newfoundland Scotch cure, were sold a short time ago at $1.50 per half barrel. The Bill prepared, which we are now considering, is framed with the idea that some drastic measures should be adopted to prevent the export of herring known as "Scotch cured" unless they are in a fit condition to be sold under that term, and in competition with the herring of other countries. This will never be accomplished if the fishermen are left to their own volition. In the first place it must be in well constructed barrels that the fish must be exported. Scores of men in Notre Dame Bay and elsewhere believe they can make a herring barrel as well as anyone. They believe it for the reason that the fish they have been packing for years has been accepted and been paid for. But many of the barrels will scarcely hold peas, let alone fish and pickle, and I have no doubt that many hon. members have been on the wharves when ships were taking barrels of herring on board and have seen the stream of pickle as soon as the barrels were lifted from the pier pouring out as fast as it could before the herring were lower into the hold of the ship. Herring which have lost their pickle deteriorate very quickly and spoil. For that reason, a much more substantial barrel must be used, and if there is not some compulsory law, then many will continue their old habits and will pack herring in inferior packages and send them to market as heretofore. Then it is necessary, having provided a suitable package, that the herring shall be properly selected and graded. It does not do to mix all sizes of fish in the same barrel. They must be carefully selected, carefully packed, cured immediately they come from the water, as herring left uncured fo rover a day deteriorate, and is easily detected by the expert as soon as the barrel is opened. There is, I believe, Sir, a great deal of money in the business if properly conducted, but unless hedged around with proper safeguards, and the penalties made stringent, we shall never have our goods accepted as the Scotch fish are, because, Sir, the packers of the fish in Scotland, can sell their herring by cable and no buyer questions the quality of those goods. If a man sells 500 barrels of 'fulls," then the buyer knows he is going to get them, or if he orders 100 barrels of "matties" he knows they will be all right. Unless our goods are standardized in some way, we cannot hope to compete with the herring put up in Scotland, Yarmouth, Norway or in Holland. As I said, Sir, the law must be stringent and enforced. It must be so stringent that if a man packs herring by the Scotch method he must not be permitted to export herring at all unless they bear the brand and stamp of the expert Inspector, and until a number of people get their fingers burnt, and find they cannot use or sell the herring they have prepared; not until that occurs will they realize that this is not every man's business and they must conform to the rules made, or

otherwise it will prove a failure. It may be that when this Bill is in Committee it may be found necessary to make some amendments to it. I have not had much opportunity of examining the Bill, and for my own satisfaction shall require to study it perfectly before passing on its various sections. I hope hon. members of this House will endeavour to acquaint themselves with the Bill and its various sections before it is considered in Committee. I beg to move the second reading.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I confess to a sense of disappointment with this Bill. The Bill has been heralded as a Compulsory Inspection Bill, and the hon. gentleman has spoken of it as such. There is, however, nothing on the face of the Bill to indicate compulsion, but compulsion is a sine qua non for the best development of the herring packing industry. The Board of Trade passed a very strong recommendation that there should be compulsory inspection of herring packed under the Scotch method, and that the use of certain terms should be retained entirely for the use of Government Inspectors, and that every barrel should be inspected. The Board of Trade passed that recommendation, and as a matter of interest, I may say that recommendation was sent to the Board of Trade of Bay of Islands. That Board replied that they endorsed everything recommended, except that even if we do not get compulsory inspection. As these gentlemen represent the largest herring trade in the country, the St. John's Board of Trade did not press the matter, recognizing that if the people packing were opposed to compulsion it was difficult for the St. John's Board to press the matter upon the Government. Up to the time I read the Bill today I was in hopes from what I had heard of it that this really was a compulsory Bill. I hope it is, but it certainly does not read so to me. But I am glad to see also that the Bill at any rate calls for a very full enquiry and research with regard to the maintenance and improvement of the fishery. Research is what we want, and even if we do not get compulsory inspection of every barrel of Scotch cure, it is at least encouraging to see a Bill going through the Legislature asking for close research with regard to any branch of our fisheries. We all ought to welcome it, and the pity is it is so late in the day. I am sorry that research is confined only to this particular branch, and does not include the whole fishery.

On motion the Bill was read a second time and will be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

EDUCATION BILL

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Education Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—With your permission, Sir, I wish to offer a substituted amendment to the sub-section (x) of section 6. The Hon. the Leader of the Government yesterday said my amendment was too wide, in that it might enable widows or people well able to pay for the education of their children to take advantage of the section. As I said at the time it was a matter of verbiage. All I wished to arrive at was to place on the Statute Book a recognition that it was the right and not simply the privilege of every fatherless child to receive free education in public schools. With the assistance of the Clerk I have altered that, and would ask that this amendment be substituted for that introduced yesterday.

In section 6, sub-section (x) insert after the word "provided" in the last paragraph, the words "that a fatherless child be entitled to free educa-

tion in any public school, except where the person undertaking his support is able to pay his school fees without embarrassment."

The amendment was carried.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—(Section 17). There is no necessity to elaborate on what I said yesterday. I will therefore put it briefly and concisely. I respectfully maintain that where any two or more denominations in a locality, knowing their own requirements, knowing their own financial limitations, desire to have common schools, they shall have the right to have them without interference from the Superintendents of Education as it now reads. Also I think that 12 months notice of the change should be given instead of 6 months.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I regret I cannot accept this amendment. The motion is too drastic a change in existing conditions and calculated to antagonize the Superintendents of Education, and as time will not permit of consultation with the Inspectors of Education upon the matter, I am therefore compelled to refuse the amendment at present, but must ask that the section be carried as it is in the Bill. I think, however, that it is a subject which might be investigated further, and if it does appear that there are any localities suffering disabilities on account of the matter, as my hon. friend impliedly charges, then I think a remedy for that condition should be provided.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I should just like to say in reply to the hon. gentleman, I made no charge. I simply state that such a state of affairs might happen under that section. I have not said they have happened, but that they may arise.

HON. MR. HARVEY—As far as I am personally concerned in regard to this section, I cannot believe that the Superintendents, as I know them personally, are going to do anything to prevent the amalgamation of schools or at least so far as the Church of England Schools are concerned, and furthermore, I am a great believer in the authority of the Superintendents.

The amendment on being put to the vote was lost on division and the original section stood confirmed.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I would respectfully suggest that the Committee now rise, as it is twenty minutes past six. I have a series of amendments to introduce on the next four sections; they are such as may give rise to discussion, and I think it would facilitate matters if I read the amendments. I propose to introduce and leave discussion for another day. The amendments I have already introduced are minor matters and I regret that one has been defeated. In part three, Council of Higher Education, omit the word "higher" section 3. The Governor-in-Council shall appoint a Board consisting of 30 members (not 31) of whom the six superintendents and assistant superintendents of Education and Headmasters of the Colleges mentioned in section 19 of this Act, shall be members ex officio and the remaining 20 members of the said Board shall hold office for three years only, but may be reappointed. The said Board shall be known and called as the Council of Education and hereafter in this Act called Council." In other words reducing the Council to 30, omitting the Government official named there, and omitting the word "Higher."

Section 31—Sixteen members of the Council shall be a quorum for the transaction of business.

Number 32, in the second line, omit the word "Higher."

Number 33.—In lieu of sub-section 1 put the following: "To promote sound learning and advance the interests of Education in this Colony

with power to hold examinations and award to successful candidates diplomas, prizes and scholarships, provided that in no case shall any candidate under the age of 13 be allowed to sit for any such examination."

No change in sub-section Nos. 2 and 3. A sub-section (No. 4) to be inserted "to advise the Governor-in-Council upon all educational questions relative to the Colony that may be referred to them." I shall not say anything further at present, the hour being late, and will move these amendments to-morrow.

On motion of Hon Mr. Bishop, the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT acquainted the House that he had received from the Assembly a message intimating that they had passed the Bill, "An Act respecting Certain Retiring Allowances," in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was then read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned till 4 p.m. to-morrow.

WEDNESDAY, April 19th, 1916.

The House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

MARRIAGE FACILITY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Marriage Regulations Bill was read a third timee, passed, and it was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee on the Trawl Fishing Protection Bill was deferred.

EDUCATION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Education Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—On Section 30—The amendment that I am moving in connection with this section consists of two parts practically. The first part is in connection with the Council of Higher Education. There are some people who very kindly say that because I do not approve of everything done by that body, I am opposed to that body. The charge is absolutely unjust; nothing I have said justifies it; and, moreover, no man in Newfoundland has a higher appreciation of what has been attempted by that board. The majority of the members of that board is composed of citizens who are giving their time voluntarily to a work for which some of them are thoroughly competent and experienced, for which others are not, but for which all are inspired by a strong desire to improve matters. I desire to pay a tribute of respect and gratitude to them for the time they have expended; for the interest they have taken; and of sympathy with them because they have been so "cribbed, cabined and confined" that their work has been rendered almost valueless.

The first crucial difficulty in connection with educational matters in this country is our inability to distribute these advantages to every section of the Colony. By these advantages, I wish to make myself perfectly clear, I mean elementary education:—the public schools as defined in this Act. We are very active, or have been during recent years in connection with higher educational matters, and very silent with regard to elementary education. The C.H.E. has always found two wet blankets thrown upon it. The first has been: "You are not an educational council, you have no right to deal with any matters outside of higher education;"

the second is "You are only an examing body." Now Mr. Chairman, if I want to endorse the position which I take on this matter, I think I could do so by merely quoting from the reports of some of the Superintendents of Education, and statements, written and oral, of many of the members of that Council. It has always been a matter of marvel to me that the members who sit on that board and find their discussions valueless and powerless, their recommendations ruled out because of the absence of powers, which are refused them by the Act, have been content to accept the position as it has been for so many years. My proposal, then, is that this council shall be no longer a council of higher education, but of education, that the word "higher" be omitted. If that is done there is really no departure from the present position, from the denominational standpoint. The council is appointed denominationally, and the powers given them under the proposed amendments, are in no sense absolute powers, but subject to the Governor in Council. Any attempt on the part of the C.H.E. to interfere with the main principles of the existing system of education, that is to say, the denominational principle, would be so much time lost. They would be simply acting in an advisory capacity and in no sense in an executive one. The Executive is denominationally appointed, and the Legislature will see to it that no wrong is done, or discrimination permitted. The Hon. Mr. Gibbs spoke of the very great necessity of a wider interest being taken in educational matters, and in that I entirely concur with him. I know, Sir, of no way in which this wider interest can better be secured than by enlisting the sympathies and interest of such men supposed to be our leading men educationally, many of them our leading educationalists, who are selected by the Governor in Council, and appointed on the board of the C.H.E. My plea is that the usefulness of that board may be extended, not crippled; that the council of education shall be in fact what it cannot be, as long as those powers are restricted in their present form. I do not desire to delay the House by any long explanation on that point; I think it must appeal to every member interested in education, and if we are to improve matters we cannot have too many counsellors. In counsel there is wisdom.

The other point is a small matter; one I am not particularly keen about, but I think a most pernicious principle is introduced into this Act. I have spoken of the unwisdom of appointing headmasters, who come here without the slightest knowledge of local matters, directly they put their feet on Newfoundland soil. A man may come here and prove an absolute failure, and yet, by virtue of his office, he becomes a member of the Council. I am introducing no amendment to that, because I recognize the fact that anyone entrusted with the headship of a college, who even knows nothing about local conditions, must have some idea of educational requirements; but when we come to the appointment ex officio of another official who may have absolutely no knowledge of educational requirements, because of the principle, I ask that it be stricken out. I do not care if the number thirty one is reduced so as to admit of the appointment of the present holder of that office, indeed I hope when the Governor in Council is appointing the next board it will appoint him, for I know of no man of whose qualification I have a higher opinion,

who has a wider knowledge of education matters or would be a more valuable member than Mr. Davies; but I am not discussing this matter from the standpoint of Mr. Davies, but protest against, what may be termed personal legislation. I am concerned only with general principles. I have no great objection to retaining the number of 31, but I object to the Government Analyst, as such, being appointed. I consent to the retention of the 31, but urge that the Government Analyst be not a member of the Board ex officio.

The amendment, upon being put, was carried.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg to move that instead of 7 members being designated as a quorum in 31, it be increased to 11.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I beg to support that amendment. I was about to suggest 12. The reason I suggest it was that I have had the experience ,and Hon. Mr. Harvey has had the same experience of being associated with Committees connected with important matters since the war began. Although they have a total membership of 24 or 25, it is no unusual experience to get no more than one half the members present, and I think if you make the minimum 16 in this case you will be unable frequently to do business. This has been the experience of the Committees I mention, and as most of these gentlemen are of the same class as the Council of Higher Education, it will, I fear, be found that the interests of education would suffer by having a higher number and I think no great evil would result by making the number 11, so that I hope the hon. gentleman, who moved the amendment, may see his way clear to accept this as a compromise.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I wish I could, but I cannot. The argument advanced by the Hon. the President I do not think holds good in connection with this Council of Higher Education. He forgets that six members of the Council are officials, whose duty it is to be present at every meeting, and if I know anything about the way in which educational affairs are managed, not one of them would dream of being absent from meetings of this kind, if to be present were possible; and they are quite right in this position; I know of no more important duty that a Superintendent or Inspector would have to perform, than to be present at the Council's meetings. Moreover, this leaves only 5 of the other 21 who need be present, and Hon. Mr. Harvey stated yesterday that the meetings are always well attended, there being gnerally about 20 members present. Now, the Superintendents in the very admirable consolidation which they present, insist, and properly so, that there shall be a reform of every board in this country, and that no business shall be valid unless transacted by a majority of the Board. "What is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander." If it is necessary that out of nine members of the Joe Batt's Arm Board, five should be present, I respectfully maintain that out of 31 members of the Council 16 should be present. In other words, 10 more than the official number. This is the reason I cannot agree with the amendment introduced to my amendment.

HON. MR. HARVEY—As an ex-member of the Board I think the large quorum mentioned by Hon. Mr. Robinson is unnecessary. If the Board had not been well attended there might be an object in increasing the quorum. But suppose that 15 men went to a weekly or monthly meeting and had to wait for one gentleman to make a quorum, it would kill the work of the Council. I entirely endorse the observations of the Hon. President that time of other Commit-

tee meetings is wasted waiting a great deal of time for a quorum, and the bulk of Committee work is generally done by the few people particularly interested and expert on the subject. This may be taken objection to, but nevertheless it is a fact. There were a number of laymen on the C.H.E. who were good in their attendance, and missed very few meetings, but who were really of very little value on the Council. I regard the Council as too large for the present work. It is very seldom that a question arises on which the opinion of a layman of the Council is of any value. I think a smaller quorum is desirable, instead of the number of men in the amendment, eleven or twelve are enough.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—The hon. gentleman's position may be absolutely right, but I thought every member of the Council of Higher Education was appointed because of his great interest in its work. If members are appointed that take no interest, the sooner they are dropped the better for the Council and for the community. I am not thinking of another world, but of the present, but I cannot conceive how it would be possible for 25 men to accept responsibilities attaching to such an important appointment, and only a bare majority—and six of that small majority officials—could be induced to attend. There are 6 Government officials and 4 heads of Colleges, though these may not be Government officials. There are, however, 10 who are sure to be present if matters of importance are on. According to the Hon. Leader of the Government's amendment one more will be sufficient for a quorum, so that six Superintendents, and the four heads of Colleges will be in a position to transact the business of the Council, if only they can get the Public Analyst or one member from outside the enchanted circle. If there was time a provision might be put in the Act, by which elementary school teachers would be represented on it by right and not by privilege. If we have men engaged in education living in the outports, who know the requirements of the outports from personal and sometimes painful experience, represented on the Council, I would be willing to listen to the proposed 11 or 12, as the case may be. But the Council is composed mainly of residents of St. John's, and every man is supposed to be there because of the live interest he takes in education. It is not an honour to be a member of a Board, when the official and interested members virtually control its deliberations, holding as they do the quorum, and it may not unreasonably be said, the majority in their hands.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—Let us apply the practical test to this. In the other Chamber the membership is 36, the quorum is 12 and it is incumbent upon the Government to find a quorum. There are 5 or 6 office-holders of the Government and probably one or two Executive members who will make 8 or 9 out of the 12, yet it is not unusual for the House to have to adjourn for want of a quorum. If this is the position in the Legislature where the gentlemen elected generally are as desirous of furthering the public interest as the gentlemen of the Council of Higher Education, then surely if the House in its wisdom fixes the quorum at 12, I do not see, under the circumstances, that we are called upon to raise the quorum for this Council of 31, to 16. I cannot say much as to the rest of the argument of my hon. friend. I do not know what the circumstances may be, but in the cases of small localities like Bay Bulls, where the number is 5, 7 or 9, it should not be difficult to get a majority in the evening or the afternoon when the meeting is held.

However, in the present instance, the point is, as I see it, that in the experience of gentlemen members of this House Committees and organizations of large membership, get down to a half dozen or 8 or 10 working members, and others can't be relied upon to attend meetings, and in my judgment, if the quorum is made 16 the meetings will be frequently adjourned, time lost, and if there is anything of any virtue in this argument about the work the Council will do, the interests of education will suffer if you endeavour to compel work to be done by a quorum of at least 16 members.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I think if hon. members would take the trouble to investigate, it will be found that the attendance of members at meetings of the Council of Higher Education are perhaps nominally greater than at any other similar organization or business or society. Here in this Chamber we have 26 members, and the quorum necessary to carry on the business is five; and surely if only five members are necessary here to carry on business and the deliberations in which we engage here, seriously we ought not to expect more than half the Council of Higher Education to form a quorum. Hon. members, with experience of societies and other organizations, know that quorums are reduced to small numbers in order that business may not be delayed. And if you are to fix a hard and fast rule, that no business can be conducted except 16 members are present, I do not say there will not be a meeting. It will be called and it may be possible that 15 members may be present, and they may have to adjourn because of the absence of one member. There are outport members on the Council of Higher Education, and some of them will never miss a meeting of the Council, and the fact that they come from the outports to attend meetings of the Council, sometimes at great inconvenience to themselves, shows the great interest they display in these meetings. I agree with Hon. the President that 11 or 12 should be sufficient to form a quorum to carry on business. It is true there are six Inspectors, but it often happens that three or four out of the six are invariably not in the city, and cannot attend the meetings for months throughout the year, and to make the hard and fast rule, that nearly all the members of the Council who are neither Inspectors nor heads of colleges, should be in attenlance here, would be unfair.

The amendment to Hon. Mr. Robinson's amendment was carried.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—We now come to one of the most important amendments I am introducing. It is to section 33. I propose that sub-section (1) be deleted, and the following substituted: "To promote sound learning, and advance the interests of education,and to award the successful candidates, diplomas, prizes and scholarships, provided that after July 1st, 1916, no candidate be allowed to sit for any such examination who is under 13 years."

We now come to a crucial point raised here on many occasions and one on which I feel very strongly. I do not desire to make any personal reference, but it is due to myself to say that I am not talking without knowledge. The best years of my life, numbering fifteen were spent by me as a school master, and my experience has been distributed between Carbonear, the city of St. John's, England and Belgium. I know of nothing more valuable in schools than examinations. I cannot imagine a school in which examinations are not held, but there is a vast range of difference between examinations in school, and

inter-school examinations. Examinations are not necessarily a criterion of progress; there are a great many things which must be taken into consideration; the physical condition of the child, especially the nervous condition, for if this becomes overstrained at an early age, the child becomes physically and mentally crippled. I have referred to a case of this kind before. I remember a child, unquestionably one of the brightest I have ever known, a lad who was able to absorb anything. Through an unwisdom, strongly protested against at the time, he was taxed unduly at an age when he was unable to bear a severe strain upon either his mentality or his physique, with disastrous results. Over-pressure was responsible for the wreckage of a brilliant career. I respectfully maintain that no children under the age of thirteen should be subjected to the test of examinations of a competitive character outside of their own schools. If we take up the reports of some of the Superintendents we will there read some very strong criticisms of the Council's methods; perhaps that is putting it too strongly. We are reading continuously about the objections that are made to the home work which is becoming almost a nightmare in many of the homes in the city and country, and I want to say here, Sir, that I cannot conceive of a school being conducted without homework, provided that work is of preparation and within limits. There was a very excellent letter on this subject from a prominent college principal recently published in a local paper. With it I am in full accord. But the lines there outlined are departed from, and as a result the burden is becoming intolerable. The children have to sit up night after night when they ought to be in bed; not the brighter ones, perhaps, for it is a matter of common knowledge that some children, for weal or woe, absorb in an hour what others take much longer to absorb. The main objection is the strain brought upon them by examinations at a tender age, which renders the home strain unavoidable. I have felt for years that it would be a blessing if the primary and preparatory grades were swept out of existence. There is use for the intermediate, I admit, and possibly for the Associate, but as regards the lower grades, they are an unnecessary burden in my opinion, and it is an opinion fortified by that of many medical men, and educational authorities. Now I am well aware that we get concrete illustrations advanced in which children derive no apparent harm, and I say apparent advisedly, but we must legislate for the majority and not for the few. My object is that children up to thirteen years may be released from these examinations around which centres the whole of the year's work. It is idle for us to deny that as long as these examinations exist they will be the goal for which everything is sidetracked. The cry is for good lists, good passes. "If we do not get passes people think there is something wrong with the school." Teachers are compelled to direct all their energies with that one object in view, because if they do not succeed in getting passes they are written down as failures. Now education must be applied in the younger years; the teacher who wants to make the best of his pupils has to study every pupil and it is impossible to cast all children in one mould and turn them out at equal values. Under the present system those most in need of attention fail to get it. I do not ask for interference with the Council or its functions as an examining body, but merely a limitation in the age of those who are called upon to suffer the tortures prescribed.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I cannot agree with the hon. member's amendment

with regard to excluding children from examination except from the age of 13 years. Now I have children of my own and know from experience that no physical harm has happen d them or would happen them if they did enter the lists in these examinations. If the child of twelve is not sufficiently advanced to be able to pass in the test set forth by the C.H.E. then our educational system is very backward indeed. You must have stimulus in a school to make children learn and the stimulus which makes them pursue their studies carefully and become efficient is the examination. There is no question at all about that. You must have them; it is competition which stimulates the brain to activity, and except we have that stimulus there is no incentive to the child to put forth its best energies. Now it is not compulsory upon the child to sit for these examinations, it is optional, and if the parent does not wish his child to go in for the examination at ten years of age, that ends the matters. I know numbers of children who pass that examination at ten years of age, and are you going to ask that child who may be able to pass at ten to wait until he is thirteen before he can advance in school? We have some system by which we can judge the standard of education there and how children are progressing, and that no children of less than thirteen can sit for an examination is absurd. I take it that when the C.H.E. fixed the age limit at 12 years they did so after giving very careful consideration to the whole subject. Now I am not questioning the sincerity of my hon. friend, but only question the wisdom of making the amendment so far as the age limit is concerned. We have on the C.H.E. some who are giving their lives every hour of the day to educational uplift, and these men are not going to interefere with the growth physically of the children, and I think, with all due deference to my hon. friend, it would be a signal act of discourtesy for us to alter the age limit which they must have fixed only after giving it every consideration and looking at it from every viewpoint. I know my children sometimes complain that the age limit restricts them from going further. And they are one of a number who would like to advance, and cannot do so because of the hard and fast rule laid down for the age limit of those entering examinations. Now the only one of us who may be termed an expert upon this question is my hon. friend; the rest of us are laymen as far as education is concerned, but as against the expert knowledge of my hon. friend we must have 13 or 14 on the C.H.E., and in dealing with matters in every day life where we look for evidence to guide us in our decisions, we always follow the weight of evidence, and the weight of evidence in this particular is against my hon. friend.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I want to say a short word or two. First of all I rather regret that the hon. gentleman has not made his amendment in the form of two sections. With the first part of his remarks I entirely agree as regards the objects of the Council. I would like to see those objects wider, and I understand that his point is to enable the Council to take a wider view. That I am in favour of. The second part of the amendment has to do with the age limit of examinations. One sympathizes very much with the hon. gentleman and must give great weight to the views expressed by him and I would not for a moment put my opinion in opposition to him beyond this. I would like to have some further information. I would like to know, and we ought to know. how many children under the age of 13 are now being put in for these examinations. Are any large number

of children going to be affected? And if not, and if optional, I can hardly see why we should exclude any children who might want to sit and whose parents want them to go in for these examinations. I understand that in Scotland there is a more or less greater school board examination, and children go out of the primary schools at twelve years, and we have already had quoted to us the Scotch educational system as a model to follow. I do not know anything about it myself, but that has been put to us in this House. I very much sympathize with the viewpoint of the hon. gentleman in regard to homework. If these examinations are inducing children to be working in their homes to such an extent that it interferes with their sleep and health, I would oppose it. But I would like to know, and if it is possible have the matter held over so that we can make some enquiries as to how far the young children who are going in for these examinations are being overworked. The matter of homework I can recognize is a very difficult one, and we come down once more again to the whole question of the training of teachers. There is one other point I would like to mention for the consideration of the hon. mover of the amendment, and that is the description of these examinations as competitive. As I understand it, they are not competitive, but standardizing examinations. They take the form in many schools of competitions owing to the ambitions of the children to get ahead of one another, but the actual fact is they are standardizing, and not competitive in the objectionable sense of the term. But I would very much like to know how many children are going to be affected, and to what extent it is causing an excess of night work to young children.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I should like to read to the house what the Superintendent of Church of England Schools has to say:—

"I would, however, like to utter a word of warning: While I recognize the need of an examining body and agree that examinations are essential in every phase of life, teachers must be careful to what extent they rely on them as a means of education. I am of opinion that they should not be used as a means, nor even as a goal in education, but principally as a test. I cannot help feeling strongly that the development process through the school is better conducted without the public examination than with it. I have not the space in which to go fully into this matter, important as it is, but I instance the study of literature. If during each year between the ages of 12 and 17 boys and girls are required to study an appointed set of books which have to be gone through with wearisome repetition and careful attention to all kinds of little points in which an eccentric examiner may possibly ask questions, I am of opinion that in nine cases out of ten the beauty of the literature is lost and the taste for reading killed. Were no such public examination in view, were the teacher free to take the students through a course of literature in reasonable leisure, with time to pause a little where the scene or feast delights, passing on more quickly over the portions that are not of like interest, compassing only that which is consistent with industry can be compassed with delight, no mile post to be reached by a given date or hour, no cross-examination at the end of the course by one who does not know either the student or the teacher from Adam, I firmly believe that in the end nine out of every ten students would develop a love for reading and a thirst for the charms to be found in literature. What is true of literature is likewise true in varying degree of every subject.

"Therefore, I am of opinion that public examination should be confined in every school to the students that constitute the highest class, who have passed through the school and who are, within a year probably, to leave it; students whose education has been developed along lines of reasonable freedom and who, having reached one of the intermediary goals of life—the end of a school course—are entitled to a test conducted by some public body whose judgment in such a matter is beyond question. I therefore advise and, so far as I have power to do so, I direct that the examinations of the Council be utilised in Church of England schools as leaving certificates only. Under this direction Colleges would enter candidates for the Associate of Arts Diploma only, High Schools for the Intermediate Grade Diploma only, large elementary schools for the Preliminary Grade Diploma only, and small elementary schools for the Primary certificate only. Such a regulation could hardly be treated in our circumstances as a cast-iron one. It would need to be elastic in its application. But I am satisfied that good would result if these proposals were accepted as the proper policy at which to aim.

"Nevertheless, I must add that it would not be easy for Church of England schools alone to adopt this policy, and that it would be desirable to have it the common practice and regulation. I do not desire, however, to trespass on the fields of others. All things considered and in spite of certain disadvantages that might accrue, I stand by my proposal, made after many years of experience and observation."

If hon. members will not listen to me, Mr. Chairman, will they listen to what the Superintendent of Church of England Schools has to say. It is entirely in line with the remarks I have quoted. I go another step. There is an educational body in this country, the Christian Brothers, who are doing magnificent work, and I speak, subject to correction, from all their elementary schools the C.H.E. examinations are cut out. It is unnecessary for me to say anything further on that point. The Hon. Mr. Harvey has made a plea on the point that these examinations are not compulsory. The hon. gentleman is critically correct but there are very many methods of compulsion. The children who do not go in for the examinations in the schools in the outports, have a very hard time of it.

The teachers are disappointed and they certainly cannot give them the time they should. They look for results and nothing but results, and the teachers are not to blame. The teacher's reputation rests upon results. There is such a thing as direct compulsion, and compulsion that is not direct, and sometimes the latter is the most distressing. As to the charge of Hon. Mr. Gibbs that we should be guilty of discourtesy if we made an alteration on the age limit ,all I have to say is that my firm conviction is, the great majority of the Council themselves, if they say the same in the sacred Council circles, as they say outside it, regard the lowest grade as an unmitigated evil.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—I have no desire now to lengthen this discussion, but I notice, Mr. Chairman, that the Education Grant, or at least the amount being voted during the present session, is $366,923.66. The question is, as it appears to me, are we getting value for our money, so far as education in this country is concerned. I think I may be allowed to call Hon. Mr. Robinson's attention to another matter ,the age limit, which he refers

to as 13. Now, I don't agree with this. A boy of 13 ought to be in the meridian of his school brilliancy, and should not be debarred from going up for any examination. The Hon. Mr. Harvey referred to Scotland. Well, the system in the schools there is that it makes little difference what the Government Inspector's religion is. He is sent, and he is known as the Government Inspector of Schools. I do not think any pupil in this country arriving at the age of 13 should be debarred in any way from taking examinations, nor do I believe in this minimum. I presume that this Bill before us now has been carefully prepared by those teachers and inspectors who are modern and up to date. Hon. Mr. Robinson was a very successful teacher in his day ,he is now old at it. He may have taken a great interest in these boys then as he does now, but I do not think a boy of 13 should be debarred in any way, if the teachers and inspectors say he is all right. I also must concur with the observations of Hon. Mr. Gibbs on the matter, which require a great deal of consideration and thought.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—In regard to the quotation from Mr. Blackall's Report, I did not arrive at the conclusion that the hon. gentleman draws from him. It is true that he would not confine his examination only to the higher type of student, but acting under conditions here he says:

"I therefore advise, and so far as I have power to do, I direct that the examinations of the Council be utilized in Church of England schools as leaving certificates only. Under this direction colleges would enter candidates for the Association of Arts Diploma, High Schools for the Intermediate Grade diploma only, large Elementary Schools for the Preliminary Grade diploma only, and small Elementary Schools for the Primary certificate only."

Surely this is a recommendation that these schools go in for these examinations. I understand that a large majority of the children in the primary classes are 13 years old, and some over, and that very few are under 13. At any rate before we vote on the subject we should have some idea as to how many children will be effected.

On motion the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

Second reading of Weights and Measures Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—This Bill is a consolidation of the laws relating to weights and measures, and the inspection of lumber. It may have been noticed by hon. members in looking over the Bill that the scale of charges for inspection appears to be greatly increased. In fact this is not so, however, and the scales embodied here are only the charges that the Inspectors have been receiving for a considerable time past. There may be some slight changes, but generally speaking, there are only the charges that they have collected for some time. There are some changes in the Bill deserving of consideration, but I do not propose to make any special reference to them on the second reading, as they will be fully considered in committee. One thing I found requiring amendment, and which I will assume is a misprint, or would assume such, but that I have been informed that the attention of some of the members of the Lower House was calld to it, and I see it has not been remedied, and that is the section referring to the length of shingles. Section 40—"the standard size of shingles shall be 18.inches." No such thing is sold here as an 18 inch shingle the standard for years has

been 16 inches. There is nothing else manufactured or sold, and whether this is an oversight or not I shall propose an amendment to the section, by changing the paragraph to read "16 inches." As the hour is now late I will content myself with merely moving the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was read a second time and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop was ordered to be submitted to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into committee on the Local Affairs Bill, Hon. Mr. Angel in the chair.

On motion the committee rose, reported the bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morow.

SHIPBUILDING BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Shipbuilding Bill, Hon. M. Blandford in the chair.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—Is this thing really going through? I asked the Hon. Leader of the Government a question yesterday, perhaps he can answer it? I did not put it in writing. Are there any companies in the country subsidized above 5 per cent.?

HON. MR. BISHOP.—There are no other companies subsidized at more than 5 p.c.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—There are no other companies subsidized more than 5 p.c. Then we are deliberately doubling the bounty on shipbuilding and granting a seven per cent subsidy additional, and these are war times; and we talk economy. I spoke about this change yesterday and protested against it. It is one of the most dangerous precedents, that we could possibly put on the Statute Book. I suppose I have no right to move an amendment, as it is a money Bill, and I will not move an amendment. I will leave it as it is, but I strongly protest against legislation of this kind. As sure as we pass this section and make it law we shall reap a terrible harvest.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I would like to point out to the hon gentleman that there is not such a tremendous difference between 7 per cent. for 15 years and 5 per cent. for 20 years. If we take thirty thousand dollars at seven per cent. that is $2,100 a year,or $31,500 in fifteen years That is the capital will be returned in fifteen years. Now take the same at 5 per cent. for 20 years and it will amount to $30,000, that is the capital will be returned in twenty years. So that it is not such an extraordinary guarantee for the Government to give after all.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I think windlasses, patent wheel gear and iron pumps should not be admitted free, so that local industries may be protected.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I presume we have no right to amend a money bill, and, perhaps we should not hamper or condemn anything that is being done to revive a dying industry, so if we cannot alter it, we had better leave the bill as it is.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I would point out in reference to the articles referred to Hon. Mr. Angel, the term is "machinery for windlasses," and not "windlasses," because many ships in Nova Scotia and elsewhere are now equipped with gasoline engines for hoisting the anchor, and it may be applied in this country. The ordinary windlass can be procured here, and I have no doubt it will be.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, it was ordered the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

PATENTS BILL.

Second Reading of Patents Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—This Bill is intended to amend Cap. 109 of the Consolidated Statues entitled "Of Patents, copyrights and trade marks." Its object appears to be to bring the law with respect to patents in line with the law enforced in Canada. This Bill it not a Government measure. I do not know who drafted it or who introduced it into the Legislature. I was asked some days ago to take charge of the conduct of the Bill in this chamber and have much pleasure in doing so: not on behalf of the Government, or because as Attorney General I consider this Bill necessary, but because I find on a perusal of the Bill that it is reasonable and desirable legislation. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—In connection with the Act as it stands at present, I take it that the inventor has a freedom in this Colony, but in the new Act being brought in now, that he will have to continue operating his invention in this Colony or forfeit his right, and I think that what I say can be borne out by a number of individuals who have gone more deeply into the Act than myself. It was only this morning that the introduction of the Patent Amendment Act came under my notice and, if I am not mistaken, a similar Act was introduced into this Chamber about two or three years ago when it was defeated.

I am of the opinion that it would be a hardship on those of our people who may be ingenious enough to think out a patent, and then having done so to discover that under the Act that is proposed he would be called upon to continuously operate in this Colony. The idea of a continuous operation would be correct in every particular detail if our country was sufficiently large to produce the materials and machinery necessary for the manufacture of the article patented, but it would be ridiculously absurd to conceive of the idea that because it is not manufactured in this Colony, and may be patented in any other part of the world, the patentee would not have the protection of the Act. We should give as much freedom as possible for their inventions, whereas by this Bill you are restricting them.

My hon. friend has stated that under Section 12 any Letters Patent brought forth and not brought into operation shall at the expiration of a period of two years be void. This is clear, because the mere fact of putting in an advertisement in the Gazette saying that it is the intention of the Inventor to operate at a certain period, is supposed to get over the operating clause, but it does not, if allowed to continue things would adjust themselves as in the past.

The old Bill as it stands is sufficiently good for us at this juncture and we should not make any alteration in it at the present time. If we do it will debar many outside from becoming interested in our patent law, and inventors generally will keep clear of the Colony, and thereby the Colony will suffer the loss of the fees that are called for under the Act.

Section (a) of paragraph 4 says: "Commence, and after such commencement continuously carry on in Newfoundland the construction or manufacture of the patented invention in such manner as to enable any person desiring to use it to obtain it, or cause it to be made for him at a reasonable price at some manufactory or establishment for making or constructing it in Newfoundland." This is very objection-

able. I therefore object to the Bill generally.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— This Bill does not bear harshly upon inventors. It is true that in the early part of the measure continuous manufacture in Newfoundland is required, but the patentee may under section 5 be relieved from the conditions of section 1. I feel that the Bill is generally advantageous to the patentee rather than adverse, because it puts the right of patentees on a firm basis rather than on the somewhat uncertain and untested system of advertising, as referred to by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I feel that this is not objectionable legislation and should not be refused a second reading. The Bill has been taken seriously by the House of Assembly and if any amendments are considered desirable for perfecting the measure they may be considered in committee.

The bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

GUARANTEED STOCK COMPANIES BILL.

Second reading of a Bill, entitled "An Act respecting Companies, Payment of Whose Capital Stock or of Interest Thereon is Guaranteed by the Government."

HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL. (Hon R. A. Squires)—The object of this bill is to repeal chapter 26 of the Consolidated Statutes, entitled, "Of Corporations, the interest upon whose stock is guaranteed by the Government," and to substitute this Act, which is to be known as "The Companies (Guarantee Act), 1916." The law at the present time on this subject is that contained in chapter 26 of the Consolidated Statutes. This Act is a broader and more complete enactment than the old law and vests in the Governor in Council larger powers to deal with companies which may call upon the Government for payment of guarantees. The effect of this new legislation will be that in the event of any company making default in the payment of eitner its capital or interest, if such capital or interest shall have been guaranteed by the Government under an Act of the legislature of Newfoundland, the Governor in Council may at any time after such default cause an investigation and examination into the affairs and management of such company to be made by such persons and in such manner as the Governor in Council may think most expedient. Or, if it shall be considered advisable, without such investigation being held, supersede the appointment of any director or directors appointed by the Governor,and to annul and cancel the office of any director or directors chosen by the shareholders of any such company, and thence forth to assume the direction and management, and to direct and manage the affairs and business of the company, and to assume, possess and exercise all and singular the powers and functions of the directors appointed and chosen as aforesaid.

By virtue of section 2 the power of the shareholders to choose directors ceases and determines upon the exercise by the Governor in Council of the powers vested in him by section 1. The policy of the act is the same as that of chapter 26 of the Consolidated Statues intended to be repealed by this Act, but the powers vested in the Governor in Council are broader and of such a nature as to be more effective in dealing with companies which default in the payment of their capital stock or interest, with the result that the public funds of the Colony are under liability to make good to the shareholders of the defaulting company because of any guarantee which may have been given

because of any Act of the Legislature with respect to the repayment of capital stock or interest of that company. I feel that this measure will commend itself to this Council. I consequently move that it be now read a second time.

On motion of Hon Mr. Squires the Bill was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the remainder of the order paper was deferred and the House adjourned until Monday next, April 24th, at 4 o'clock.

MONDAY, April 24, 1916.

The House opened at 4 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Local Affairs Bill and the Shipbuilding Bill were read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly, with a message intimating that the Council had passed both Bills without amendment.

EDUCATION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House went into Committee on the Education Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I would point out to the Committee and the hon. gentleman who has moved certain amendments to the Act, that in view of the amendment changing the name of the Council, the impression has gone abroad that it means a radical change in the system of education throughout the country; and as that idea has gone abroad, under the circumstances I would ask that the consideration of the amendment be deferred, in order that greater and more mature deliberation may be given the matter.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—I would like to put myself on record as saying that I have not yet heard anyth'ng to make me change my mind as regards the amendments proposed in this Bill, and it appears to me that we are acting in somewhat of a ridiculous manner to be here one day voting for amendments, and the next day turning them down and voting against them, and especially so when they were carried so unanimously.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—Education in this country has so long been the province of the very few, that anyone who dares to suggest any amendments to the Education Act, does so with fear and trembling. When, however, the statement is made, as has been made here this afternoon by my hon. friend (Mr. Gibbs), that there is an impression abroad that the amendments now being introduced to this Act are revolutionary, and that the purpose is to interfere with the existing system of education, or the salient principles of the existing system, I, for one, sir, am not afraid of the most thorough investigation, and the most careful consideration, and reconsideration if necessary. So far as I am personally concerned every word I have said in this house or elsewhere I am prepared to stand for and substantiate. Away out yonder in far off Asia Minor is an old town called Ephesus, where many long years ago, some nineteen hundred. lived a gentleman of the name of Demetrius. He was a silversmith, and one day the Christians came along there and objected to idolatry. Demetrius got in a blue funk. He did not know just how he was going to stop this, so he raised a small riot, and said to his craftsmen. "Our craft is in danger." But to the masses of the people, his plea was: "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." And so now the double Demetrian cry is raised by interested parties. For public behoof it is: "Great is Denominationalism," but the real thing is "our

craft is in danger, our absolute power is threatened." I do not want to go any further into this matter at the present time, but just want to say this My object is to give to the Council a reason for its existence, and to some extent I may justify that in other amendments proposed to section 31. As things are, the Council is an utter farce, and I will challenge any member in this Legislative Council to point out a single power, initiative or advisory, which this Council has. The Council of Education, or Higher Education, as it is called, is merely an examining body. It cannot legislate, and I am not asking that it shall; it cannot advise, and I ask that it may advise. If you will turn to the 24th page you will see that in sub-section (g) one of the duties of the Superintendents of Education is to advise the Governor in Council, either individually or collectively, I simply ask that this Council of Higher Education may be transformed into a Council of Education, and that the advisory powers of the Superintendents may be give them also, and I have no hesitation in saying that by allowing a statutory enactment, which gives the Council a name, but denies it even the power to advise, to remain on the Statute Book for another year, you insult the lay members of the C.H.E. But as they seem quite indifferent about it, I am not going to worry myself unduly about that. As to examination, that is what the Superintendents and Inspectors are paid for and appointed for, to examine the schools of this country. Do they want 24 men to go around and help them? There is not one of the twenty-four who takes practical interest in these examinations. They are carried out nominally under their auspices, but in reality from and by another country altogether. But Demetrius finds his craft is in danger, he finds there may be some other persons from whom advice may possibly be asked, and therefore we hear the cry of "Great is Diana." On the denominational question I have been explicit in this House on many occasions. I have no desire whatever to see anything done which may in the remotest degree affect the division of the grants. I have a very strong desire, and hope the day will come when that desire may be consummated, when the iniquitous subdivision of the Protestant grants, which is choking the life out of the people of this country, may be done away with. But, Sir, I am not going to take advantage at the present time to endeavour to force to a conclusion, the alteration of the status of education so long as an idea may be abroad, an idea which has been carefully cultivated and fostered, that the object of this amendment is to hit at the principle of division of the Roman Catholic and Protestant grants. For that reason I am quite content that the word "higher" should be left there pending further consideration, not at the present session, because we have not the time; but I am content to let it stand over until as a people we can rise a little higher out of the mire of narrowness in which we find ourselves at the present time, and recognize that there is no sufficient reason to prevent a denominationally appointed Council, denominationally controlled by denominationally appointed Superintendents, acting in an advisory capacity to a denominationally selected Government.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT.—I should like to bear testimony to my belief, and I think I can be truthful in saying the belief of everybody within this House, that the motives of the hon. gentleman were of the highest and most creditable, I do not think any-

one who knows him would believe he would do anything that would even tend to create the suspicion that he had any ulterior motive in introducing these proposals. At the same time we have to look at the fact that within the past few days the impression has gone abroad that these amendments are the thin edge of the wedge to do away with denominational education. Those of us who can view thse things coolly, can afford to smile at this, but it may have serious effects if the idea should get abroad through the community, and be fostered, as the hon. gentleman suggests it may be. I am not aware as to who exactly are fostering it, but it is very easy to spread the seeds of suspicion, and in certain atmospheres these seeds thrive remarkably quickly. I think, therefore, that in view of the circumstances the hon. gentleman is to be congratulated on deciding not to press his amendmgents, and is willing to allow the bill to remain, as I understand him, as it is, for the time being at any rate. I would suggest to him that this matter be allowed to stand for another session, and that in the interim, those in certain capacities in the community who are entitled to weigh carefully the immediate and prospective effects of such proposals as he has made, will have an opportunity of going carefully into them, and it may be that next session those outside the Legislature who enjoy an authority which entitles them to speak on such a matter, may see their way clear to accept these amendments of his. Personally, I would be prepared under such circumstances to strongly support my hon. friend. If the House will remember, he and I have seen eye to eye on educational matters in previous sessions. I think the whole educational machine wants to be shaken up. I have no reflections to cast upon the gentlemen who are acting as Superintendents of Education, but I do think that a record that shows that one-third of the schools of this Colonly are not inspected every year is not a creditable one, and one which we should not stand for much longer. I do think it would be most desirable to bring in one or two educationists from abroad and set them to work to overhaul the schools throughout the country, and I believe their report would be a revelation. I throw out that suggestion to the hon. gentleman representing the Government in this Chamber, with the belief that it would be a good move. I do not, of course, know that the Superintendents at present may be able to do anything more than they are doing, but I do say that when we maintain an educational machine for doing only about two-thirds of the work that it ought to do, it is not good enough. If the machinery is not adequate, then we ought to enlarge and improve it. Returning to the immediate subject before the chair I would like to add another reason why I think it is desirable that these matters should stand over for another year. If anyone is sufficiently interested to follow affairs in Canada, he will find that a very serious racial discord has been created in Ontario, and that a strong suspicion exists among the French parts of the population that the present educational system is being applied for the purpose of stamping out the French language. The matter has assumed a very acute form in the neighbouring Dominion, and the Ontario Provincial Legislature is very greatly perplexed at the present time by the imbroglio. In the city of Ottawa, where there is a large French population, the latter have boycotted certain schools and put their own nominees in other schools, which are teaching French in defiance of the authorities. The School Commission there

sided with the rioters, if I may use the term, and an Act has to be passed to wipe that Commission out of existence, and to substitute other gentlemen appointed by the Provincial Legislature. These officials found themselves confronted by a virtually impossible situation. Their authority was defied, and the money which by law should have been handed over to them was refused; then the matter was appealed to the courts, and it looks now as if it would go to the Privy Council. In the meantime the whole Dominion is disturbed over the situation. To be sure I do not suppose we are going to have anything like that here, but if the impression were to get abroad that any interference was to be attempted by the Legislature with the existing method of education, it would have a very bad effect, and I think it would be better to postpone the matter for a year, and then I would be willing to support the hon. gentleman in any proposal that would be acceptable to the denominational authorities.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I had not meant to say anything on this matter, but I would not be doing what I consider my duty if I sat entirely silent. The hon. President referred to the School Inspectors, stating he was not aware if they were able to improve matters at all, and, as I understand him, my honourable friend on my left, Hon. Mr. Robinson, said he thought they did not want to improve. I think such a statement as that should not go out of here without a protest in the interests of these gentlemen. I consider the statement is not in accordance with the facts. I have seen a great deal of these men during recent years, individually and collectively, and I do not think there exists a more self-sacrificing, hard-working lot of men than these Superintendents of Education. And I am very sorry to hear their honest intentions and self-sacrificing efforts questioned in this chamber. As to denominational education, I don't believe you could get on in this country to-day under any other system. The entire school system of the country outside of St. John's has to be looked after from day to day and month after month by the clergymen. They are the educative force of the Colony capable of such a task. These gentlemen are the mainstays of the school boards, and to attempt to get on without them would simply spell failure. It is impossible to get on without the clergy at present, and so it is impossible to get on without denominational education. They are the best friends of education in the country. I do not think anyone in this Chamber is advocating non-denominational education, and certainly not Hon. Mr. Robinson. Apart altogether from the moral aspect, as a matter of practical working, you cannot get on without denominational education. When I speak of denominational education, I would go on to explain that there is denominational education and denominational education. It can be carried to extremes, and when it does, it becomes an evil, but it can become a blessing. There are some small places where an amalgamation of interests would improve the educational advantages, and there are certain places where it would be quite unsuitable. But I do not think that, taken as a whole it is seriously abused, nor do I defend the few cases where it is abused. But, on the whole, I do not believe that anybody will, on broad lines, support anything else in this country at present. This is all I want to say, but the principal thing is that I protest against the unfair reflection cast upon some of our very best public servants.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—The hon.

gentleman, before he makes such statements, should be sure of his ground. The Hon. President made certain remarks when he was discussing the matter of making certain amendments. I asserted that I didn't think they wanted to. I was not reflecting upon the Inspectors of Schools. I marvel that you can get men to do the work they are doing, especially the Assistant Inspectors, for the compara tively small remuneration they get, and make no reflection whatever upon them, but I did say, and do say, that they do not want to have the remotest suspicion of anybody sharing with them even in their advisory powers, and if that is a reflection then there it is. But when he says that I reflected upon the work or standing of these gentlemen, the hon. gentleman has used misleading language towards me. and he is grossly mistaken.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I regret if I misunderstood my hon. friend, but in doing so, must say that the blame is not altogether mine, for I think other members must have understood him as I did, and I am glad to know that he was misunderstood.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I wish the House to understand that I was casting no reflection upon the Superintendents of Education. Like other hon. members of this House, I think they are hardworking, zealous, painstaking and trying to fill a difficult situation as satisfactorily as possible. But I say, and repeat, that the situation which confronts us is not satisfactory, and I will read from Mr. Blackall's report, extracts which will support what I say.

I merely quote from Mr. Blackall's report because it is the only one before us. Doubtless the reports of the other superintendents are similar to his. Mr. Blackall's report for the school year ended June 30th, 1915, was laid on our desks a few days ago. He begins by saying that with the aid of his assistant he was able to visit some 230 schools and settlements, not as many as he had hoped to visit, and leaving about 170 not visited during the school year. He said they would have been able to visit more but that he felt it his duty to assist in recruiting for the Army and Navy, and in addition all the northeast coast was blocked with ice up to the end of June last year, preventing them from getting to these places in May and June, during which months he and his assistant are generally able to inspect many schools. He adds that it distressed him that so far his staff has been quite unable to inspect every school at least once a year, and says he will not feel satisfied until this much at least can be done, though he thinks his staff should be made large enough and the work organized so as to make it possible for the full year schools to receive not less than two visits from an inspector every year. He goes on to say that the correspondence and routine work of his department continued to increase enormously, that this kind of work occupies too much of his energy, and that he feels that this time could be spent to greater advantage to the work of education in this Colony if he were able to do more inspection. The situation therefore is even worse than I represented in my previous remarks. Mr. Blackall has 400 schools under his control. He visited 230, or slightly more than half. He was unable to visit the other 170 or almost the other half, though he has an assistant with him. Thus we find that of the Church of England Schools in the Colony nearly half have received no inspectional supervision for that year, and I make bold to say that this situation will be duplicated in the case of the other denominations.

I think that supports the position I have put forward that the in-

spectional machinery is not satisfactory. No business man could allow an institution under his direction to go without an inspection for 12 months without its falling off deplorably in efficiency and no schools like those we have in Newfoundland can be carried on year after year without a visit from the inspector without falling off in efficiency. I sympathize with the Inspectors. I think that the situation as revealed here, is a just ground for a demand for immediate action by the government to remedy it and I hope that this discussion will result in something being done. In fairness moreover to the Inspectors and teachers and to those connected with the Council of Higher Education which I think, much as we differ as to its value is entitled to some credit, it is only right to point out that with reference to the figures quoted the other day as to those who could not write—73,150; that in the previous census of 1901, 97,146 was the number thus handicapped, and 132,633 in 1891. In 1911 the number who could not write in the Colony was only 73,150 out of about 220,000; in 1901 the number was 132,663, an increase of thirty-six thousand, so that the total increase in twenty years in this country of those who could write is 81⅓ per cent. This puts another aspect on the matter. We may regret that things are not better, but it is satisfactory to know that there is that much improvement in 20 years. Moreover, while we would like to see very much more done for education in the country, we cannot afford to overlook the fact that those who may desire advantages are entitled to some consideration, and I have been told to-day that one of the matters which the Council of Higher Education has succeeded in accomplishing, has been to effect arrangements with the Universities of Canada, where it will be possible as the result of lectures to be started here, to hereafter secure for young men from the Colony entry into these Universities, with our examinations taken as equivalent to two years of service in these Universities, and this will render it necessary for Newfoundland boys in future to spend only two years for these who now must spend four. This will be a great saving for young fellows whose circumstances will not admit of putting in four years in the neighbouring Dominion. And an argument put forward in connection with the Council of Higher Education was, if the proposed amendments of last week were insisted on and "Higher" eliminated, it might result in this whole undertaking collapsing. This, however, is incidental to the larger issue. But with reference to the Superintendents I wish it to be clearly understood, that I cast no reflection upon them, but I do not know if they can improve conditions. I presume that one of the difficulties is to get the funds to provide for the changes necessary. But I have, I think, substantiated my case to the House, that our inspectorial system is not satisfactory, and ought not to continue, in fairness to the people, who pay $360,000 a year for educational purposes.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I think in view of the present position of affairs here in respect of the Bill we are now considering, it demands that we should as far as convenient express our convictions as regards the attitude of the mover of the amendments to the Bill. My feeling is, Sir, that if we had even a few more men in this country evincing the interests and with the ability that is possessed by the hon. mover of the amendments we might reasonably expect that before many years we would see very different figures indeed with respect to the educational status of our peo-

ple than those which have been quoted by Mr. President. I am perfectly sure that the hon. mover of the amendments, Mr. Robinson, has been actuated by nothing but the strongest desire for the improvement of education here. I have heard no reflection upon the Superintendents, and I am sure that he has not in the slightest degree reflected upon their motives or efficiency. The Hon. President, in his remarks, stated that seeds of suspicion have been sown. This is most regrettable, and it is particularly regrettable that misrepresentation should have been necessary to cause the alarm which unquestionably exists, and that persons high in authority in respect of education here, should have been moved to take the action they have taken. I certainly hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Superintendents of Education are none of them responsible for the means to which I refer. I would be prepared to defend, as far as I am able, any aspersions that may be cast upon the Superintendents of Education or their assistants of any denomination. I think they are doing a very noble work. for the cause of education. There has been no attempt to interfere in the slightest degree with denominational education, but we have been told in the plainest language by those who claim to know that they will soon be in a position to give effect to their ideas that free undenominational education is very soon to be introduced here in this country. How that will be viewed, sir, or what action will be taken or will be necessary before that becomes an issue we need not now consider, and I desire to say that when he assents his willingness to withdraw certain amendments moved by him at the last sitting, I think Hon. Mr. Robinson is showing that he is influenced by the very strongest motive to assist rather than interfere with the cause of education in this Colony.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—The only amendment I have now to introduce to this section is to the sub-section 3; this is to let the sub-section stand as it is with the following addition: "Provided that on and after July 1st, in no case shall any candidate under the age of 13, be allowed to sit for examination." I am not going to labor this point but I want to point out first, the age of 13 means the age of 12. The grinding process begins at 12. It takes a year of continuous and hard grinding to cram the applicant to pass the examination, therefore when you are considering this amendment please to remember you are thinking of a child of 12 years of age. I have been surprised since coming here to learn that there are a number of children who go in for this exam at the age of 12, that means they will be thrown into the brick-making machine at the age of 11. We were given to understand that no one under 12 was allowed to sit for these exams. I shall say nothing farther, but shall not, cannot, dare not be responsible individually for this sacrifice of the young people of this country to this education machine. I ask for the release of these persons under the age of 13.

HON. THE PRESIDENT—My inclinations are to go with my hon. friend, but I would ask one question. I am informed by some parties who claim to speak with authority, that boys and girls, age for age learn more advanced subjects in the Old Country than do our children. It is stated, for instance, that boys are admitted as cadets for the navy at 13, that boys in colleges and public schools are learning subjects at 13,

which are not learned by our children at that age. The hon. gentleman is expert on these matters, and perhaps he can throw some light on it. If children in the British Isles of these ages, are learning subjects which our children are not learning, I do not know why ours cannot accomplish the same result. On the other hand, if our children are being put to subjects more advanced than the children on the other side, they should not go on. The strongest argument against our local C.H.E. examinations is that the Christian Brothers here, whose qualifications and success as educators none will dispute, have deliberately—I am speaking of St. Patrick's Hall and Holy Cross schools—abandoned all connection with the C.H.E., on the ground that they find they can do better work in training boys along practical lines to take positions throughout the city than if they entered for the C.H.E. exams. And this is the strongest indictment of the examinations that we have in the country. Another argument is the charge which I think is well founded in some cases, viz: that many of the pupils in the schools taking the exams. are sacrificed by the teachers to put forward some promising children to get as high a percentage of passes as possible for the school. But I am wavering now and await the answer from my hon. friend as to the age limit for exams. for children in the Old Country.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—The Hon. President is correct in what he states, but he does not seem to catch the whole point. There are children at a tender age, who are exceptionally bright and precocious; but you cannot educate the bright child, no matter how bright, by forcing it in a groove. The heavy machine work, and the strain upon his mental and physical powers is a menace to health and intellect. If you do not give the child its natural bent you rob it of its heritage. If you are going to train children up in the best way, you must train them individually. As the twig is bent so the tree grows. Force the twig to grow in a certain direction, it will grow in it and will not get out of that groove. It is not education—leading the child out from ignorance into knowledge, this process of forcing it into narrow channels. When the child is older, the brain developed, and the physical frame developed, then competitive examinations may be all right and competitive examinations in the schools in Newfoundland are all right, but only so long as the child's welfare and the welfare of other children are not neglected. The present method is not education, but a dangerously mechanical process.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I regret that I must confess that my hon. friend has not made the position clear to me. I am not satisfied. I can see his point of view, but at the same time I am confronted with this situation: if in the Old Country large numbers of children of 12 and 13 are studying and being examined in subjects more advanced than ours are, then I fail to see why we can't take the same risk. The question, of course, as to facilities, opens up a very much larger problem.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I think no child in its plastic state is fit to be turned into a machine.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I contend that for commercial life you will get more brilliant boys in this country about the ages of twelve and thirteen than anywhere. I remember at the school I used to attend myself, the brightest boy was only ten years of age, and he was not crammed. I do not agree that boys under thirteen should not be allowed to go in for examinations. I think my hon. friend will agree with me after thinking it

over that twelve is a reasonable age. Take two boys growing up together, they are not going to grow up alike; one will be more brilliant than the other, but that is a matter which must be left to the teacher as to when they should go in for examinations. I think between ten and twelve is a reasonable age. As regards the word "higher," I think it is only a sentiment. It may mean a lot in this country, and perhaps it is better not to drop it. I think we ought to arrive at a compromise; make the age ten or twelve years.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—The hon. gentleman has given me two very valuable points. In the first place he told us of a brilliant lad of ten years taken hold by the teachers and pushed through his examinations. That is just what I object to. For every lad of ten years pushed through, there are twenty neglected, ignored and allowed to drift along. That is one point. Now the hon. gentleman also speaks of getting bright boys from various schools for the business houses of this town. I will ask the hon. gentleman where do we go for these bright boys? To the Christian Brothers of St. Patrick's and Holy Cross, who will have nothing whatever to do with the C.H.E. examinations, because the Christian Brothers know these do not and cannot equip the boys for office work or any other kind of work.

HON. MR. BISHOP—My feeling in regard to this matter is that I am not yet in possession of sufficient reasons to allow me to vote that the age limit of boys be set at thirteen years. Since our last meeting I have had no opportunity of seeing more than one person. His opinion was that this would be a hardship, particularly upon the children available. My feeling at present is that I must vote against the amendment. I want more information. I recognize a great deal of sound argument advanced by the mover, and yet as other amendments proposed by him are now withdrawn, I think it would be better not to disturb this important matter at the present session, but to endeavour, as I hope we all shall, to more fully inform ourselves on the matter, and be prepared at the next session of the Legislature to amend this important Bill in the best interests of the education of the country. I feel, therefore, I cannot accept the amendment.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I regret I cannot accept that position. I do not care if I stand alone. This has been up here four or five years, and we had an assurance that children under 12 years would not be entered, and yet we find they are. I dare not have it on my conscience any longer. I cannot share the responsibility of this sacrifice of the children of the country to the Educational Moloch. I shall press this amendment if I have to stand alone.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would like to give the House the exact figures of the last year. The number of children entering these examinations were as follows: 11 years of age, 41; 12 years, 308; 13 years and over, 1350; total number of candidates, about 1,700. This is only for the primary grade. One cannot but sympathize with the hon. gentleman's very strong plea in this matter, but I want to say that even amongst practical educationalists, of which he is one, there is a certain amount of difference of opinion, and I am not satisfied he is finally right in his position. If I thought for one moment it was dangerous to the health of the children, I would support him. Now in my own case I went home to England at thirteen, and my brother went with me at twelve. We both had to pass an entrance examination to one of the large English public schools, every one of which schools has an entrance

examination, and very few, I think, admit boys over thirteen years. That goes to show that they do not look upon examinations carried on at the age of twelve years as being a serious menace to the child's future. I further entirely agree with the hon. gentleman in regard to examinations generally, that compulsory examinations had better be left postponed as long as possible, and that education should strive to get at the individuality of each child, and that is the trend of all highly developed modern systems, but that presupposes a most elaborate organization, and we have to deal here with a most primitive organization, and will have to for many years to come, and in view of this fact it is absolutely impossible to deal with each child by himself. We have not the teachers, and we have not got the facilities to train the teachers for such work under present conditions. An abandonment of the elementary C.H.E. exams, I think, would reduce the already small effectiveness of our schools. I find that Mr. Blackall, instead of being against examinations, is very strongly in favor of them. In his 1913 report he says the schools, which take these exams. are conducted with a greater degree of efficiency, and that, on the whole, is the report all the way through. And the very fact pointed out here in regard to the Christian Brothers' schools, which everybody will endorse, shows that there is no compulsion anyway and that the situation need not be fraught with any such dangers as we are assured it is. because the very fact that they are able to exercise their option of keeping children out, shows that other schools may act in the same way, and that there is nothing compulsory about it. I do not consider that the case is really so desperate, especially when I have the views of a number of practical edutionalists entirely against those of the hon. gentleman, and when I know examinations did me no harm, and they are, as far as I can learn. common in more advanced countries than ours.

The committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment, and it was ordered that it be read a third time on to-morrow.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

On motion, the House went into Committee of the whole on the Weights and Measures Bill, Hon. Dr. Skelton taking the chair of the committee.

HON. MR. MURPHY—In section 43, sub-section 3, I wish to propose an amendment. This measurement is all right in dealing with the men in the camps or the men who cut and get out the pit-props, but in delivering a cargo to the purchaser it bears a different aspect, and should not apply to men selling or shipping cargo lots to the exporter, or those who have to deliver a cargo on board a ship, as this process would be too slow and the shippers would be compelled to pay demurrage caused by delay in handling the lumber in loading the ship. There are cases where cargo lots have been resold to purchasers several times before the cargo is shipped, and under the law each seller would be compelled to have the cargo lot surveyed before he could deliver, which would eat up a large part of the value of the wood, leaving less for those who cut it and handle it. In reference to the 128 feet to the cord. This has never been disputed when handling barked wood, but there are hundreds of men who work in the woods for a few weeks or a month or two in winter who only cut and haul the wood to the bank, leaving the bark knots, and occasionally a little snow on their piles, who never bark their own wood or the wood they haul, but sell it

from the pile. If you measure this at 128 feet to the cord there will be a loss of about 10 or 12 per cent. at least, and the men who are employed in the spring to bark it by the cord will find that they are at least 10 to 12 per cent. short. The usual allowance for unbarked wood is about 140 feet to the cord, and my experience in the past has been that in buying it at that rate we often had less than 128 feet out of a cord of 140 feet after barking and preparing it for shipment. A great number of the men who get out this wood have to leave after a month or two and cannot remain to bark it, but it provides ample employment during the spring for a number of others near their homes, where they can find employment for their sons and give them a chance to earn a few dollars also. I cannot see how this unbarked wood can be sold at 128 feet to the cord unless the price is lowered correspondingly, or unless an allowance is made for all these superfluities on the wood. This bears a close analogy to the shipment of fish, in which no merchant would be foolish enough to take a quintal of damp fish at 112 pounds to the quintal. An allowance is always made, so that the quintal of damp fish will equal 112 pounds when it is dried; and this must be so when the contractor says he cannot get the seller's lumber surveyed until the bark, knots, ice, and snow are taken off the wood. The men In many cases want to be paid for their wood as it stands, in order to make provision for their families before they leave, they consequently wish to reckon up so many cords before getting paid, and this is a hardship on the poor man who can't stay to bark his wood and needs to make provision for his family, for according to this law he is not allowed to make an allowance and sell it as he would damp fish. Moreover, the purchaser also has not the option of doing this, which will result in the transaction being deadlocked, and as usual the poor man will be the sufferer, and will be prevented for some time from getting paid for his hard winter's work. The purchaser cannot be blamed if he refuses to buy the wood until barked, for according to this Bill he has to pay $5 for 128 feet of unbarked wood which is 12 per cent. less than a cord when barked, and will cost $1.50 to have barked, when he can buy a full cord of 128 feet of barked wood for $6.00.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Before the amendment is put in writing I want to say something further upon the lines which Hon. Mr. Murphy has been following. On the question of pit props he has shown the great difficulty that exists in carrying out the law and the serious delay that may occur to steamers, but I do not see why the section should be compulsory on lumber in addition to pit props. There is no other general article on which it is absolutely compulsory, no other section which calls for a penalty if something else is neither measured nor weighed. It should be purely and simply a matter between the buyer and seller. If a man goes down to the Horwood Lumber Company's yard to buy 250 feet of spruce, why should it be necessary for him to call a surveyor and have to pay the cost of the survey. I do not at all see why this rule should be made compulsory any more as regards lumber than as regards hay or oats. It seems to me to be a serious subject for the buyer and seller, and a heavy tax on the shipper of lumber. As regards pit props, we must remember that to-day demurrage on a steamer may easily amount to £250 a day, and you may not be able to get a surveyor, and may have to keep the ship tied up to wait for a surveyor to come and measure the cargo, and

to-day this is a very serious consideration. My view of the section is that it should be made optional. In the absence of an agreement between the buyer and seller, then the section comes in force, but that it shall be optional to have a mutual understanding whereby it shall not be necessary to call in an inspector or measurer.

HON. MR. MURPHY—In the following section, 44, mill men are obliged to pay 38 cents per thousand for surveying manufactured lumber. In surveying cargo lots the usual price paid has been 20 cents per thousand, the usûal amount handled daily by the surveyor is from thirty-five to forty thousand, which gives them from seven to eight dollars per day. In the case of a surveyor in a large sawmill turning out from 30 to 50 thousand a day, the surveyor would receive according to that rate, 38 cents per thousand, or from $11.40 to $19.00 per day while most of the other men working much harder in the mill producing the same quantity of lumber per day would be getting probably $1.50. There are cases where surveyors are called away a considerable distance from home to survey small lots, e.g., one to five thousand, and must go under a penalty. It is perfectly justifiable that these should be allowed 38 cents per thousand, as they would possibly make very little even at that rate.

The law previously in force always allowed 38 cents per thousand, but the parties concerned, i.e. the mill man and the surveyor always made their own agreement as to the amount to be paid according to the quantity to be surveyed and the facilities for handling it.

I therefore, Mr. Chairman, propose as an amendment to this section the words: "In the absence of a private agreement between the parties concerned."

HON. MR. BISHOP—The only change from the old Act, which is a very old one, is the insertion of the words "pit props." The remainder of the section has been on the Statute Book for a great many years. Now, apparently, the objection to the section is in relation to pit props almost entirely. It seems to me it ought to satisfy all parties if the seller have the right to demand that his product should be measured by a Government surveyor before making delivery. It shall be optional with him if he has any reason to suspect he is being unfairly dealt with, to have the right to hold up delivery until the Government surveyor shall have passed upon the matter. It seems to me there can be no strong objection to an amendment of that kind.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the remaining orders on the paper were deferred.

Hon. Mr. Bishop gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the suspension of the 33rd rule and all other rules in relation to all matters then before or to come before the House for the remainder of the session.

The House then adjourned till to-morrow, Tuesday, April 25th, at 4 o'clock.

TUESDAY, April 25th, 1916.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, it was ordered that the 33rd rule of the House and all other rules of the House be suspended in relation to all bills now before the House or to come before the House for the remainder of the session.

EDUCATION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the Education Act, 1916 Bill, was read a

third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the said Bill with some amendments and requesting their concurrence in the same.

TRAWL FISHERY BILL.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Trawl Fishing Protection Bill, Hon. Mr. Angel in the Chair.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—While on this section 7, I cannot help thinking that if some sort of an insurance had been started in this country some fifty or a hundred years ago, it would have been of great benefit, and I think now something of the sort might have been adopted embracing men of from 20 to 60 years of age. whereby they would pay a nominal sum per year with some way of collecting it, it would today be one of the strongest institutions in this country. It may not be too late to start now. It need not go beyond $1.20 a year, and if twenty or thirty thousand fishermen took an interest in it, the accrued interest on the money paid in in 25 years would surprise everybody. I think it is worthy of the consideration of the Government. It only requires a beginning; that would be small, but I believe the fishermen would derive a very real benefit from it. It would be one of the greatest mutual benefits that could be started.

HON. MR. KNOWLING—(On section 9). I would prefer that the insurance be increased instead of reducing the premium. I move that this section be eliminated.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose, and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments. The Bill was then read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message intimating that the Council had passed the same with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of the Assembly.

HERRING FISHERY BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee on the Herring Fishery Bill, Hon. Mr. Power in the Chair.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I would like to say for the information of hon. members that upon examination of this Bill I find it is not as important a measure as I had anticipated, and which I think all the hon. members of the House had reason to expect in view of the remarks regarding the necessity of some measure regulating the herring fishery. I find the Bill provides for the formation of a Herring Fishery Board only, and they will have very little power except to make enquiry and investigate for the better regulation of the fishery and make recommendations to the Governor-in-Council, so that some regulation be formally devised.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I regret that this Bill does not go as far as it should in relation to the industry, because it might be made a very valuable and lucrative one to the Colony. In reconsidering this measure we might with reason apply the maxim enunciated by Hon. Mr. Milley:—"In time of War prepare for Peace." We have an opportunity now for making this industry one of the most important in the country, of creating a demand for our herring in the markets of the world, in markets, Mr. Chairman, that were never opened to the same extent before. The herring fishery if properly developed and carried on, can be made profitable to the herring catchers, and can be made profitable as well to the cooper, hoop maker, laborer, and others. All can share in the profits derived from this industry. Now let us look at how the price of pickled herring advanced during the past three years. In 1911-12

there were 74,734 barrels of herring (pickled) exported, and the average price per barrel was $3. In 1912-13 about the same quantity was exported, and the price was the same, $3. In 1913-14 we find we increased the export to 75,790 barrels, and increased the average price per barrel to $4. In 1914-15 there is a still further increase in the export of herring, the quantity exported being 87,540 barrels, of an average value of $5 per barrel, or that from 1912 to 1915 upon barrelled herring alone this Colony has been benefited to the extent of $170,000 according to the figures given by the Customs returns. And the same thing applies to the quantity of herring exported in bulk, which increased from $1.50 to $2.10 per barrel. Between 1913-14 and 1914-15 there have been less bulk herring exported than in 1912-13, and the reason is because more barrelled herring have been put up. It is a pity we cannot take advantage of the opening afforded us now, and which will continue, especially while the war lasts. What we want is herring put up according to a certain standard, and the herring properly inspected. When once this product will be put on the market, a fish which the American public require, we can retain to a great extent the control of the market. We should be in the position of the Scotch packer if we want to sell herring that the American dealers want. The Americans want the Scotch cured article, and we now know that they will pay the men in Scotland $15 for a quantity of this herring. In the beginning the sale is made by cable, the dealer knows that the herring comes from Scotland. and he gets the quality, quantity and standard, which is the subject matter of the cable. In this country during the past year or so a great deal of herring put up on the Scotch principle has been utterly valueless. I know of some hundreds of barrels put up at great expense which did not yield more than $2 per barrel in the American market because those engaged in the work either did not know or did not care how the fish was barrelled, and as a result we sent to market goods called Scotch cure that are even worse than the herring sent to Halifax and the West Indian markets. This is unfortunate, because instead of receiving $3 or $4 per barrel we might be receiving $10 or $15 or a still higher price as the case might be. I trust that those who are vitally interested in the development of our fisheries and have money invested in it will take precautions whereby the shipments of improperly cure and improperly packaged herring may be prevented. There is another thing connected with the industry which those who have money invested in it are as great sinners as the men who export, because sometimes the packages sent out with the herring are brought back again. It is utterly impossible to pack good herring in such packages and expect the contents to turn out good. There should be a law prohibiting the importation of packages that go out being brought back empty because such action is destructive of the industry and the enterprise of our people. and not alone that, but it takes a great deal of work out of the hands of a very worthy section of the community. I trust something will be done by those interested in the industry to have some rules or regulations made, whereby the splendid opportunity now afforded may be availed of to the fullest extent.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I certainly agree with the Hon. Mr. Gibbs in relation to the cure of herring, but I do not think he has told us sufficient as to the cause of what he complains of. I do not think it is attributable to the inexperience of those packing them up. I think it is attrib-

utable to a great extent to the package employed. I question whether the barrels can be made satisfactorily tight in the outports to maintain the pickle in them. I think our people have the impression that they can make barrels as good in the outports as elsewhere but they make a great mistake. They do not give the care and attention to the manufacture of the packages that are necessary, and the result is that packages are loose, lose the pickle, and on arrival at the market they are valueless. My hon. friend refers to the necessity of proper inspection, and this is another of the things which is particularly required, seeing to the proper inspection of the package in which the herring are put up. It is useless to put them up in the Scotch way if the package is not tight, for if it is not, there is nothing to contain the pickle. This is the main course of our future. Our hon. friend the Chairman, is a cooper who knows all about packages, and I am sure he will agree with me that the great cause of the trouble is inferior packages. This is the reason of the failure to bring the herring up to the standard they ought to attain considering the quality of the fish we have to put up. Sound, properly-made packages and a thorough inspection, I think, will save the situation.

HON. MR. POWER—As my hon. friend, Mr. Angel has appealed to me, I may, I think, be permitted to make a few remarks on this question, in which, I am sure, we all take a deep interest. I thoroughly agree with what he says as regards the question of the soundness of the package. The herring itself demands great care, but if the package is not good, in which the herring is contained, the fish cannot possibly turn out good. I know that in Scotland they are very particular about the inspection of the package. There must be a certain class of material and the barrel must be made of spruce. The proper material in large quantity can be procured in Newfoundland. Most of the barrels of the Scotch cure made here last Fall were made from fir. According to the Scotch method, however, they should have been made with spruce. There is some difference of opinion as to the merits of the woods. One idea advanced is that fir wood interferes with the flavour of the herring. However, it is a pity that our herring fishery should not be successful, for it is a great source of employment and would afford an immense revenue to the country, if we could put up the articles in proper form after the Scotch method. I have again to say that very much depends on the inspection of the packages as well as the fish, and we here in this House should endeavour to have put into force proper inspection of the package and careful packing of the contents. I am told there was a good report of the samples of Scotch cured herring sent from here to New-York. But it is strange that our Scotch cure sold there at $16 per barrel—these were the herring put up here for Scotch cure—and at the same time the real Scotch cure sold for $32, or twice the money that ours brought. However, I do not see why we cannot put up as good an article of herring as the Scotch, if we give proper attention to the business. I wish to reiterate what I have already said, that success for us in this new and important department of our fisheries can only be attained, I believe, by the proper inspection of both the package and the herring.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I have listened with a great deal of interest to both Hon. Messrs. Gibbs and Power, and believe with them that we should take more interest in and properly encourage the packing of our

herring by advanced methods, and furthermore, I believe, if carefully looked after that the herring fishery would come second in value to the codfishery only. I do not know who are the packers here, but the curing and packing of herring is a profession. It is like every other trade; you must have an apprenticeship at it. The only herring to any extent packed in Scotland. is the Loch Fyne herring. This fish is very small, and I never could find out why it is so small. My hon. friend to my left, (Mr. Knowling), will bear me out in what I say, for he has imported many of them from time to time, and I am safe in saying in all that he has imported that he never saw one of ordinary size. In connection with the herring fishery of the east coast of Scotland, it is an enormous industry. From Montrose, St. Andrew's, along the different parts of the Scotch coast at certain seasons of the year from nine to ten thousand lassies go from various Scotch places to cure the herring. They know how the curing and salting and packing are done Great care has got to be exercised with the barrel, and in the salting and cleaning of the fish they are very particular. They are carefully inspected and are sent to the Russian markets. In days gone by they commanded such prices and were of such fine quality that Germany alone could take all the herring that could be produced. The catch within the last two years has been limited, and it takes all to meet the domestic requirements of England alone. In days gone by in certain places along the coast of Scotland there was any amount of herring, but there were seasons when there was no herring. The herring is like a bird of passage. If you don't find it in one place you will in another. I believe in this country if we had a scientific way of following the great shoals of herring that frequent our coasts the industry would be second only to our cod fishery, and I am fully convinced that Hon. Mr. Gibbs' observations are well worth consideration. He says, and with reason, that if our herring fishery is to be developed as successfully as it should be something more should be embodied in this Bill than we at present see in it.

HON. MR. KNOWLING—I do not wish to lengthen this discussion, but if possible to throw some light on it. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Gibbs that there is something besides the barrel. You need to begin first with the cure and then see that the barrels are right. I believe we can make as good barrels here as anywhere else. Let our people be taught the way to get the material and if the material is not here let it come in, duty free. I believe that they can get good enough material here but the main thing lately has been the cure. You want to teach not only the packers but the inspectors. Last autumn a customer of mine in Green Bay asked me what I thought of Scotch herring. I said: "You can do it all right enough, but you want to do it right." "Do you know the way?" He said "yes." I said: "You can pack a few barrels and send them along, and we will see what can be done." He did so, and by accident instead of sending them to me, they fell into the hands of a merchant in town. I had been waiting for them for some time, but had found they had been delivered with another lot of herring, and when the merchant got them inspected the inspector condemned them and said they were no good. I took them back, had them opened, and found that the herring were as fine as I ever saw cured here, but I was not satisfied with my own judgment but sent for a man I knew who was a Scotchman and an expert in the herring fishery, and had worked as

a packer for years and years, and I asked him to give me his opinion. He said the herring were perfectly good I sent for another man of equal experience, also a Scotchman. I did not inform him what had been the opinion of the first man. He said he could not wish for anything better. What you want is to get inspectors who know their work. The men who had to inspect those fish know nothing about herring. If you get over the cure, and the packing and the barrels, you will get over nearly all the difficulties. There is no reason why we cannot put up as good fish in Newfoundland as in any part of the world, but if everybody is allowed to do as he pleases you will still have trouble, and it will go on all the time. I was not satisfied with the opinion of those two men or my own judgment, so I put some of the herring in each of the retail stores and they were snapped up very quickly; we sold three or four barrels, and I think that is very good evidence that good herring can be procured in Newfoundland. There is no better judge than the consumer, who is going to get as good value for his money as he can. What I would like to see would be one or two experts such as the men I have referred to, and let them go around and see what is being put up, and show people how to put them up. The cost would be very little but the returns great.

HON. MR. BISHOP—It is perfectly true that there were thousands of barrels of herring packed in Newfoundland the last season that were excellent, but it is indisputable that thousands also were very greatly inferior, and it will take a good deal of instruction before our people will be able to put up a thoroughly satisfactory barrel of herring by the Scotch method. Those inclined to be taught will learn quickly, but we cannot hope to turn out goods equal to the Scotch pack for a good many years to come It has been an industry there for many years, and the fishermen there do their work in a systematic manner. All are perfect in their work and they turn out uniform fish and a uniform package, and as I remarked before, Lewis' herring of Aberdeen are known everywhere, and he can sell his fish without their being examined. My firm sent herring to New York in 1914 and they were perfect; I have never seen herring better than those. We have material here for barrels,but not in abundance. Our wood for barrels here does not usually run clear enough, but is more or less knotty,and in securing a quantity of staves for Scotch barrels you will find a great many defects. A well known cooper in St. John's who is making more Scotch herring barrels than any other, has imported from Nova Scotia considerable quantities of material for barrels, and he contends that he cannot procure in this country material equal to what he has imported from Nova Scotia and he invites people to come to his cooperage to see the beautiful staves they are. If we have the material and proper care is exercised, we can turn out a good barrel. but as the Chairman has remarked, it is necessary to procure spruce wood and not fir or birch or anything else. Now it has appeared to me, and I have had a good deal of experience, that there is no better possible package than that which brings beef and pork from Chicago, and when that keeps its contents good so long, surely it ought to be a good package to put herring in. They will remain tight and hold the pickle, but will not be accepted by the buyers abroad. A man can put the same weight of herring in a pork barrel that he can in a herring barrel; in fact I can produce a man who claims he can put more. but the buyer will not have the unaccustomed package,

We have tried, and it is only today I opened a letter referring to this matter, and the writer said: "We notice again all you say about the package, and while it is all right, the trade will not buy them, and we canno' get within $1.50 a barrel of the price we can get for the fish sent to this market in hardwood packages.'

The Bill provides for the formation of a board, and if an active board is contemplated and can be found who will give the time and attention necessary to this matter. it is possible a great deal of good will come out of this Bill, and if the recommendations of the Governor in Council are agreed upon, then we may have such regulations published in the Royal Gazette as will regulate this business satisfactorily, and lead to the best possible results.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received. The Bill was then read a third time, passed, and it was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

GUARANTEED COMPANIES BILL.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the House went into Committee on the Companies (Government Guarantee) Act. 1916 Bill, Hon. Mr. Murphy in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and on motion the said Bill was then read a third time, passed, and it was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

INFLAMMABLE OIL BILL,

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to move the second reading of the Inflammable Substances Act, 1916 Bill, and in so doing would explain the measure somewhat. Section 2 is entirely new. and defines the various phases which occur in the succeeding sections, which in many cases under the old act were misleading and indefinite. Section 4 has reference to a class of petroleum which is imported for places such as Cape Race and Cape Ray lights. It is a very high test and only imported for that purpose. Section 5 makes provision for outside illuminating purposes; and section 6 deals with the sale and importation of naphtha, and hon. members will readily agree that it is very necessary that there should be some control over such a dangerous article as naptha. Section 7 gives power to a constable or officer of the customs to enter premises where it is offered for sale, and take samples to ascertain what test of oil is being sold, for analysis. Section 8 makes provision for lubricating oils; 9 is really part of the act now in force; 10 provides for a time limit for landing; 10 is really 17 and 18 of the old act; 11 is new, and 12 also. the latter giving power to the proper authority to erect such buildings as may be deemed necessary for the storage of oil. Section 13 is practically section 9 of the old act, and 14 and 15 are new. Sixteen and 17 are the same as 3 and 4 of the old act, and 18 corresponds to 5 of the old act. Section 19 is 10 of the old act, and 20 is new.

Section 21 differs from section 14 of the old act. I may say that this act has been gone over very carefully with the Government analyst, Mr. Davies. and is modelled to some extent upon the act in force in Canada in relation to naphtha, acetyline gas and other such substances. Sections 22 and 23 deal with calcium carbide. the manner in which it is to be kept and stored, and hon. members will see the necessity for a provision of this kind in connection with carbide of calcium. Section 24 deals with gun powder and dynamite, and corres-

ponds in principle with sections 1 and 2 of the old act. Section 25 is the same as section 16 of the old act, except that gasoline is omitted. it having been previously dealt with in another section. Section 26 is section 15 of the old act with the addition of part of section 5 of the old act. I therefore beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

The Bill was accordingly read a second time, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee of the Whole on the measure, Hon. Mr. Goodridge in the Chair.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would like to ask the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill whether non-volatile inflammable oils such as cod and seal oil, are included.

HON. MR. GIBBS—They are not included.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Goodridge the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The Bill was then read a third time, passed and sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed same without amendment.

PATENTS BILL.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the House went into Committee on the Patents Bill, Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I do not really know the necessity for this legislation just now. I am not aware of anything that has arisen to call for it. and consequently I am not prepared at present to vote for the section as read. It appears to me that we will inflict a hardship upon people of an inventive turn of mind in this country, if we enact legislation of this character. Our markets here are limited, very few classes of goods can be manufactured in this country at a profit to the manufacturer. If, for instance, the patent was connected with boots and shoes or some article that enters into the daily life of the people, then one can understand why there should be a compulsory working, it must be carried on continuously. and unless the patented article be manufactured continuously in this country, the rights of the patentee, though he may be a native of the country, will be seriously compromised. I can understand the necessity, existing in other countries to compe' the compulsory working of certain classes of patents. In England it became necessary for the Board of Trade to mak erepresentation to the Government, and the Government has acted upon these and compelled the compulsory working of certain patents in that country, because the patents affected an industry in England which was perhaps the largest there—the woollen industry. A great number of patents, used in carrying on this industry, were the work of German citizens, who acquire patents in the United Kingdom, and then after acquiring these patents rights, refused even to bring them into operation, refused even to sell them to the English manufacturer, having in view the object of crippling the particular industry or trade. Then again, other methods were resorted to. If a citizen of a foreign country, notably a German made application for Letters Patent and was granted them, he would only permit the use of the patented article upon condition that a lease of from 10 to 20 years was executed by which the person taking the lease of a patent bound himself to use that patent and no other in connection with the industry to which it applied. The result was that although improvements were made by others in the Patent, the person who signed the lease under which he acquired the right to use, could not avail of the improvement. As a result, the trade and industry of the grantee was crippled. Then again, another fact, which entered in-

to the Board of Trade's consideration was that the descriptions of the Patents were so vague—that is, the patents that would be applied for by British subjects in England would be of a kind that was perhaps closely allied with the patents of Germans; and in the same way the description of the German article would be so general in its terms that litigation between the German patentee and the British subject went on for many years. The result was that the British subject could not bring his patent into operation because of the case being before the law courts. The British Government to prevent this from going on and to prevent the crippling of trade and industry, through this needless litigation, compelled the working of certain patents in England. It became necessary to their industrial life. No such conditions have arisen here. We cannot hope to engage in the manufacture of patents in this country; we cannot compete with these industries and manufactures in other countries. I am sure hon. members do not want to inflict any injury on the inventive genius of any Newfoundlander, but I do think this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee to see is it necessary.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I would like the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill to give us a little more information as to why it is brought in here so late in the session and as to why it is necessary at all. The reason I ask is that I have here before me the Consolidated Statutes (second series) containing a Patent Bill passed twenty-five years ago. I have also here a copy of the Acts of the session of 1914 containing another Patent Bill which is radically different from the previous one. I have likewise here the Consolidated Statutes (third series) which we have just passed, in which there is a third Patent Act that differs materially from either of the others, and now we have submitted to us today a fourth Patent Act which exhibts many other changes from previous enactments. What, may I ask, is the need for all this patent legislation? I am not aware of anything that has occurred to give rise to it, more especially because it is quite possible today for any man, under the old Consolidated Statutes, who gets a patent in another country, to come in here, and by virtue of that fact, obtain patent rights in this Colony without any further formalities whatever. I do not propose to inflict a lengthy speech on the House at present with regard to this Bill, but merely to state the position I took two years ago, which was that when a man got a patent right and enjoyed it for two years, he had secured as much from this country as he could reasonably expect, and that if he did not put his patent into operation within that period, any monopoly should then and there cease.

I supported that contention at that time by citing many of the arguments just put forward by Hon. Mr. Gibbs, notably that Lloyd George had introduced legislation in the Old Country, the gist of which was to compel people who were enjoying patent rights either to put their patents into practical operation or lose their rights. Various American companies, not to speak of many German makers of machinery, automobiles, etc., then found themselves compelled to establish factories in the British Isles, which benefitted many people there. Now, I know it is not possible to establish many industries here through our Patent Laws, but I do think we ought to have a clear understanding as to why so much patent legislation is flooding our Statute Book. In addition I might say that as I understand

it, the gentleman who originally introduced into the Lower House this Bill which we are considering, introduced it in the form of a small bill, the object of which was to provide that the present practice be abolished, which is that a man now gets a patent for two years, and when that time is about to expire he puts a notice in the papers to say he is prepared to bring the patent into operation in this country if any person wishes to utilize it and lease the rights, and by reason of this notice he claims the power to continue his patent indefinitely. The gentleman who introduced the Bill was of opinion that we ought to wipe out that practice, and his reason for doing so is that he was convinced that this scheme for getting over the operation of the patent laws by putting this notice in the newspapers was of no value, and he believes that the courts would not sustain any such position taken under it, but at present time it suffices to scare off other people from doing anything with articles which might be patented. I am told that the Bill as it stands at present is largely modelled on the Canadian Patent Act.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is the same.

HON. PRESIDENT—Well then, if the law is good enough for Canada, I do not see any reason why it should not be good enough for us, because we have more limited facilities than they have in Canada, but it was with a view of eliciting some information on the subject that I went to the trouble, in view of our experience here two years ago, to delve a little into the history of the Patent Laws, and I now submit that information in the hope that the hon. gentleman in charge of the bill will make it perfectly clear why we are getting so much patent legislation of recent years.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—As I explained on second reading, this is not a Government measure, nor is it one for which the Department of which I am Head is in any way responsible. I am informed that a brief bill intending to make certain alterations in our Patent Law was introduced by a member of the Opposition in the House of Assembly; that the Solicitor of the House put the suggestions of certain members of the House into the form of a draft bill which was ultimately passed by the House of Assembly in the form in which it is now before us. When the Bill came up to this Chamber, the Leader of the Government asked me if I would take charge of it, saying that he knew nothing whatever about it; and as I could not discover that the member of the House of Assembly responsible for the Bill, had asked any member of this Chamber to take charge of it, I moved the first reading of the measure as an act of courtesy to the House of Assembly and to those who were responsible for the introduction of the measure. On examining the Bill I found that it was really a copy of the Canadian law, beginning at section 38 of the Act of 1906. It may not be necessary legislation from a Newfoundland standpoint, but it is not objectionable legislation, as it has the effect of bringing our law into conformity to a very large extent with the law in force in the Canadian Provinces. If there were only one section in the Bill, namely, section 1, I would concur entirely with the observations of the Hon. Mr. Gibbs. His remarks were made after having read section 1 only and without having regard to the scope of section 5 of the measure. Section 5 answers all the questions asked by Mr. Gibbs, and disposes of practically all the objectionable features suggested by him. The observations

which were made by the Hon. Mr. Blandford on the second reading, and all the observations of hon. members to-day have been made without regard to the fact that section 5 of the Bill empowers the Governor in Council under certain circumstances to take a patent out of the operation of section 1, and subject the patent to conditions quite different from those set forth in section 1. These conditions are as follows:

5.—Upon the application of an applicant for a patent previous to the issue thereof, or upon the application, within six months after the issue of a patent, of the patentee or his legal representatives or assigns the Governor in Council having regard to the nature of the invention, may order that such patent, instead of being subject to the condition with respect to the construction and manufacture of the patented invention hereinbefore provided, shall be subject to the following conditions, that is to say:

(a) Any person, at any time while the patent continues in force, may apply to the Governor in Council by petition for a license to make, construct, use and sell the patented invention, and the Governor in Council, upon proof to his satisfaction that the reasonable requirements of the public in reference to the invention have not been adequately met by reason of the neglect or refusal of the patentee or his legal representatives or assigns to make, construct, use, or sell the same, may by writing under the hand of the Colonial Secretary require the owner of the patent to grant a license to the person applying therefor, in such form, and upon such terms as to the duration of the license, the amount of the royalties, security for payment, and otherwise, as the Governor in Council, having regard to the nature of the invention, and the circumstances of the case, deems just:

(b) The existence of one or more licenses shall not be a bar to an order by the Governor in Council for, or to the granting of, a license on any application under this section;

(c) The patent and all rights and privileges thereby granted shall cease and determine, and the patent shall be null and void, if the owner of that patent refuses or neglects to comply with any order made by the Governor in Council under this section, within three calendar months after a copy of such order is addressed to him or to his duly authorized agent.

6.—The Governor in Council may make rules and regulations for the carrying into effect of the said Chapter.

It appears to me that nothing could be more reasonable or just, and that the interests of the patentees are fully protected. Anticipating that some members of the Council might desire an enlargement of the powers given the Governor in Council under section 5, I have drafted an amendment which would make it abundantly clear, if it is not already clear—as I think it is—that the Governor in Council would take into consideration all the circumstances surrounding the case of each applicant; and when we come to section 5, if the House permits the Bill to travel thus far, I shall submit the amendment which I have drafted. As I have already pointed out, this legislation is not immediately necessary, but it is wise, fair, reasonable legislation, and is, in my opinion, worth the serious consideration which it received at the hands of the mem-

bers of the House of Assembly.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD— From a little experience I have had there are some parts of this Bill which might be unfair and unjust upon those who may have an inventive mind, and I think if we are going to take the patent laws of Canada we should take the whole thing so that we may know just where we are. And if you do take the whole thing there is one important point I would like to make to the House. If you take the whole law you will have to appoint an expert to examine patents in England, France, Germany, Austria, and all foreign countries, as well as Canada and the United States. An application for a patent has to go through the patent office, and the patent be examined by an expert before they will grant the patent rights. But what are we to do here? As a matter of fact the only thing required at present moment is that notice be given in the papers. The application is then forwarded to the Attorney General, he reports in turn to the Governor in Council and if the papers are in order the patent is immediately issued, and the reason is that we have not the facilities for working the bill as it should be worked. I do think it is not a fair position to place Newfoundlanders in. Can you compare Newfoundland with Canada or the United States or any other country? I do not think so because we have not the scope. This is one of the strongest objections unless you can have a patent office. Further I think it will debar others in foreign countries from patenting their inventions here, and we are losing a number of fees by the introduction or passing of this bill. Another strong point, in my opinion, is the continuous operation clause, but my hon. friend says we can get around that by bringing in amendments. That is true, but while we have the law on the Statute Book as at present and there has been no objection, I do not think we should make any change. I move that the Committee rise and report progress and that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

The Committee rose and reported having made some progress, and asked that a Select Committee be appointed to whom the Bill be referred.

Hon. the President accordingly appointed the following to be a Select Committee:—Hons. Minister of Justice, Gibbs, Blandford, Bishop, Harvey, Anderson, Milley and Goodridge.

On motion, the remaining orders were deferred.

Hon. Mr. Bishop tabled the report of His Excellency Sir W. E. Davidson, Governor, Chairman of the Patriotic Association of Newfoundland, and on motion the House then adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 26th, at 4 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, April 26th, 1916.

The House met at 4 o'clock, pursuant to adjournment.

SEALING BILL.

HON. PRESIDENT intimated that he had received a message from the Assembly stating that they had passed an Act relating to the Seal Fishery in which they asked the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill was read a first time.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I beg leave to present a petition to the Council from Harvey & Co. and others on the Sealing Bill just introduced here, and I beg leave to move that the petition be read by the Clerk.

The Bill was accordingly read.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I beg leave to present a petition from Messrs. A. J. Harvey and Co. and others, praying that they may be heard by Counsel at the Bar of the

House in connection with the Sealing Bill, and would ask that both petitions may lie on the table.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Though there may be hon. members who hold a contrary opinion, I do not think this is the place where counsel should be heard against this Bill. This Bill has emanated from the Lower House, and is a product of the deliberations of the Joint Select Committee with the exception of one hon. gentleman who signed the Report with reservations. There was ample time for counsel to be heard in the interest of the parties before the Bar of the House and also ample time for counsel to be heard before the Joint Select Committee, and personally I see no good reason in view of these facts why counsel should be heard at the Bar in relation to the Bill when there was ample time for that to be done before the Bill came before this House. We should endeavour as far as possible to keep away the least sign of suspicion as to the motives that may influence us in dealing with legislation of this character. While I have no doubt that every hon. member in this House will give the Bill in its several sections that consideration it deserves and will vote according to his opinion and convictions, nevertheless we can't get away from the fact that this Chamber is regarded by the majority of the people as being representative of the classes, and we should do as little as possible to give any weight or force to this idea for our own sake and for the reputation of this Chamber. For these reasons I oppose the petition that counsel be heard before the Bar of this House in relation to this Bill.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I see no objection, Mr. President, to the petitioners being heard at the Bar of this House, though it is quite true that they might have been heard before the Select Committee or at the Bar of the lower branch of the Legislature. But it is as to the action of the Select Committee that they wish to be heard, and there is, I have no doubt, a precedent for their being heard at the Bar of the House. Nor must it be forgotten that these men are largely interested in the sealfishery, have large sums of money invested in it, and it is only due to them that they be given an opportunity to place their views before this branch of the Legislature. The lower branch of the Legislature is representative of the masses, and while I don't mean to say this branch represents the classes, it should not be thought for one moment that this branch is representative of the classes only. Hon. members are here for the protection of the poor man as well as any other, and are as much interested for the benefit of the poor man as the other Chamber. I cannot see why I should not vote for counsel being heard at the Bar of this House.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I should like to say, Mr. President, that I am not aware of any particular reason why the petitioners should not be heard at the Bar of this House, nor yet have I any information as to the reason why they did not present themselves for the same privilege to the Lower House. But this much I do say, that as the petition has got to this stage I must agree with the observations of Hon. Mr. Goodridge, and assert again that I see no valid reason why they should not be heard at the Bar of the House, because we must remember that the sealfishery here is second in importance to the other great staple industry of the country, the codfishery. I have no objection whatever to Counsel being heard at the Bar, and I feel assured that the Bill will receive from this

House careful and very careful consideration.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—Mr. President, I am not out of sympathy with the petition introduced here, but must say that I am very much in sympathy with the position assumed by Hon. Mr. Gibbs. I should like to be clear as to the reason why when the Select Committee was sitting these views were not represented before that Committee. I cannot understand why they could not submit their views to the other Chamber when the matter was first discussed.

There seems to be no reason why the very representative Committee from the two houses should not have been approached and these statements submitted to them. We should be very careful in what we are doing at the present moment. Not long ago a petition was presented in the Lower House. That petition may come up here if it is thrown out. I cannot help thinking that we are being used in this House. Bills that are obnoxious are rushed through the other Chamber and then sent up to us to be killed. Now, Sir, before we accept this petition, and I want it to be understood I have not the slightest desire to prevent the House from getting all the information we can, nor have I the slightest intention of allowing myself to be menaced by any threats from any other quarter, yet I want to be satisfied that this Select Committee is yet out of existence, for if not they can have this information put before them. If the Committee is dead with no possibility of resuming its work, then I am prepared to support the motion put before the House. If, however, that Committee can be resuscitated, then the proper place for these petitions to be read is before that Select Committee.

HON. MR. BISHOP—It does not appear to me that the course suggested by my hon. friend is possible. That committee reported to the House of Assembly. The House of Assembly dealt with that report, passed the Bill finally and sent it here for consideration, and, I speak subject to correction, it seems to me that that committee is no longer in existence.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I feel that I would very much rather have seen this petition come before the two branches of the Legislature, or at least before the Lower House. But as it has not and as these gentlemen want to be heard, it appears to me that too great regard for our position should not prevent our hearing counsel. I shall therefore vote to hear counsel on the petitions, but I very much regret that the matter was not brought before the Select Committee of the Houses. We must, however, remember that this Bill was not in its final form when it left the Lower House, and it is quite conceivable that the gentlemen now approaching the House were unaware of the action of the Committee and unable to express their views before it.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I should like to ask the hon. leader of the Government is the Bill we have now before us prepared on the lines of the original report of that Select Committee or has it been changed. The reason I ask that question is that at the time it became a Bill we only saw it in this House for the first time. It might have been better for these gentlemen to have presented their petitions to the Select Committee, but I understand the Bill was changed considerably between the time it came before the Select Committee and this House. When you take into consideration the importance of this industry and the vast amount of capital invested in it, and its importance to the country, it seems to me reasonable that capital's representative should be heard at the Bar of this House.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs said that the Lower House is the representative of the masses, and I presume therefore this Chamber represents the classes, but we must bear in mind that the merchants of this country have a right to a certain amount of consideration.

HON. MR. BISHOP—In reply to the question of the hon. gentleman there were amendments made to the Bill after the report of the Select Committee was presented.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I object to the petitioners being heard by counsel at the Bar of this House. One of the questions asked was whether there were any amendments made to the report of the Select Committee. It is quite true there have been amendments made to that report, so that can be no argument in favour of the counsel being heard in relation to this Bill. As I have already pointed out, this is not a matter of yesterday; it is over twelve months old, and it is well known to those who have capital invested in the industry that a bill somewhat on the lines of the Bill now before us, would come under consideration, and if adopted, be carried into law. And furthermore, there was ample time while the Bill was before the lower branch for counsel to be heard there. The Bill emanated from that body, and is not alone the production of the representatives of the people in the Lower House, but the production of both sides, i.e. those interested in the investment from a cash standpoint, as well as others engaged in the industry, namely, the sealer. Now whatever objection may be urged, if any, against the adoption of this measure, I submit they should have been heard before a body which represents by far the most numerous class interested in this Bill, and a class whose rights are superior to the rights of property; but this petition treats the rights of property as being more sacred than the rights of individuals, and whatever reasons may be advanced against the measure, I submit the same should have come before either the Lower House or the Select Committee, when they would have had an opportunity of considering them in all their details before the Bill came up here. For this reason, I oppose the motion.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I should like an answer to my question. I am in a very difficult position. If application had been made that the petitioners be heard before the Select Committee and refused, then I should have been compelled to advocate that they be given this opportunity here. But no such application has been made, and I want to know if it is now too late. The hon. leader of the Government has not given a definite reply; he says he thinks it is. If it is impossible, then I am going to vote that counsel be heard before this Chamber, but if it is possible, then I shall vote against it, and until I get an answer to that question I do not know what is best to do.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I am informed by the Solicitor of the House that the Committee is now out of existence having reported. I should also say further, that I am sure every member of this House wants to be enlightened as to this measure. I may say that I received one notice to attend a meeting of the Joint Committee; I never had notice afterwards, but I understand that there were other meetings to which hon. members of this Chamber were not invited, and there were undoubtedly changes made. When the report was brought to me to be signed, I did not know of those changes and signed the report unwittingly; that report was not in accordance with the findings of that Committee, but was amended and seriously. The Bill would not be before this House in its present form if the members of this House had

been given the opportunity of subsequently attending the meetings.

The motion that counsel for the petitioners be heard at the Bar of this House was carried, and Mr. W. R. Warren, the said counsel, thereupon appeared at the Bar of the House, and addressed the hon. members for some time concerning the aforesaid petition.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg leave to move that the Bill entitled an Act relating to the Seal Fishery be read a second time on to-morrow.

And it was so ordered.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

On motion the House went into Committee on the Weights and Measures Bill, Hon. Dr. Skelton in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Murphy moved amendments to sections 43 and 44, which were carried.

HON. MR. HARVEY—There is a mistake in section 31, sub-section (b), where it says that in the case of cod oil sold in casks an addition of one and one-half gallons shall be added to the contents of the cask. Now the point is whether the cask be only half full or two-thirds full would the one and a half gallons have to be added? Clearly that is not what is meant. What is meant is that to the gross cubic measurement of the cask shall this quantity be added. I propose to amend that, if I have made it clear.

The amendment was carried.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the Committee on Weights and Measures Bill rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the Bill was then read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message intimating that the Council had passed the Bill with some amendments, in which they asked the concurrence of the Assembly.

PENSION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the Pension Bill was read a second time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill, Hon. Mr. Power in the Chair.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

On motion, the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with an intimation that the Council had passed the Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House adjourned until 4.30 p.m. tomorrow, Thursday, April 27th.

THURSDAY, April 27th, 1916.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. President read a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the amendments made by the Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled the Trawl Fishing Act, without amendment.

Also that they had passed the amendments made by the Council in and upon the Education Act, without amendment, except that to section 33, sub-section "1" in which they did not occur.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the amendment referred to was read by the Clerk.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I would not accept the responsibility the House of Assembly have taken on themselves for a large inducement. That means, Sir, that we have been deliberately fooled in this House; we have been told again and again that the age limit was 12; some of us knew it was not 12; some of us knew that little children at the age of 11 were being sacrificed, and 11 means 10. Sir, it is useless for me to say anything further. I am thankful that I

am placed on record and I have no hesitation in saying that the time will come when the views I have enunciated will be accepted in this country. I shall not keep the House here days and days, but shall have to accept their decision, but disassociate myself from any responsibility.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg to move that the House recede from its decision in regard to this amendment.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I voted in favour of the amendment for 12 year limit, and while I support the motion of the Leader of the Government in accordance with the expressed opinion of the House of Assembly, yet I would like to go on record in support of the 12 year limit. I myself am in favour of 13, and I have four children going to school, and shall take good care that none of them go in for competitive examinations until they reach the age of 13 years. As the House of Assembly has taken this position, however, I feel I would like to go on record as being in favour of the 12 year limit.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I should like to know at what age they can go in now that the House of Assembly has refused this amendment.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—Any age at all; three if they like.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—Then I support Hon. Mr. Robinson. While I think in some cases children of 10 or 11 would be all right. yet many throughout the country would suffer by it.

On the vote being taken, the motion was lost, and Hon. Mr. Bishop then gave notice that he would on to-morrow move that the amendment be reconsidered.

SEALING BILL.

Second reading of the Sealing Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg leave to move that this Bill be now read a second time, and take the opportunity of pointing out that the awful catastrophe which happened at the seal fishery in 1914 points to the absolute necessity of legislation being enacted which would serve as a deterrent, and at the same time a protection so far as human foresight can make it against a recurrence of such conditions. A Commission composed of the Judges of the Supreme Court carefully investigated the circumstances surrounding the terrible loss of life, and as a result of their enquiry made certain recommendations, many of which will be found in this Bill. As you cannot carry on business enterprises without considering man and his relation thereto and his welfare. so superior to all rights of property, it is and will be always necessary to protect him against the greed or recklessness of those who employ him. It may be said, and truly, that for centuries, down until the dawn of the 20th, the time of deliberative bodies, such as Legislators. was principally occupied in protecting the rights of property, while the rights of the individual, in consequence, suffered; in other words, property rights wee regarded as greater, if not superior, to the rights of the individual, as life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That trend of thought passed from Europe to this country, and it is because it still exists, though not to the same extent as formerly, that the enactment of this Bill becomes a necessity.

The first section of the Bill defines the meaning of the word 'ship' and the word 'sealer.'

The second section deals with the hours during which seals may be killed, and when sealers may be employed at the work. It provides that it shall be unlawful to kill any seals or for a sealer to be upon the ice in charge of any seal pelts, except between the hours from daylight to dark, and it penalizes the sealer who without lawful excuse, remains away

from his ship or on the ice during any part of the period named, by punishing him with a fine of one hundred dollars. This, I feel assured, will commend itself to the judgment of the hon. members, because the sealer who remains upon the ice without a good and valid reason, knows that when so doing he will be liable to punishment under the Bill.

Section 3 has reference to the obligations of the Master or other Officer of a ship, in connection with the sending of sealers on the ice, or permitting them to be on the ice except between the hours of daylight and dark, or at any other time when the state of weather is such that the sending of them to kill seals or to search for them would endanger their lives or their limbs. It makes the Master or Officer liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars, and the Magistrate before whom an offence under this section may be tried, is given the power to suspend the certificate of competency of the Officer given him under this Act for such period as he may deem proper. The reason why this additional penalty is prescribed is because there will be degrees of guilt; some may wilfully endanger the lives of sealers, while others may, through thoughtlessness, and not wilfully, commit a breach of the section. Discretion in such case is given the Magistrate as to whether the second penalty provided for will be imposed. It is only right that a Master or other Officer who sends men on the ice when weather conditions do not warrant him in so doing, that he should be made feel the consequence of his act.

Section 4 provides that the preceding Sections 2 and 3 shall not apply to the work of strapping and hoisting seals, and further, that in any prosecution under the Sections named, no conviction should be had unless a complaint be made within twenty-four hours after the committing of the offence to the Master or other officer in charge at the time, whose duty it shall be to enter it in the log-book. The reasonableness of this provision is apparent, because it is only fair that in the carrying on of an industry such as the prosecuting of the seal fishery, where officers of a ship have a number of men under their control going a long distance from the ship, that they should be apprised as soon as possible of the occurrences named in the Sections, in order that they may be in a position to investigate the circumstances when all the facts are fresh in the minds of the person or persons making the charge, and of those who may have witnessed its occurrence.

The next Section, 5, may be considered somewhat drastic because it provides that a breach of Section 3 by the Master or other Officer which results in total disablement to a sealer for any period less than three months, shall be a misdemeanour, punishable upon conviction by imprisonment not exceeding one year; if death results, the section makes it a felony, punishable upon conviction by imprisonment not exceeding three years.

If hon. members will carefully examine Section 3, they will see that the duty of Master or other Officer towards the sealer in relation to his hours of work and weather conditions is clearly defined, and when he wilfully commits a breach of it, which results in the disablement of the sealer or his death, it is only right that he should be punished for his conduct in the manner prescribed by this Section. If some such law had been in force for a number of years past, many of the hardships and privations which sealers have endured, would not have taken place, and many a home that is bereft of its bread winner would now have one.

Section 6 makes it obligatory upon the part of the master or officer in charge at the time when men are missing, to send out a search party to look for them. Hon. members may say: "Why insert a provision of this kind—would not humane motives force the officer to immediately organize a search party?" But I am afraid the records of the sealing industry compel us not to rely altogether upon that kindly feeling which should prompt every man to alleviate suffering.

The next section deals with ships being supplied with fire-rockets, and if they be not so supplied there is a penalty of $400. This in the light of experience is a very necessary provision. I feel assured that if ships had been compelled to carry fire rockets in 1914, the very tragic occurrence that then happened, would not have taken place.

The next Section, 8, makes it obligatory upon the Master or Officer in charge whenever any sealer is absent from his ship after dark or in fog, or falling or drifting snow, that the steam whistle shall be sounded at intervals of about five minutes, and that he shall also cause fire rockets to be discharged at suitable intervals. It is not necessary for me to refer to the unfortunate event already spoken of; it may in part be traced to the fact that rockets were not on board ship and that the steam whistle was not kept going as long as it might have been; not that there was any intention to cease sounding it, but because of the false hope which had arisen in the breast of the captain that his men had found shelter on another ship.

Section 9. As the non-observance by the captain or other officer in charge, of the obligations cast upon him by the preceding section, may be the cause of sealers being on the ice all night, and suffering cold and hardship, it provides that the penalty set forth in the preceding section, may be recovered by any sealer who may sue for it, and that in addition the offending officer's certificate shall be cancelled, and he shall not receive another certificate of the kind proposed to be granted under this Bill.

The next section requires that ships carrying more than one hundred and fifty sealers, before being cleared for the seal fishery, shall have on board a competent Medical Practitioner. If one cannot be obtained and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries issues a certificate to this effect, then the ship may be cleared.

The eleventh section makes it obligatory that a ship before clearing for the seal fishery shall have on board a person holding a certificate as Master or Mate, which complies with Chapter 17 of the Consolidated Statutes. This requirement, however, may be dispensed with, if the Customs Officer granting the clearance is satisfied that one cannot be obtained.

A great deal of complaint has frequently been heard against the practice of persons other than the captain hiring sealers to prosecute the fishery, and the 12th section provides that no sealer shall be placed on the articles without having first obtained the approval of the master.

The next Section, 13, has for its object the prohibition of any steel steamer of more than 450 tons net, engaging in the seal fishery. The sub-section, however, provides that the steel steamer which prosecuted the sealing industry this season shall have the right to do so in the future, but the catch is limited to 35,000 seals, under a penalty of one hundred dollars for every seal brought in in excess of the number named. The necessity for the preservation of the fishery because of its decline has of late years forced itself on the attention of those who desire to see it preserved for future

generations. There can be no doubt, whatever, that if large, powerful ships be not prohibited from engaging in the industry the seal fishery will cease in the very near future, to be a source of any real wealth to the country. The chances of escape of any portion of the seal herd during the past ten years or more have become less. As we have but one steel steamer prosecuting the industry an opportunity is now afforded us of doing that which should have been done years ago, namely, the protection and preservation of the industry. If we fail to take advantage of this opportunity, we will be false to the best interests of the country, we will permit a desire to accumulate wealth at the expense of a great national industry, to be the objective point of the capitalist who invests money in large powerful ships. Some may think that there should be no restriction whatever as to the class or size of ships or the number of seals brought in at any season. Those who reason thus are very short-sighted, and are unable to rise superior to the gain of dividends at the expense of the exhaustion of the natural wealth of this industry. We must, if we desire to preserve the industry, show that we are not living for the present, that we have no desire to deplete and exhaust this industry.

The next Section, 14, makes it an offence for any ship to have on board more than two guns, or for any person on board of a ship to kill a seal by means of a gun. I feel assured that the object of this Section will commend itself to hon. gentlemen, because nothing has been more destructive to the seal herd than the employment of guns in pursuit of the seal. To the one obtained by means of shooting, numbers are wounded and die, and to such an extent has the employment of guns at the seal fishery wrought havoc and destruction that all have joined in a chorus of condemnation against this method of prosecuting this industry.

Section 15 is a re-enactment of a section which is already upon our Statute Book, making it unlawful to bring into port hood seals.

Section 16 deals with the right of property for seal pelts, or in other words the panning of seals by providing no right of property shall exist in them unless they be taken into possession within 48 hours after the killing of them. After 48 hours elapse, then any ships' crews in the vicinity may take them on board. This provision, while perhaps it may not meet with the support of all, must, however, commend itself to our judgment and common sense. It is a well known fact that when a sealing steamer gets among the herd, the desire of the captain and crew is to slaughter as many seals as they can, and it thus happens that many thousands are killed and panned in excess of that required to load the steamer, the result being, that the excess killed, is in the greater number of cases entirely lost, and the industry suffers in consequence. Another factor which those who have given this Bill study which induces them to place the section there, is that great hardship and suffering have very often occurred to the sealer in going long distances from his ship to pan seals. If the right of property in panned sealers were entirely prohibited, the awful disaster of 1914 would not have occurred. This section, while it aims to protect the fishery, has, however, a higher object in view, and that is to protect the life of him who prosecutes it.

Section 17 makes provision that if the cooking be satisfactory to the owner of the ship, the owner shall pay to the chief cook a bonus of $20, and to each of the assisting cooks, a bonus of $15. This is a highly commendable object, because it ensures

the proper preparation and cooking of food and prevention of waste. If food be not properly cooked, the men suffer and the owner as well, because of the waste that occurs.

The next Section, 18, deals with the appointment of a Board of Examiners for Master, Second Hand, or Master Watches,and the granting of certificates of competency, and makes it illegal for any person to go to the seal fishery who has not in his possession a certificate of the kind, under a penalty of five thousand dollars, to be recovered from the owner of the ship. An adoption of this Section ensures the employment of men of competency in positions of the kind.

The next Section, 19, and the various sub-sections connected therewith, deal with the compensation to be paid to the sealers who have not returned to their ship within one hour after dark and suffer injury or death. In the case of death, the amount to be paid shall be one thousand dollars. Where total or partial incapacity results, the amount of compensation shall be a weekly payment during incapacity not exceeding fifty per cent. of the sealer's average weekly earnings during the previous 12 months, the amount not to exceed five dollars a week. This section also provides the mode of procedure for the recovery of compensation in the event of its not being made. It differs from the "Workman's Compensation Act" in this respect, that no claim under the section will be valid where the injury is attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of the sealer, or where the injury was suffered while he was absent from his ship on his own business or for pleasure, and not in the course of his employment.

Section 20 relates to the mode of procedure where injury or death has resulted and is really copied from the Workmen's Compensation Act.

The next section empowers the Governor in Council after taking steps to ascertain the views of the owner and crew of the ship to approve any schemes of insurance for the crew of any ship, and provides compensation not less favourable to sealers and their dependents than that provided for in Section 19. Where the majority of sealers, and where the scheme is applicable, are in favour of it, it empowers the owner to contract with any of the sealers employed by him that the provisions of such scheme shall be substituted for the provisions of this Act. Some may see in the provisions of this Bill an interference with the rights of capital. This I deny. There is no attempt whatever being made to interfere with its legitimate use and investment, but there is an interference to the extent of protecting the lives of those who man the sealing fleet, and of conserving and protecting the industry. There can be no doubt whatever that the industry is declining because of our destructive methods in its prosecution, and because of these facts and others that we know of, legislation prohibiting the sending of powerful ships to the seal fishery is imperative. When sail only was used, the catch was double that of recent years, which proves that even with the advantages of steam. we cannot bring into port but half the number formerly killed. Why? Because the herd is becoming depleted. In the light of these facts we should ask ourselves: "What are the causes?" They point to this, that if we permit the powerful ocean going ship to continue in the prosecution of the seal fishery, in a very short time there will be a very limited number of seals. The ship that can in almost any weather conditions search the ice floes for the herd is not the type we want, because very

few will escape. So long as there is a chance of profit being made, the destructive methods of the past will be employed unless we avail of the opportunity now afforded. We are not interfering with any vested rights because the steel steamer sealing fleet has passed into other hands, and is employed at other work. Now then is the opportunity for conserving and protecting the industry. We have, strictly speaking. no right to destroy by our methods of carrying on this industry, the gifts of nature. The seal fishery is one of them. It belongs not to this generation solely, but to future ones as well. Others will come after us, and we must not destroy the portion of their heritage that belongs to them. Except we limit the tonnage of vessels that may engage in this industry, you may have in the future a larger and more powerful type of sealing steamers prosecuting the seal fishery than in the past. In the hands of a few will be placed the control of the industry, because of the greater amount of capital required. The tendency of modern industrialism is the centralization of financial power. which enables the formation of trust companies and other such combinations of the few. By this means the number of employers is diminished; trade, manufactures, and other forms of industry have fallen into the hands of the few, and as a result they become too rich and the rest of humanity sink to the level of the too poor, and with it other attendant evils. Men and women, boys and girls of tender ages, are waiting to be hired as slaves to toil in stifling factories and sweat shops. This form of industrial expansion is commencing to rear its head in our midst. and is it desirable that we should have colossal wealth on the one side and abject poverty on the other? Some of the provisions of the Bill aim at preventing this from happening in the sealing industry, and to make it possible for a man of limited means to engage in it; but if they have to face the competition of the steamers costing many hundred thousand dollars, he cannot and will not be able to do so. Many a man of limited capital has started a business enterprise, only to find that he could not compete with this centralization of the financial power, and as a result he finds himself very soon powerless, financially, in consequence. Some may argue that this centralization I have referred to works for efficiency. True. it does, from the standpoint of those who possess the power, but it means to the many starvation wages, and when they can no longer work the poor house and an old age of abject poverty.

The ideal country is where the majority of the people are neither too rich nor too poor. The greater the number of moderate fortunes in a country, the greater will be its stability. Fortunately for us in this country there is perhaps a greater distribution of wealth than can be found elsewhere, because we have such a large number of people who are independent planters carrying on their own fishing operations, the servant of no man.

If the cod fishery were concentrated in the hands of a few and the many had to seek employment at it from them, would we have the same prosperity among our people? Would we have that distribution of wealth I have referred to? We would not. Why? Because the fishermen would be. because of his necessities, forced to bid against his neighbour for employment at the fishery, owing to the number of employers being limited. Where you have hundreds seeking to employ fishermen, employers competing with one another to get the necessary help to carry on the industry, you would have the fishermen

competing with one another with the attendant consequences, we see elsewhere. We passed a law preventing the use of steamers from engaging in the prosecution of the Labrador cod fishery. Why? Because, if we did not, it would sound the death knell of the independent planter and fisherman. They would not be able to compete with large aggregations of capital and mechanical power which cost so much to obtain. It would not alone spell the ruin of the individual fisherman on the Labrador. but possibly that of the industry as well. This is the principle underlying this bill in relation to prohibition of powerful steel steamers, the principle that protects the industry for future generations, the principle that makes employers compete for workingmen. We have in this country perhaps the most independent peasantry in the world. But suppose the land on the foreshore which they occupy, the lumber which they use, were to pass into the hands of private persons, and they had to pay an annual rental for the land and other privileges now enjoyed by them free. would not their earning and purchasing power decrease very materially? This would be so because they would have to pay for that which they now have free; and instead of a happy and prosperous peasantry, you would have poverty and discontent.

The hon. gentleman on my left in his address on education quoted from Goldsmith by way of condemnation of competitive examinations of school children under our educational system. I also quote from his "Deserted Village" when he arraigned England's industrialism, which through centralization of financial powers caused the destruction of Merrie England.

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills
a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men
decay,
Princes and Lords may flourish or
may fade,
A breath can make them as a breath
has made;
But a bold peasantry the country's
pride,
When once destroyed can never be
supplied.
A time- there was ere England's
griefs began,
When every rood of ground maintained a man.
For him life labor spread his wholesome store,
Just what life required, but gave
no more;
His best companions, innocence and
health,
And his best riches, ignorance of
wealth."

HON. MR. HARVEY—I want to say that I have listened carefully and with much interest to the remarks of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, but I think that the danger of losing control of the sealfishery is not as far-fetched as people may suppose. It is true that no population except our own can carry on the sealfishery. but it is not true that ships have to come here to get men, and it is not true that seals must be brought back to this country, and I would point out to the House that within the last week a cargo of seals taken by a Canadian ship has been sold in Sydney and will be manufactured there by a Canadian concern. So near as that at present is the danger to us of outside interference with our monopoly of the seal fishery. That is a matter which we must not ignore. All that I am saying is that we must not sit comfortably down and take the position of the hon. introducer of the bill, and say we have a monopoly and can do what we like. There is a danger, and not only from Canada. but from St. Pierre. and if matters were made too difficult and impossible, it is quite on the cards that the industry might be transferred there, and even against their own desire those carrying it on here today might find themselves obliged to shift to compete. I do not say this will happen; I hope it will not.

and I don't think it will; but it is unquestionably possible. I would like to refer briefly to the memorandum put in here yesterday in regard to one or two matters with some of which I am not perfectly in agreement. The attorney for the petitioners indicated that legislative consideration of the subject had been greatly neglected, but the Legislature has not been as neglectful as may be generally supposed, for it will be remembered that a Joint Committee of both Houses of which you, Mr. President. were the Secretary, sat for over a year out of session, and did a large amount of work, examined all the captains available and took a great deal of evidence on the seal fishery, that members of both Houses were on that committee, and reported to the last session of the Legislature. But I am afraid the report is like the reports of other commissions, other committees and other departments to which I recently referred here, it probably went on the table of the House, and nobody heard of it again. or if they did, paid little attention to it. That committee put in three or four recommendations, one of which was for a close time for hood seals; and another for no killing after April 15th, which I believe was a good one. Another recommended that the Canadian Government be approached in order that they might make Canadian laws conform with our laws on the seal fishery; an important matter that, and one it would be well, I think, to get in force as soon as possible in view particularly of the position now opened up in Sydney to which I have already referred. A further recommendation was in regard to rifles. We have also had a report from Captain Kean and very lengthy debates in recent years.

Now in the petition that came in I notice that the first section of it asks:—

(a) Section 7 should be amended so as to provide a penalty for any ship using the fire rockets without cause or excuse.

I think the petition would have been better without that section. It is perhaps meant to be facetious. Section (c) says that there are not enough ships now at the ice to bring in the amount of seals that may reasonably and without harm be acquired. I take entire exception to that claim; I think it is entirely incorrect; there are enough ships to-day, though we shall soon want. I hope, more and better ships; and it goes on to say: "Section 14 which deals with guns "ought to be deleted. To encourage "investment in the seal fishery it is "necessary that a reasonable hope "of profit as distinguished from a "chance of profit should be held out "to investors. The hope of profit is "greatly diminished and will bring "with it a corresponding lack of in-"terest in those who might invest "in the future. It is the opinion of "your petitioners that the time has "not arrived when the old seals should "be so carefully protected. Nature "provides close seasons for them as "well as for the young which escape "from year to year." To lay down to the Legislature that there is no need for any such small protection as is proposed in the Bill is to me an absolute heresy. Section "e" treating of hoods, I must confess, I entirely agree with. I am not going to vote to alter the section as it appears in the Bill, but I do think if we could have had the bill permit the destruction of dog hoods and protect the females and pups, it would have been much wiser than the way it is now. I would like to refer to the position of the Select Committee that sat on this bill, and hon. members may observe if they have studied the Bill in its original text, that there are a very

considerable number of minor modifications. many of them on the lines recommended by this Chamber last session, and there was, I am pleased to say, a desire on the part of the members of that Select Committee, members who had this Bill particularly at heart, and who were largely responsible for it, to meet within certain limits the desire of this Chamber. and a great many suggestions, mainly of a minor character, were on some very slight discussion, readily admitted and agreed to. In these minor matters the bill is a very great improvement on that of last year. I am just going to run through one or two sections, not referring by any means to all of it, and not to unimportant matters. Regarding section 5, I said on the Select Committee. and I am not clear today why a man should be guilty of a misdemeanour if a sealer gets injured; and guilty of a felony if that sealer dies. I believe it is a principle admitted in law, but not in reason, that a man may be guilty of a different crime if the victim happened after its commission to do this or that. If a man gets his feet frostbitten so that he could not get to his ship and dies, I do not see that the Captain is very much more guilty than if he did not die. Now we come to the section dealing with the exclusion of steel steamers. This section as it stands, must, I think. be admittedly regarded as unsatisfactory. That is to say, it is special legislation, and while the special ship provided for, the Florizel, may have been built under the laws here and may have cost much more, because she was designed for the purpose of engaging in a legalized industry, and may in that way have a special claim for consideration, still I think it is undesirable unless the matter is very urgent to deal with any particular ship and to legislate for her alone. My feeling about this is that the regulations should not deal with the Florizel or Stephano or any special ship. What we want here. and everywhere in the world in all things, is efficiency- and if we can get ships to go out there for three weeks, bring in a load of seals and pay off their crews with a good bill in their pockets in a short time, that is the type of ship we want. We want the type that will not only do that, but as soon as the fishery is over will take on board a crew of deck hands, engineers and stokers from this place and be able then to ply in any trade in any part of the world. That is the best type of ship for this Colony, both for the men who operate on board her and also for the capital owning her. To throw back to wooden ships. to refuse any obtainable improvement in our shipping, is legislation which I must confess I cannot support.

As regards the quantity to be brought in, if you limit a ship to 35,000 seals, I fail to see whether it makes any difference to the seal fishery whether that quantity is brought in in a steel ship or a wooden ship. What is the difference? The principal thing is not to kill too many; subject to that you want the best and most efficient ship you can have. There is a general feeling, and I think a stupid one, that the country should go back to sailing vessels. Not only do I think the sailing vessels would be impossible and undesirable. but if we had to wipe every steamer off the ocean today, and brought a fleet of old time sailing vessels here, I say you would not be able to get crews for them, and it would be undesirable if you could. They could not do as well per man even if they got half their hand as this year when they got only one third. You would not get men to go to the ice about the first of March and come back in June or the end of May, and furthermore it would not

be economical. This last year men went out to the ice on the east side and came back in three or four weeks, and were paid off with more, on an average. in their pockets, than ever the sealers got in the good old days of the sailing vessels, which took two or three months to do the same thing. Now this sailing vessel theory, which is based on poetry, imagination, glamour of distance, and all sorts of things, is perfect nonsense. The men are far better off. just as the country is, with the better tools with which they can go there and come back with a trip of seals in a month, and then go to work at the fishery, or in the mines, or at other occupations. I believe that among many who advocate this legislation there is the idea and hope that we will ultimately go back to the sailing vessels. One of the reasons why it is undesirable is that we would have to go on slaughtering old seals indefinitely. The same argument against efficient tools was used in the time of the sailing vessels. I suppose a good many hon. gentlemen have read the little accounts of the ancient sealing days published by Mr. Murphy, and it may be noticed that when Captain William Munden in 1819 built a 100 ton vessel to go to the seal fishery, the vessels at that time being about 30 to 70 tons, the people all said he was crazy. Mr. Brown of the Commercial Bank stated that Wm. Munden had always been regarded by him as a competent man, but since he had decided to build a vessel of such dimensions he must be crazy. Then, again, there is an idea that motor boats can be used for the seal fishery. It is quite possible that motor boats may some day in the future be used, but I do not think myself that in the present development of the internal combustion engine there is much likelihood of there being used for a long time to come. When that does come there are other ways to encourage their employment if they are likely to prove the better tools, just as today we want the best tools available to do the work in the best sort of way, and there is no question that the best tools today are the steel steamers, so long as they are kept in reasonable limit as to catch. I certainly say that the return to sailing vessels on the old scale is impossible, not alone on account of the men, but on account of the reduction in the seals. In a period of 13 years, prior to 1860, the total catch averaged 490,000 seals. In 1857 400 vessels brought in 530,000. There were obviously many more seals, and there was large destruction of old seals.

I have been trying to calculate what the men in those days of the sailing vessels really averaged, and I find that in 1857 when the catch was 537,000, and when the men got half their hand, they averaged about 18 seals apiece, and valuing these seals at $2.40 each, they made a bill of an average of about $43.00, which probably took them from early in March, when they began to get the vessels ready.until the end of May. I have not made up the figures for this year, but I shall not be surprised if the average bill on the front, is not double that. In the following year, 1858, the catch was roughly 400,000, and I figure the men averaged about 13 seals each, and made an average bill of $31, on the basis of $2.40.

Now, Mr. President, in reading the petition I have noticed the owners' remarks, and the discussion generally as regards the use of guns, and I am going to worry the House with a few figures. The whole question of the extent of the fishery and the quantity of seals is very much of a guess. It has been estimated that there are 500,000 bedlamers today besides old harps, and that the comparatively

small quantity of old brought in in recent years cannot do any harm at all. That is the opinion of people who ought to know better, and is based on an entire want of thought and examination. The figure that is required to upset the balance of nature may possibly be very small. There can't be any question in my opinion as to the facts that the sealfishery has declined.

Average Catch of Young Harps on the Front, 3-Year Periods.

1899-1901	254,000
1902-1904	242,360
1905-1907	206,230
1908-1910	197,858
1911-1913	164,202

Average catch declined about 90,000 in 15 years. The three following years would show a still greater decline, but they are abnormal owing to the failure in 1915, when only 16,000 young harps were brought in.

For 13 years prior to 1860 the average catch, old and young was in the neighborhood of 500,000, and several times prior to 1860 it exceeded 650,000.

Thus to maintain as the owners, that there has been no decline, and that consequently there is no need for protection, will not bear examination, and that decline is not improbably due, I believe, to the killing of old seals. It may be due, I admit, to over-killing of young, but the great trouble may very likely be the over-killing of the old. The only cure for the over-killing of the young is to enforce from time to time a close season of the year, a most undesirable thing to do, because it would mean a cost to the Colony of about a million dollars to do it. In 1915 we had a close season, or almost so, because the number of young brought in was, as I have said, only 16,000; so that the escape must have been not under 150,000, and those seals were left to breed; also we could further curtail the catch of steamers. Some say there is no basis for forming any opinion as to what number of seals there are, but I maintain that although they vary from year to year, we may at least try to use our common sense. If there are 250,000 young seals brought in in a year, it is obvious there must have been 500,000 to breed. Now these 500,000 are probably in the category of breeding seals for seven or eight years, and there is a loss consequent on death from natural causes of from seventy to eighty thousand a year of these breeding seals: they are wiped out by natural conditions, and if we deliberately kill another 20,000 that might quite well upset the balance of nature, and decrease the herd. I believe we ought not to allow the killing of old seals at all, and I wish very much that we had in this bill a section not only doing away with guns, but I would like to see also one doing away with the killing of old seals in any manner.

Now I venture to give as a mere approximation to the state of things that may exist with the eastern harps the following tentative estimates:—

Average Catch of Young Harps on the Front 3-Year Periods.

1899-1901	254,000
1902-1904	242,360
1905-1907	206,230
1908-1910	197,858
1911-1913	164,202

Average catch declined about 90,000 in fifteen years. The three following years would show a still greater decline, but they are abnormal owing to the failure in 1915, when only 16,000 young harps were brought in.

For 13 years prior to 1860 the

average catch, old and young, was in the neighbourhood of 500,000, and several times prior to 1860 it exceeded 650,000.

The productive period of a breeding seal has been estimated at from 7 to 8 years. Taking it at 7 years, and estimating, for purposes of approximate calculation, an average annual production of 275,000 young during the 7 years (1907 to 1913) the following analysis is submitted.

YOUNG.

Average Annual Production	275,000
Av. Annual Catch (1907-13)	185,000
Average Annual Survival ..	90,000

OLD.

Required to produce 275,000 young	550,000
Annual Loss from age on the basis of 7 years of breeding life	79,000
Average number brought in by steamers annually	19,000
Average annual loss of Old and Bedlamers	98,000
Average annual survival of young, as above	90,000
Annual net loss	8,000

This would make an actual loss to the herd during the 7 years prior to 1914 (without other cause of wastage) of say 56,000 seals. The actual average reduction in the catch in this period, as shown by Mr. Chafe's statistics, was about 42,000 seals, (although much more efficient ships were being used than had ever been engaged before).

If, on the above calculation, there had not been an average take of 19,000 old seals, there would have been an annual gain of 11,000 to be added to the breeding stock.

During these 7 years there were actually brought in 133,000 old and bedlamers. Those seals, had they been preserved, would have had a productive value of 60,000 young, and in actual fact (as it would appear that on the average, nearly one-third of the young must annually escape), this figure of 133,000 would be very much increased by the resulting whitecoat survival.

Further, the loss caused by the premature destruction of those old seals is in all probability even larger than appears from the above consideration because there is good reason to believe that an excessive proportion of these old seals brought in, in any year, are females.

On the above estimates we may calculate that the average number of bedlamers on the front (reckoning that a seal becomes a regular breeder at the beginning of its fifth year of life), has been during the 7 years up to 1913 about 275,000.

The situation today ought to be considerably better than this, owing to the fact that almost all the young escaped in 1915, and this survival of that year should ultimately add somewhere about 150,000 to 175,000 to the breeding harps.

The Gulf Fishery shows (1) that from 1901 to 1908 an average of only 500 old were taken, and (2), that the subsequent average increase in the take of young has approximated as much as 150 per cent.

The above figures, of course, make no pretence to accuracy, but they do purport to show that the annual destruction of a relatively small number of old seals, even on an estimated harp population of over 1,000,000 may be quite sufficient to upset the balance of nature and to turn a gain into loss. They are sufficiently cogent to contravene such a proposition as that the time has now arrived when the old seals should be protected. On the contrary, protection is needed, and particularly it is needed now when na-

ture has intervened to stop the debacle by giving the compulsory holiday of 1915. If no harps excepting whitecoats were killed hereafter, there would be at least some reasonable chance that the herds might increase by degrees, and if this result can be so attained it will be much cheaper for all concerned than the only other alternative, viz: a series of periodic close seasons at a cost of some three quarters of a million of dollars, or thereabouts, each.

The position is better now than two years ago owing to the conditions that developed in 1914, and especially in 1915; and that position is rightly that the escape of the two years 1914 and 1915 very probably added over 250,000 to our future breeding stock, which means perhaps an eventual total of breeding seals of 800,000 or more. I reckon the quantity of seals (as the seal fishery of 1915 was a failure) to have materially increased, and while it will have improved the figures given, it will not alter the argument that the apparent annual number of old seals being killed may not improbably upset the balance of nature, and may be a determining factor in the direction which is seen in the eastern fishery. Now, I want to refer to the question of panning. I have always stood as firmly opposed to the abolition of panning, and when the question came up in Select Committee, I stated that I was entirely opposed to the abolition of panning but that in any case as the bill stood, with 24 hours as the time fixed in it, I pointed out that it seemed to me altogether inadequate, because the seals must be left on the ice to cool, and if the first of the crew started killing seals at 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning, and the ship moved on to put out others of the crew, they often could not do it in time to get both the crew and the seals on board on that day. So that it would at least be desirable to make it 48 hours, and when I brought this before the Committee the promoters admitted the fairness of the position, and said they would be satisfied with 48 hours. I was opposed to doing away with panning for a number of reasons. One of the objects of the section is for the protection of the weaker ships. But it may easily work against them. A man sends out his crew four or five miles to find the seals. His ship is a low power vessel, and to-morrow is jammed and can't get at the seals. Along comes the Florizel or the Neptune or Eagle and takes up the pans. This, so far from protecting the low power boat, would, as a matter of fact, be protecting the high power ship. When the high power ship can get about, it is obvious that the low power ships' pans are at the mercy of the high power ships. Furthermore I have felt that this is going to result in bloodshed. We have argued the question in this House before. It may be remembered that Hon. Mr. Job favoured the clause, and he and I argued the matter out here two or three years ago. In regard to the remarks made by Mr. Warren yesterday as to the abolition of panning some years ago, and the reversion to it after one year's trial, I have taken the trouble to look up the debate that took place that time, and it is only fair to say that the conditions were somewhat different. The bill then was that any seals on a pan and not in charge of someone could be taken by any ship coming along. It did away with the rights in panned seals to that extent, and the result of one year's experience was that men stayed out all night at great risk and hardship, and immediately the House met the following year the whole thing was abolished. I looked through all the speeches made. Most of the speakers simply argued that it was unfair and inhuman to leave men out on the ice. Cap-

tain C. Dawe introduced the Bill which brought back the old panning system, and he, at least, was very strong about the danger of collision and bloodshed.

Captain Dawe said it was not possible to take seals on board when steamers are killing them; and he urged that in every case it was impossible to conduct the fishery unless panning was allowed. As I have already taken up so much time, I shall not now deal with the compensation clauses, which I nevertheless think might be greatly improved both in the interests of the men and the owners.

Section 23 is a new section which was not before the Select Committee. The object of it is to give the crew a free hand in selling their share of the seals. I am in sympathy with that object, but how the section can be worked as it now stands I cannot understand. I think it will have to be amended to make it workable.

HON. MR. GIBBS—In view of the lateness of the hour, and as other hon. members may wish to speak on the second reading, I beg to move that its further consideration be deferred unti to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned until 4 p. m. to-morrow.

FRIDAY, April 28, 1916.

The House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

EDUCATION BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was directed that the Council's amendment to section 33 of the Education Act be reconsidered.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—We are confronted with a curious position. An amendment was proposed here in this House placing the minimum age at 13 years. It evoked considerable discussion and was defeated. A second amendment was proposed by which the age limit was set at 12 years, and this is also evoked discussion but was eventually passed by an unanimous vote of this House. In view of that unanimity, and of the fact that no reasons for the reception of the amendment by the other Chamber have been given, I propose that a message be sent to the House of Assembly saying that this Chamber cannot recede from its position.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I voted for the amendment when first brought in, and when it came before us yesterday voted that the change be reconsidered, not that I have changed my opinion. I believe the hon. gentleman on my left is right, but I thought it would delay the work of the House, and perhaps it was not a very important matter, hence I voted the opposite to what I did the day previous. But since that I have had conversations with other hon. members. which have convinced me that it is detrimental to the best interests of children that they be allowed to sit for examination even at the age of 13, but when it came down to 12 it practically means that children of 11 years and even earlier are allowed to go in for examination. I cannot agree with it. I am convinced that examinations at the age of 13 are injurious, and under these circumstances will go back upon what I did yesterday and vote for the amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. Robinson.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I think it ought to be understood that it is not compulsory upon any child of any age to sit for these examinations. It is only a voluntary act and if the parent does not wish the child to sit, that ends the matter. If any parent thinks that preparation for the exams. will be injurious to the health of the child, surely the parents can exercise their discretion and not permit their children to sit for these examinations.

Now I do not agree with some hon. members that sitting for the exams. is injurious. I have children of my own who sat for them at 11, and I can say without fear of contradiction, and sincerely say, it has not injured them physically or otherwise. A great deal of education is taught in the home, and the desire of the average parent today is to shirk that duty. It is the club or some other life that the bulk of us are after, and a great deal of the work which in the past was done in the home is now done by the teacher, and I think if home studies were given more attention by those who are placed in charge of children that a great deal better results will be obtained from education. I will speak from experience when I say that sitting for examinations at 12, as far as I can judge, has not, and does not interefere with the physical or mental growth of a child. In England, as pointed out by some hon. members, examinations are undergone by children before they can enter certain colleges, and furthermore, we have to bear in mind that we have in this country a very hardy growth of population who do not labour under the disadvantages that people do in industrial centres of England, Scotland and other parts of Europe, where they do not get the pure air we do in this country. Consequently when we talk about physical harm being done by these examinations, I personally cannot agree with the hon. gentlemen in that respect.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I am absolutely puzzled what to do myself. I sympathize with the hon. gentleman on my left, and voted for his motion, but as only 41 children are affected according to the figures given, and as I regard a clash between the two houses as objectionable, and may result in the possible loss of the bill, I felt yesterday, and feel again today, like saying that this matter is not sufficient to warrant us in creating bad feeling between the two Houses. I think the House of Assembly has been foolish and small-minded in not letting this go through; I hardly understand their attitude, but still I do not think the matter is of sufficient importance to warrant any trouble.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—If the hon. gentleman on my right wishes to revive the argument, I am quite prepared to meet it. He voted for the amendment. The hon. gentlemen next to him feels the matter is not sufficiently important to warrant us in making any discord between the two Houses, and my answer is that I cannot conceive of any matter being of greater importance; first because of the principle involved, the rescue of children of tender years from the grip of a soulless system, and secondly because of the apparently deliberate affront placed upon hon. members of this Chamber who had unanimously passed the amendment which is now contemptuously thrust on one side without even the semblance of a reason being advanced for doing so. Reverse the position and would it be conceivable that any amendment passed by the Assembly, unanimously, would be rejected in a similar manner, and with no reason advanced by this Chamber? Who is in control in educational matters? Is it the Legislature? If so I am satisfied, but events of recent days have demonstrated that it is not the Legislature, nor the Executive Government, but that outside and interested influences have been brought to bear. The Hon. Mr. Gibbs has argued that because there were only 41 children being crucified last year the crime should be continued. I say, Sir, that if there was only one child it is our duty to free that one child. The number has nothing to do with it.

HON. MR. GIBBS—It is not obligatory.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I thank the

hon. gentleman for that word. Nothing is more obligatory. In St. John's not to such an extent, because the Christian Brothers have relieved their pupils from the influence of the machine. But even here to some extent, and in the outports altogether. Not obligatory by the letter of the law, but wholly so in practice. What child dare face the displeasure of the teacher, whose success depends on his passes, and the boycotting of his schoolmates? I admit that there is no obligation if the child is dull, because no results are obtainable. The dull child, who most needs attention, gets the least, and the bright child who needs the least, gets the most. But it is not necessarily the dull or plodding child who is the victim. Genius is near akin to insanity, and often the brilliant child, pushed ahead beyond his years, his mental and physical faculties taxed beyond endurance, suffers in his after years the most. The hon. gentleman says that he speaks from experience. I think that I may fairly claim to speak from a wider and a more extended experience and that the views which I have enumerated are endorsed by eminent educational authorities. Apart from this, I think we owe it to ourselves not to recede from a resolution unanimously adopted by the Chamber, without at least some reason being advanced for such action.

The motion was then put and carried.

SEALING BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I beg to move that the Sealing Bill be now read a second time.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I wish it clearly to be understood at the outset of any observations I may make on this sealing bill that when I presented the petition a few days ago I simply did it as a member of this House; and I am perfectly free to discuss any section of the bill when it goes into Committee. I support the second reading with much pleasure. I listened to the speech of Hon. Mr. Gibbs which contained a vast amount of information. I also listened to the statistical facts presented by Hon. Mr. Harvey, facts that I hope will bye and bye be given the people of this Colony in such a manner as will be clearly understood. I also have gathered a few facts from a statistical point of view, since the introduction of the steel steamers. In 1909 the Florizel made her first voyage to the sealfishery; her tonnage 1980, her catch 30,488. The Adventure of 829 tons, that year brought in 17,046 seals; the Bellaventure of 466 tons had 26,758; the Beothic 464 tons, 34,-837; clearly when it comes to a question of tonnage, tonnage has nothing to do with it, for the Beothic with a tonnage only a quarter of the Florizel brings in 4,000 seals more. In 1909 also, the Bonaventure, 461 tons had 31,118; and where so much has been discussed in the Lower House as to unfair competition, the Viking in close competition with the Florizel brings in 19,145, the Eagle 20,433. In 1910 the Florizel had a very successful spring, bringing a total of 40,069; the Adventure that year had but 10,-578; the Bellaventure, 35,816; the Beothic 32,029; the Bonaventure 18,-584. Now you will observe, Mr. President, that the Viking, an old wooden steamer in close competition with the Adventure of 829 tons, brought in 23,754, and that the Southern Cross, another old wooden steamer, had more seals than the Bonaventure or Adventure. In 1912 the Florizel brings 28,129; this was the first spring the Stephano went out; and here I would point out that when these ships, the Stephano and Florizel were built they cost $75,000 more than they otherwise would have by

reason of their extra strong construction to contend with icefloes. In that year the Stephano brought in 13,110, and the Florizel 4,582. The Nascopie, a new ship of 1004 tons, is now introduced, and brought in 17,557; the Adventure 20,860; the Bellaventure, 5,160, and the Bonaventure 2108, and here is the old Ranger, an old antiquated wooden ship that has been in the fishery for years and years, this year running close to the Stephano with 11,580, and the Eagle with 11,577. What does tonnage mean so far as competition is concerned? Nothing! I shall now show you the averages from 1909 up to the present time. The following tables speak for themselves:

Steel Steamers Over 450 Tons.

Stephano, 2145 tons, 3 springs, 1912, 1913, 1914, 73,202; average per ton. (15th) 34 seals.

Florizel, 1980 tons, 8 springs, 1909-16, 200,862; average per ton, (13th) 102 seals.

Nascopie, 1004 tons, 4 springs, 1912-15, 68,240; average per ton, (14th) 68 seals.

Adventure, 829 tons, 7 springs, 1909-15, 99,608; average per ton, (11th) 120 seals.

Bellaventure, 466 tons, 7 springs, 1909-15, 115,107; average per ton, (6th) 247 seals.

Beothic, 464 tons, 6 springs, 1909-15, 168,347; average per ton (1st) 363 seals.

Bonaventure, 461 tons, 7 springs, 1909-15, 128,170; average per ton, (4th) 278 seals.

Wooden Steamers.

Viking, 276 tons, 7 springs, 1909-15, 93,729; average per ton, (2nd) 340 seals.

Eagle, 418 tons, 8 springs, 1909-16, 138,429; average per ton, (3rd) 331 seals.

Erik, 461 tons, 8 springs, 1909-16, 79,143; average per ton, (5th) 252 seals.

Diana, 290 tons, 7 springs, 1909-15, 48,847; average per ton, (9th) 170 seals.

Ranger, 353 tons, 6 springs, 1909-14, 46,109; average per ton (10th 133 seals.

Sam Blandford, 568 tons, 7 springs, 1909-16, 73,725; average per ton, (12th) 112 seals.

Neptune, 465 tons, 8 springs, 1909-16, 96,634; average per ton, (7th) 208 seals.

Thus the total catch for these steel steamers totalling a tonnage combined of 7,347 tons, was 853,536 seals, and the eight wooden steamers of a combined tonnage of 3,145 tons brought in a total of 658,275 seals, both for the periods of 1909 to 1916. This shows an average per ton for the steel steamers of 116 seals, and for the wooden steamers of 210 seals per ton, or in other words the wooden steamers have benefitted so far as tonnage is concerned to the extent of over 100 seals per ton more than the steel ships. It makes very little difference, in my opinion, whether steamers are of 500 tons or 5,000 tons. If you are going to limit the catch and say what it is going to be, say 35,000; if that is the limit of the steel steamers, there is no wooden ship that can bring a larger amount. These latter ships can strike the seals just as soon as the steel ships, because they have done so this spring.

Now what are the facts in connection with tonnage. It has been said that this bill has been left to be dealt with as an experiment. An experiment of what? I have not gone into the details of the amount of money which has been invested in the seal fishery, but were I in a position to do so today, I would say that in this period of the country's progress it is not the time to experiment with a Bill of the seriousness

of this one, and which means so much to this country. I am not familiar with the propagation of the seal, and not in a position to say that the seals are in danger of extermination, but this bill before us now which provides that no steamer is allowed to go to the ice over 450 tons is as absurd and unreasonable as anything could be put before any common sense men of the country. But tc go back to the facts of the tonnage question. As to steel steamers of over 450 tons, what do we find? The Beothic that in the six springs that she went out brought in 168,347 seals, average per ton 363 seals. Then there was the Bonaventure, tonnage 461, average per year, 278 seals per ton; Bellaventure, 466 tons with an average of 247 seals, and the fifth is the Florizel. I am only dealing with the steel steamers, but when I classify them I shall show that it is absurd again. The Florizel secured 102 seals per ton. As regards the Stephano, she made three trips, in which she averaged 34 seals per ton.

Now going down to the wooden ships. The Viking is first with a tonnage of 276, with an average per ton of 340 seals. You will observe that this old steamer has had a remarkable career, and made a most successful voyage each spring; and today, if these facts are correct—which I do not doubt—must be in a very nice position as far as her accounts are concerned, because we find her only 23 seals per ton less than the Beothic, and 213 seals per ton more than the Stephano. But the butt of the whole argument brought forward in connection with the industry is the Florizel. She has been the target for poisoned arrows no matter where they come from. If the owners of the Florizel and Stephano had wanted to accept the offers made last autumn or earlier by Russia, to take the steamers out of the country, what condition should we here be in as far as tonnage is concerned. It appears to me to be only right to ask if such legislation as this had been in existence when the Adventure and the other steamers were sold at good prices, what further use would they be as far as this industry is concerned?

Now here is another classification —I am speaking of tonnage.

Beothic (1st), 464 tons, average per ton, 363 seals; (steel), 6 years; average for year, 28,058 seals.

Viking, (2nd), 340 tons, average per ton, 340-7 seals; (wooden), 8 years; average for year, 13,400 seals.

Eagle, (3rd), 418 tons; average per ton, 331-5 seals; (wooden), 7 years; average for year, 17,300 seals.

Bonaventure, (4th), 461 tons; average per ton, 278 seals; (steel) 7 years; average for year, 18,310 seals.

Bloodhound, (5th), 314 tons; average per ton, 252-6 seals; (wooden), 8 years; average for year, 10,000 seals.

Bellaventure, (6th), 466 tons; average per ton, 247 seals; (steel), 7 years; average for year, 16,444 seals.

Neptune, (7th), 465 tons; average per ton, 208-4 1-2 seals; (wooden), 8 years; average for year, 12,000 seals.

Erik, (8th), 461 tons; average per ton, 180-4 1-2 seals; (wooden), 8 years; average per year, 10,200 seals.

Diana, (9th), 290 tons; average per ton, 170-7 seals; (wooden), 7 years; average for year, 7,000 seals.

Ranger, (10th), 350 tons; average per ton, 133-6 seals; (wooden), 6 years; average for year, 7,600 seals.

Adventure, (11th), 829 tons; average per ton, 120 seals; (steel), 7 years; average for year, 14,230 seals.

Sam Blandford, (12th), 568 tons; average per ton, 112 seals; (wooden,) 7 years; average for year, 10,500 seals.

Florizel, (13th), 1980 tons; average per ton, 102 seals; (steel), 8 years; average for year, 25,108 seals.

Nascopie, (14th), 1004 tons; average per ton, 68 seals; (steel), 4 years; average per year, 17,060 seals.

Stephano, (15th), 2,143 tons; average per ton, 34 seals; (steel), 3 years; average for year, 24,400 seals.

Now if we observe this list closely, what do we find? Do we find the great big steamers bringing in all the seals they can get? If there was unfair competition the wooden steamers would not get anything. This big steamer of 1980 tons, the Florizel, comes 13th on the list with 102 seals per ton, so the tonnage has nothing to do with it. Then the big steamer Nascopie of 1004 tons comes 14th in the list, and what is her record? It is true her record is only four trips, but during her connection with the sealfishery her average has been 68 per ton. Then there comes the Stephano. I wish we had a few steamers like her to pick up the ocean trade. The Florizel and the Stephano are appreciated very much although knocked about a great deal with the ice from time to time, but I question much if there are any steamers on this side of the Atlantic better adapted for the trade between New York and St. John's than these ships. But this House by this Bill before us, is going to legislate this fine ship out of the sealfishery. Her record is not such as would warrant us to do so. She has to her credit 34 seals to the ton, and by act of Parliament you are going to wipe her out. I have not much more to say at present, beyond the fact that I support the second reading with pleasure. When we come to the various sections we will have an opportunity to discuss the bill in greater detail.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—It is not my intention to speak at any length upon this our annual contribution from the other branch of the Legislature. I am in accord with the hon. gentleman who spoke last in support of the second reading, because there are some clauses in it which command our acceptance, but I trust also that when we get into Committee many of the clauses will be so amended as to beneficially affect the fishery on which we legislate, while certain clauses will be eliminated. I have no doubt that those responsible for the legislation which has led up to this Bill are animated with a certain desire to benefit the fishermen and the fishery, and in this desire we are all in accord. My hon. friend in introducing the Bill, alluded to the fact that capital and labour had their rights, and were inter-dependent. His remarks were correct at the time he spoke, for undoubtedly labour did not receive that consideration which it deserved. But now the boot is on the other foot. Labour is asserting her rights, and we should be careful in protecting labour to protect capital as well. Without the one the other cannot exist, and while asserting the rights of labour and protecting her, we should not injure or damage capital on which labour depends for its success. Let us do all we can to protect labour, but let us also be careful, not alone to protect capital, but to encourage others also to invest their capital. There is, however, much in this legislation that will have a contrary effect. It seems to me that some of this legislation will preclude people from risking their money in building similar steamers to those which in the past conducted the seal fishery. My friend, Hon. Mr. Harvey, in his excellent speech in which he gave a lot of valuable information ,and a great many interesting facts in connection with the seal fishery, is of the opinion that you cannot conduct the fishery on the old lines, and in that idea I agree with him. But we must also not forget that we have steamers and

steamers we will have, and it is no use our talking about what might have been if steamers had not been introduced. We know pretty well from experience, from those interested in the large steamers, that they have not received any money from their investments. Such being the case, is it wise to place such restrictions on the larger steamers?

No one will invest money in small steamers to conduct the sealfishery alone in future, because it will not pay to build steamers under 450 tons to carry on the seal fishery, which will only give employment for one or two months out of twelve. You must build steamers to conduct the seal fishery which will also be able to conduct our maritime commerce during the summer. These are precluded from entering into the fishery by section 13 of the Bill. Is it wise to make such legislation as this? We forget we are not the sole proprietors of the seal fishery. We may pass what laws we like but there is nothing to prevent the fitting out of steamers or sailing vessels in Louisburg or St. Pierre. These places are not bound by our laws and we have proof in the past year that steamers in Nova Scotia could as successfully prosecute the voyage and manufacture their catch as we can. This being the case, we pass laws here to prevent the outfitting of the steel steamers I speak of. What is the result? The steel steamers which have been sold to the Russian Government in all probability will be bought back again after the war, and will come back here and will not be allowed to conduct the seal fishery, and Hon. Mr. Anderson has proved that such legislation is not in the interest of the fishery. The clause then that puts a fine of $1,000 on the proprietors of steamers for the loss of every man seems to me to be a hardship and will prevent capitalists investing money in that fishery. By all means the sealers should have their lives insured, and it should be the duty of the state to provide such means as will enable not only the sealer but every fisherman to have his life insured, even if it is necessary to pass compulsory legislation to make them contribute. We do it in the bank fishery, and why not apply it to the seal fishery as well, and to the ordinary fishery? With regard to the section here, it makes the outfitter entirely responsible. With this I do not agree, considering that the seal-fisherman is different altogether from a labourer under the operation of the Workmen's Compensation Act. They are not paid servants they are not paid annually, monthly or weekly, but are shareholders in the voyage, and should be liable for some, if not for the whole portion of the insurance fee. This bill comes up to us continually and it was backed up by arguments in the other House which are inconsistent. For the past few years we have been told it is time to get clear of the "floating coffins," today we are asked to make a law by which none but these will be employed. Should we then set much store on such legislation? Surely we should recognize the inconsistency of this, and be guided by our own judgment in such a matter. The very able manner in which Hon. Mr. Harvey stated his views yesterday shows that he is as competent to give an opinion on this subject as any member in the Lower House. I was with him on that Committee and can corroborate what he has stated. The House is largely indebted to him for the lucid manner in which he reviewed the subject. To make the outfitters liable to a fine of $1,000 for every life lost is certainly going too far. A member of a crew may be lost through no fault of the master, but by the visitation of Providence in which case it would

be absurd to hold the outfitter responsible. Then there is a clause, (16), in this doing away with the right of property in panned seals. There never was a more erroneous view than to suppose that such a law can be carried out. Take the past season where days after killing the sealing steamers could not take their seals on board. Are the men killing these seals going to allow others to take them? It is contrary to human nature to suppose so. The men who have killed them will not allow others to take them away. Who is to be the judge of the 48 hours? It will be quite impossible to carry out this section. With regard to outside competition, we have not only the possibility of competition from the neighbouring colony, but from the Norwegians, who are at it now. They are not bound by our laws, and can take the seals anywhere and sell them. They are not under our jurisdiction. Now as we shall have an opportunity of speaking on every section as it comes up, I will not further detain the House, but trust we shall be able to put the Bill into such shape that it will not alone be acceptable to the labourer but the capitalist as well, and that our united efforts will be crowned with greater success than in the past.

HON. MR. BISHOP—This Bill relating as it does to a very important branch of the country's industries deserves the very careful consideration of this Council. That it provides for changes in the conduct or prosecution of the industry which are drastic, far-reaching, and calculated to be harmful to the best interests of the parties engaged therein is evidenced by the unusual proceedings which we witnessed at yesterday's sitting, when representations were made through petition, and Counsel was heard at the Bar of this House on behalf of the petitioners. The history, Sir, of legislation in connection with the seal fishery discloses many features and varied thought in connection with the industry, and there have probably been many more bills prepared in connection with it than with the cod-fishery. I say prepared, Sir, for not all the legislation that has been attempted has passed into law. All legislation, Mr. President, relating to the Colony's resources or industries should be framed with the object of promoting, conserving, extending or safeguarding the interests of all the parties concerned therein.

It is the height of absurdity, Sir, to suggest that you can legislate successfully for any one particular class or interest. To attempt it is to court failure, and worse than failure, for class legislation—no matter whether you aim to benefit the employers or the employed, regardless of the effect upon the interests of the others has always proved, and always will prove abortive.

A Sealing Bill came up to this House last year which did not commend itself in various particulars to the favourable opinion of hon. members here.

It was after full consideration amended in several sections, but when sent down those amendments did not prove acceptable and the Bill was lost. It is not my intention, Mr. President, to call attention to the comments of a section of the local press upon the action of the Council in respect to that Bill, but I will say this, that hon. members here were not influenced in their opinion of the Bill because of its source, nor will they show any hostility to the Bill now before us because of the expressions referred to, but will consider the sections of the Bill upon their merits, will adopt what appears reasonable and fair, and will amend or reject sections which indicate a desire to make it sectional, to unfairly protect

or advantage one party only, and to discriminate against or penalize others, and I am sure I voice the sentiment of this Council when I say we shall not be affected in the slightest degree by appeals upon the one hand, or by threats upon the other, not even, Sir, by the threat of annihilation. In fact, Mr. President, some of us would greatly miss those highly complimentary references to us from time to time, and should they cease may feel that we have dropped below mediocrity.

Before making references to any section of the Bill, I take the opportunity of challenging the statement which we have all heard, that the members of the House of Assembly, and only these, represent the masses of the working men. I would go further, Sir, and emphatically assert that upon the whole they do not as thoroughly represent in the true sense of the term, the fishermen and labouring classes of this country as many of the members of this Council do. I do not propose, at present however, to further demonstrate that point, but I here and now assert and maintain, Sir, that the Bill before us is not correctly expressive of the opinion of the men, that is, the sealing crews, the men who prosecute the sealing voyage, and those responsible for the Bill know as well or better than I do that it does not. If it does, Sir, what is the object or necessity for this legislation, why take the trouble to amend the Bill, for surely the men who compose the crews have the remedy which is sought, in their own hands? If the men are demanding that the large ships be prevented from going, the owners of such ships will not be able to get crews.

We are told that petitions signed by large numbers of men have been presented. I am not doubting that such petitions have been received, as they could be easily procured, but I will ask, Sir, can any of us believe that a man can be found—that is, a bona fide sealer—who though he has signed some such petition, will refuse a berth in the Florizel even under command of that monster—Captain Abram Kean—and go by preference in one of the wooden ships or coffins, as they have been so frequently called?

No, Sir, you may get signatures to petitions, but no men will accept berths in the coffins if they can get berths in the larger steel ships. The many hundreds of unsuccessful applicants for berths in the Florizel, not this year alone but last year, also when all of the fleet were out, disprove the suggestion. Now, Mr. President, it is not possible, I submit, to attempt a more retrograde movement than is proposed by certain sections of this Bill. It is not necessary, nor is it in the best interest of the country or of the sealing industry to prevent large ships engaging in it. What we will all admit to be highly desirable is, to provide proper safeguards for the men and to consider their interests in every possible way, but don't let us ignore the interests of others, don't attempt restrictions and penalties which will not conduce to the interest or comfort of the men, but will seriously handicap the trade generally without any advantage whatever accruing to the men.

One section of the Bill contains a positive danger to the crews of the sealing ships. I refer to section 16, relating to the right of property in killed seals. I have a very distinct recollection of the Bill which provided for the right of ownership to pass after seals had been panned 24 hours, unless the pans were in possession of some members of the crew which killed the seals, and I know how the experience of the voyage that year demonstrated its extreme danger so much that it was repealed at the following session. The Hon. Mr. Harvey

is quite correct when he reminds us that the danger to men having to remain out all night watching their seals influenced the Legislature, but there was the additional and even greater danger of conflict between different crews. I was in very close touch with sealing masters at the time and remember very distinctly how they felt about it.

The incident shows how imperative it is to avoid hasty legislation, and the necessity of obtaining very full information from all the interests affected before bringing in measures of a drastic character.

Mr. President, I own no shares in sealing ships at the present time, and I am not interested directly to the extent of one dollar in the sealing voyage, but I know, Sir, it is not in the interest of this country's commerce or of the men who catch our codfish and capture our seals that no ships of larger size than 450 tons net should engage in the sealing voyage. This has been so fully demonstrated within the past few months that it must be apparent to all, and has been very ably and completely brought to our attention by Hon. Mr. Harvey.

I take the position, Mr. President, that to limit the catch to be taken by ships is a proper and judicious measure of precaution—and I would also limit the number of the crew. This will protect the seal herd, it will give as nearly as possible an equal chance, to the owners, the masters and the men, and provide the most comfortable conditions possible for those men who are fortunate enough to procure berths in the larger ships. There is very much more that may be said regarding this Bill, but these points may be taken up by other speakers or can be considered when we reach the Committee stage upon the measure, and I hope for a thorough ventilation of the contentious sections of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time, and it was ordered that the said bill be sent to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Milley, the House then adjourned until to-morrow.

SATURDAY, April 29th, 1916.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

MESSAGE FROM ASSEMBLY.

The Hon. President read a message from the Assembly that they had appointed a Select Committee to confer with a Committee of this House in relation to the Council's amendments re the Education Bill.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

Hon. Mr. Bishop moved that a Committee be appointed, and Hon. President named the following to act as such Committee—Hons. Bishop, Robinson, Squires, Power and Milley.

MESSAGES FROM ASSEMBLY.

Hon. President read a message from the Assembly that they had passed the accompanying bills, entitled respectively: An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money to defray the Public Service of the Colony; An Act to amend the law respecting the exportation of Timber; An Act to amend the law respecting the operation of Saw Mills; An Act respecting the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors in Newfoundland after January 1st, 1917, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop these said bills were then read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SEALING BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Sealing Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I desire to make a few observations in regard to the objections argued against certain sections of this bill. Very strong objection has been taken to the section dealing with the panning of seals, and I desire to point out that if the panning of seals were entirely prohibited, some of the disasters which have taken place at the seal-fishery would never have taken place. It is a well known fact that the awful catastrophe which happened in 1914 may be said to be due to the law giving the right of property in seals that are panned. If no right of property existed no men would have been on the ice in that storm and consequently we might not have had such an awful loss of life.

This bill aims at restricting to a certain extent the right of property in panned seals and various arguments have been adduced in favour of such a position. We have steamers prosecuting this fishery to-day that are not very powerful in point of speed, and we have ships that are very powerful. Except you restrict the right in some way, to some limit of time in the panning of seals, then you place the less powerful ship in close competition with the more powerful one .The seal fishery can only be proseucted during a limited period, and if weather conditions be favourable there is nothing to prevent the powerful ships from steaming through a very large body of seals, and like a destroying angel, slaughtering as they go. It often happens that very many more seals are thus killed and panned than the steamers can take. If you limit the right of steamers to property in panned seals to period of 24 or 48 hours, then there will not be that desire to slaughter indiscriminately, whether the quantity killed be in excess of that required to load the ship or to prevent others getting a seal. At the same time it would have the effect of protecting the lives of the men. If you do not limit this right, then what happens? While the powerful steamer is moving about the less powerful boat is not, and the captains and crews of these steamers are forced to take grave risks in order to secure the seals they would not otherwise get. This is not a reasonable position in which to place men,simply because the steamers of low power are limited in their operation and the other steamers can easily get through the ice. The former class are compelled to take risks, in going miles and miles from their ship in the hope that they may secure a number of seals by panning. If they do not do so, there will not be any left because of the powerful ships which are always moving about. As sealers they are going to take the risk, and we should not permit it, when we can prevent the occurrence of such dangers. We must look at this industry not from the mere viewpoint of gain, because if you look at it from the material side, excluding the individual from it altogether, you do a grievous wrong. Personally I would like to see the right of property in panned seals much more restricted than in the Bill, because of the risk and danger men must incur on board the less powerful ships to secure seals. Various arguments have been advanced in favour of the steel ships. We ought, it is said, let them prosecute the fishery, but limit their catch. We had had facts and figures from hon. members in this House, notably Hon. Mr. Harvey, which clearly demonstrate that the herd is decreasing, and that being the case, if we permit the powerful steamers to prosecute the fishery the herd will be still further decimated. With the less powerful ships prosecuting it only, the herd has a better

chance of living and of being propagated With the powerful ship out, there is less chance of any of the herd escaping. We must recognize the fact that this industry is declining. The new rules, to some extent, prevent this, and is it right for us to enact laws which will still further imperil that industry. We have no right to destroy the Bill before us, for these things do not belong to this, but to future generations. We have no right to destroy our vast natural resources of wealth, and one of these natural resources is the sealing industry. The seal herd is decreasing every year, and unless we adopt proper measures whereby, instead of destroying, we conserve, we are not discharging our duties to the public as members and as citizens. The watchword of every country is "conserve the natural resources of the country." The statesmen of Great Britain have given attention for years to the extension of the natural wealth of that country. They have been taking an inventory of its resources and are endeavouring to compute how long it can stand the present work that is being carried on in getting at that national wealth; how it can stand the losses that must result from the destruction of the wealth of the country. Every other country is taking a similar view. In order to preserve the future wealth of the country it is necessary that laws be adopted now, not when it is too late to protect that wealth. This is the position in which we find ourselves to-day. There is no winking out of sight the fact that the herd is decreasing. We have figures as to the numbers of seals brought in by the sealing vessels. The facts so ably presented by Hon. Mr. Harvey, show a decrease of 100,000 seals annually for the past fifteen years. With these facts before us, can we contemplate permitting engines of destruction—because this is what the powerful ships mean—to go out and still further decrease that herd? In other parts of the world the seals were just as numerous as ours are now off our coasts, and to-day and for centuries they have ceased to exist, because they allowed destruction to go on and took no heed of the future. We ought to look to the future. Capital has its rights, so has the public, and the public right is the right we must conserve. Our duty to the public demands that we should protect this industry and not allow it to be totally destroyed. Some deplore the fact that in the very near future, if the seal fishery is not now regulated, we must have a close season, and a close season, as pointed out by some hon members, will represent a loss of $1,000,000 to the country. If the quantity killed this year and for the past 10 years, continue to be killed you will not alone have one close season, but close seasons for many years Instead of a loss of $1,000,000, the country will have to face the loss of many millions in the years to come. What has been our experience with the steel ships which have prosecuted the fishery in this country? They are a very expensive type, and in order to make these ships pay the insurance, outlay and expenses connected with them at the sealfishery, the seal herd has had to pay a very high tribute indeed. They must take from 20,000 to 25,000 seals before one cent profit is gained upon the cost. Are we prepared to place a tribute to the extent of 20,000 or 25,000 seals upon the fishery for powerful steamers to go there? Are we prepared to let that amount of wealth be absolutely destroyed? The gradual, but nevertheless thorough destruction of our seal fishery, is the price we must pay if we are prepared to allow steel steamers to engage any

further in it. The less expensive ships of the wooden type cost nothing in comparison with the immense outlay undertaken in order to send the powerful steamers to the fishery. Some say this is a retrograde movement but I do not agree with this contention. Is it retrograde to protect one of the greatest sources of wealth in the country? Suppose it becomes necessary to protect the forests? Some one may come in and say: 'This is a retrograde movement.' I may manufacture and make the product of the forests into various kinds of articles, but the answer to any objections on my part is: "If you continue cutting as you are, there will be no forest left for future generations." The same applies to the sealfishery. There is nothing retrograde about protecting it, not for ourselves, but those who come after us. Another argument is that the same wooden fleet in the past was referred to as "floating coffins." I can understand why some refer to them in this way. They went to the sealfishery for years and were allowed to remain in a state of disrepair. Because the less skilled captains took charge of them they were unable to meet the powerful competition of the big steamers. As a result they went to the sealfishery and came in with not enough to pay a profit. Moreover the steamer owners were not going to keep these ships in a perfect state of repair because they might lose one every second year or so. But if the powerful ships were not going to the ice, it would be to the interest of the owners to keep the ships in a good state of repair, and money would be expended on them. We see the same tendency in other industries. If a certain number of people be engaged in a particular industry, and some other person with a large capital comes in and establishes a similar industry with a greater output and more up-to-date machines and appliances, for carrying it on, the small man goes to the wall because he cannot compete with the capitalist. It is the same with the sealing industry, the smaller ships must give way to the bigger ones. This is the result of legislation which permits the powerful steamers to prosecute the industry. Is it a desirable thing to concentrate in the hands of a few the control of any national source of wealth. It is not. It is contrary to the first principles of political economy. The greater the distribution of wealth, the greater the prosperity of the state or country. Some contend that there is superior accommodation for sealers on board those large steamers. This I deny. Their superior accommodations are only shown when the owners or some influential personages visit them. Complaint after complaint was made as regards the condition in which the men lived, and only after those complaints were made did the press draw the attention of the public to the point. The hon. member, Hon. Mr. Anderson, endeavoured to show that the question of the size and power of steamers prosecuting the industry do not affect it, because some of the wooden ships made a favorable showing from his viewpoint. In support of his statement, an array of facts and figures were submitted, but which proved, though unintentional on his part that as a ship of superior power and speed enters the list, the proportional catch was in all cases much greater, than the less powerful, thus proving my contention that as steam power and size of vessels increased, the greater the catch of the ship of that class. An hon. member said: "Are we going to shoulder the responsibility of wiping out certain steamers?" I unhesitatingly say yes, if it be for the good of the industry. The question of ships and the capital

in them must be a secondary matter compared with the preservation of the industry. Let me point out to the hon. member that the question he asks is answered every day by the skilled workman who sees the machine supplant the tool of which he spent the best years of his life acquiring a knowledge. He must perforce see his capital wiped out and utter no complaint, because Society says it is for its benefit.

We do many things in this manner for the good of the country. The people want it and they consider it highly desirable that the sale of liquors should be prohibited. There is nothing wrong in the public use of it, but the people say it is necessary for the public welfare that it should be stopped. It is also necessary for the public welfare that the powerful steamers should be prohibited. We place restrictions upon our everyday actions in life. We make municipal regulations to restrict the kind of building in certain localities, a man who has land can erect only a certain class of buildings. Why? Because it is not in the interest of the public or city. The same argument applies to restrictions of the size of steamers that may engage in the prosecution of this industry. Alarm is felt that the industry may go elsewhere, and in support of this viewpoint a case in point is quoted of a steamer landing her seals at Halifax. But there is not much ground for that alarm if we reason matters out. The sealing industry cannot be carried on except by men from this country. It is utterly impossible to carry it on otherwise. If an attempt be made to prosecute the industry in St. Pierre, Louisburg, or elsewhere you must get the men from this country, and we have the right to prohibit our men from going to these places to prosecute the industry. We can pass a law making it a criminal offence for any man to leave the country for the purpose of shipping on board a sealer to prosecute the industry elsewhere. We can enact any measure of this description for the common good or for the good of the country.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I doubt the correctness of this assertion. You can't hold up a man at Port aux Basques and ask him what he is going to Sydney for.

HON. MR. GIBBS—You can do it if it is desirable in the interests of the country that our people should not go and engage in the sealfishery elsewhere. You can make such rules and regulations here, the legislature is all powerful. It may even interfere with the liberty of the subject. Do we not punish men for getting drunk, and this is only a Municipal offence? If a man be out of employment, and is out all night he is arrested for vagrancy. There is no crime in it. We infringe on the liberty of the subject in these cases for the welfare of the public. Another argument made use of is that this is legislation directed against a particular class. This I deny. The Legislature is aiming at their protection by emphasizing the necessity of conserving our vast national sources of wealth; we are acting in the interests of the greatest number and not to the detriment of any class. No class will suffer for this legislation only prohibits the powerful ships from prosecuting the sealing industry. It does not confiscate capital for every man who in future wants to invest in the powerful type of ships has the law before them, which says that he cannot do so. If this were an interference with vested interests, it would only be just that a vested interest which suffers damage and loss should be compensated in some shape or form.

Another argument is that if the men are in favour of the prohibition of

steel steamers engaging in the prosecution of the seal fishery, they will not endeavour to secure bertns.

It may also be said of men who do not want liquor that they will not go to the saloon. If this were the case there would not be any need of a Prohibition Bill, such as we have recently passed. The law says "Thou shalt not steal," but men do steal; "thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods," but we do it.

The same applies to the steel steamers; whether the men want the steamers or not they will try to get berths in them. The fear of want, the fear of the future, the fear that he cannot earn sufficient to maintain his family will compel a man to seek a berth in the steel steamers. If a man is depending upon his daily earnings the fear of the want often stalking at his door will compel him to go to the sealfishery. He will be only too glad to go and as regards the steel steamers he will try particularly to get a berth in them as they will have a better chance to secure seals than the less powerful ones.

Some hon. members find fault with the question of compensation; they think it a hardship. Any innovation by the forces of democracy is received with alarm by the capitalists. They view with alarm any obligations which are put on them by the state, an alarm evidenced all over the world. When the Workmen's Compensation Act was first introduced into the Legislature in 1903, there was scarcely a person in the House outside the introducer who supported it. Industry and trade were going to be paralyzed; but what happened? Five years afterwards, the very men who predicted ruin passed it unanimously. The same applies to compensation under this bill, but does not go as far as the Workmen's Compensation Act, because that makes it obligatory, but in this case if it is due to the wilful neglect of the sealers whereby they sustain injury or death, there is no liability whatever.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—(On section 3)—I think this is a matter that should be beyond the power of the magistrate to suspend the certificate and thus damage the character of a master. In regard to some of the remarks of my hon. and learned friend, in which he deals with the matter somewhat before the Chair, we are none of us here, I take it, but to do the best we can in the interest of those engaged in the seal fishery, having due regard to the fishermen of the country. He speaks of the large steamers having a monopoly, but that I do not agree with, as the past season showed. Of course, we all know that the poor man as well as the rich man has his rights. As regards the right of property in seals, his remarks seem to me to be more in favour of doing away with panning seals altogether. I was a member of the select committee that sat on the fishery commission, and I think the concensus of opinion was that they could not do without panning. That being so, and panning being allowed to continue, I cannot agree with the clause in this bill limiting the right of property in panned seals to 48 hours, and I object to the suspension of a master's certificate for any breach of section 3.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I quite agree with the Hon. Mr. Goodridge that we should not give the magistrate power to take the captain's certificate, as an accident may happen through no fault of his. Now this is a very serious Bill, and one that will require careful thought and dealing. Sentimental and imaginary matters introduced in connection with such an industry should not be tolerated, for there is no reason why this industry could not at some future date be transferred to Sydney, Louisburg

or Halifax, and the steamers registered there. We must remember that the steamers leaving come back again, but if you make prohibitive legislation you will find the industry being transferred, and our men going elsewhere to join these ships.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I think the first three lines in this section are quite in order: "No master or other officer of any ship shall without lawful excuse send any sealer on to the ice or permit him to go on to the ice, except between the hours of daylight and dark," but it goes on "or at any other time when the state of the weather is such as may endanger life and limb." These words were inserted in the bill after the finding of the select committee who had deliberated on it, and it seems to me that it is an enaction which cannot possibly be workable, and may lead to a ship being handicapped and perhaps prevented from securing a trip of seals. Moreover, it is quite possible that the crew might rebel from the decision of a master who may say: "I'm afraid it looks too bad to go out today." The men might say in reply: "There is no indication of a storm, and we insist on going out; we are out to make a voyage, and how can we get a share of the seals if we do not take advantage of every hour that it is fit to be on the ice." However, the section is even worse than that as far as the master is concerned, because it provides: "that the magistrate or Justices imposing such penalty may in addition suspend the certificate of competency held by such officer under this act for such a period as he or they may deem proper." Surely it will be sufficient to amend that so that it will read "if the master or officer has been found to have wilfully ignored the provisions of this section," and that ought to be severe enough. To inflict a penalty on the master if a section of the men insisted on going on the ice against his instructions, and render him liable to have his certificate stopped, is, I think, an extreme penalty, and a great injustice.

HON. PRESIDENT—I would like to point out that bad as this is, it is not the worst in this bill, for section five provides that "any such breach which shall result in the death of any sealer shall be a felony, and punishable upon conviction by imprisonment for a period not exceeding three years." Now let us take the case of 1914. There were a number of crews out that day killing seals. Captain A. Kean in the exercise of his judgment sent some of his crew on the ice when he should not have sent them, in the opinion of other people. His son, Captain Joe Kean, who was in another ship, also had men out. It is quite true that they were nearer their ship than the men of the Newfoundland, Capt. Kean's offence, if he committed one at all, was only an error of judgment, but if this act had been in force, and some tribunal had held that Captain Kean was guilty of sending his men out from his ship to the ice at a time when the weather was such as to endanger life and limb, he could have been imprisoned for three years. I do not know that this House would be prepared to imprison Capt. Kean; personally I would not, any more than the unfortunate captain and crew who went down with their ship at a time when people here in St. John's thought he should not have attempted to reach St. John's. I refer to the ill-fated Southern Cross, lost in St. Mary's Bay. It is all very well, now that the misfortune has happened, and it is possible to make an outcry against Capt. Kean, to say he should have been imprisoned for three years. Possibly he should have been, but not in my opinion, any more than if we could get Captain Clarke back he might be imprisoned for the whole of his natural life, but he has paid the

penalty with his life. Both these cases were due to errors of judgment, and now we are going to enact into this bill provision that will imprison men for three years because through error of judgment some one dies on the ice. I do not think it is such legislation that we ought to consider.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The hon. member's argument would be strictly correct if this bill did not make it a penal offence for the master or officer of a ship to send men on the ice between certain hours, or in a state of weather that may endanger life or limb. Consequently, if a master does so he must take the consequences of his act, and if any men should lose their lives, should he not be imprisoned or pay the penalty? I have not introduced the names of any captains in this debate, but errors have been made, not intentionally, which caused the loss of life, and caused much serious suffering. We are confronted with something that has happened, and the question is how are you going to prevent it happening again in the future? It is incumbent for the man who brings the action against the captain to satisfy the court that the weather was not such as to warrant him in sending men on the ice at the time they were sent, and no court is going to convict a man of an offence under this act unless it is clearly proven that the conditions of the weather at the time was such that no man of common sense or with a thought to the proper care of his crew would send them on the ice. If you have a piece of machinery in your shop and you deliberately put an inexperienced man to operate that machinery in your shop, and he suffers loss of life or limb, should you not be criminally prosecuted for that? Now the same thing applies here. It is a question of evidence. Then again, objection is taken to the part which gives the justices power to suspend a master's certificate. Now there may be degrees of guilt which may arise in future, very serious breaches of section 3, and consequently a magistrate in giving judgment in a case will have regard to the seriousness and wilfulness of the act committed, and will deal with him accordingly. That section is directory, having regard to the circumstances of the case. But the matter does not end there; if hon. members will look at section 24 they will see it gives right to the person to appeal to the Supreme Court or to the court on circuit against the judgment of the court or magistrate, and the whole of the circumstances would come under review of the highest tribunal in the land, and if the magistrate had done a wrong to the person charged with the offence, then that court would rectify that wrong. Now I think this section should remain as it is, so that as far as possible, we can prevent in the future any recurrence of the terrible catastrophe which happened, and it is only by putting restrictions of this kind on the captain or other officer in charge, that we can hope to have the industry prosecuted as all would like to see it, with regard for human life.

HON. MR. KNOWLING—Section 24 affects section 2. Under section 5 the fine is $100, and section 24 only gives right to appeal where the fine exceeds $100.

HON. MR. HARVEY—Before section 5 goes through, I would like to say that it seems to be ridiculous. Why should a master who permits the men to be on the ice after dark be guilty of a misdemeanour if a member of his crew becomes disabled for not less than three months, and be guilty of a felony if a member of his crew should die? Surely his guilt, if it is such, is the same, whether it results in death or disablement.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Another point about the section is

that there is no suggestion as to how long after the breach the man must die. It will be necessary to limit the time within which a man must die, say twelve months.

Section amended accordingly.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I move as an amendment to section 7 that after the word "class" the word "and of a quantity" shall be added. The amendment speaks for itself.

Amendment passed.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I have never been at the seal fishery, but on one point I would like enlightenment. I have been told that when a number of steamers are there together, it is not an uncommon thing for a father on one ship to go on board another ship to see his son, or for a friend to go out to see a friend. If this act passes then this custom will be done away with. It seems to me this will entail a hardship on the sealers. I think the sealers will object to this and will want another bill next year. If I were a sealer at the ice and my father were at the ice, and I wanted to see him, I would think it hard to be prevented from doing so. Neither do I think it fair on the owners that, under such circumstances as these, they should have to keep rockets going all the time, and to keep their whistles blowing.

HON. MR. POWER—I would like to point out that under sections 6, 7 and 8 there is no limit of time stated within which action must be brought.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg to move that instead of the word "shall" in section 9 you insert the words "may in his discretion."

HON. MR. GIBBS—I do not think I can consent to that amendment because we have in section 8 protected the master with regard to the duties he must perform when circumstances arise such as are contemplated under section 8. Surely if a master fails to observe the obligations imposed on him by that section the penalty of cancelling his certificate is not too great. Now should not the same care be observed with regard to human life as in regard to the ship? If the master of a ship fails to take the proper precautions imposed by the Board of Trade he loses his certificate unless he can show that the act could not have been avoided; and if we do not punish a master who causes suffering to a sealer on the ice because he fails to blow his whistle and fails to fire rockets, then I say we are simply placing the rights of property above those of the individual.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the master can become liable under this section for no fault whatever of his own. Circumstances might arise, and do arise, where he could not blow that whistle, such as the breaking of the line, or it may become frozen, or some accident may happen which would be a justifiable cause for his not doing so, but in the next section we do not leave the magistrate any discretion. We should leave it at the option of the magistrate. Surely you will afford the captain or other officer some protection if their failure to do what the section requires is the cause of an accident.

HON. MR. GIBBS—If the steamer's whistle becomes damaged it cannot be blamed on the master, and he would not be subject to the penalty. The law does not call on a man to do anything he cannot.

HON. MR. ANGEL—Very often during the night steam is shut down to allow of repairs being made to the engines, and under those conditions it would not be possible to blow the whistle.

HON. MR. GIBBS—If there are any men on the ice the master has no business to have the boiler burnt down.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Do I understand that the policy is to give the sealer making the complaint the whole or a portion of the fine?

HON. MR. GIBBS—Half only, see section 25.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Section 9 says: "the penalties prescribed in the preceding section may be recovered in a summary manner by any sealer of the said ship who shall sue for the same." Now the question of policy arises as to whether under legislation of this sort the proceedings should be taken by a man financially interested in the case. The matter was brought up in the Game Law, for instance, when complaints were made that parties suing were financially interested, and that actions were taken which would not be taken in the case of justice merely. In a bill of that sort, it is justifiable, because there are not sufficient means for enforcing the act without the parties being themselves interested in the prosecution. The policy of having a person himself interested in the fine is a doubtful one, particularly where the fines are large, because if he succeeded in working up two or three cases successfully against the captain he would make more than the voyage would give him, and it is conceivable that a smart sea-lawyer or number of men might co-operate together and work up sufficient cases to give them a good sum, and yet never haul a seal.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I agree with the hon. member, but we thrashed out this matter in select committee, and the matter has been much modified. All these fines in every case were payable to the person suing for the same—and that might have been somebody on Water Street—and in addition to that nowhere in the Act were there the words "not exceeding." Now the people chiefly responsible for this bill are very emphatic that if we do not give the informer something the bill will not be carried out; but they have greatly modified the original requirements. Under those circumstances, as a member of that committee, though I agree with the last speaker, I shall support the section as it stands.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—That is a most serious statement the hon. member has made, and I am afraid it has a very contrary effect on me. He tells us that certain parties interested in this bill say if we do not give the informer something we will not get the bill carried out. Is this bill then to find a revenue for the informer? Is this bill so inherently unnecessary that men will not be induced to seek protection under it unless they are paid for it?

HON. MR. GIBBS—In reply to the observations of the hon. member, it is a well known fact that some people are not prepared to assert their rights, and I have known people to suffer in mind and body, because of the want of sufficient courage, rather than take action against people who do wrong. We can imagine a sealer who may be left on the ice, and perhaps that sealer may be dependent on his captain for his support. In that case he would not take proceedings against him, and consequently the right is given to another. What is running through the whole of the English criminal law that appeals to this country? Do we reward the policeman who secures the least convictions? Do we give a stripe to the policeman who arrests the least number of people? It is the very opposite; that is the principle running through the criminal law. In giving the sealer the right to sue for the penalty, we are simply giving the strong the right to sue for the weak.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I would point out that while we re-

ward the policeman who does his duty and secures convictions and looks after his job, he is doing it in the discharge of his duty. He would soon lose his job if he were doing it merely to get fines. The general law is that the policeman or prosecutor takes on himself offensive work; it is thought generally the officer would not prosecute if he did not get something out of it. Likewise in smuggling; the state sets its approval on the informer. The reason why I have raised the point is this: John Jones and William Smith have a grudge against the captain of a sealing ship, and want to get a good haul off him. It is a thing that might easily occur among the thousands of men who go out on these ships, and I am quite sure that in the town of St. John's it would not be difficult to pick out one or two men who would be quite willing to go on board these sealing steamers and take half a dozen suits for their own benefit. The men themselves should be only too glad to see the act enforced and take such proceedings as are necessary for that purpose.

HON. MR. GIBBS—It is easy to suppose extraordinary cases, such as my hon. friend supposes. But we have to deal with what may ordinarily arise. There are people in the world who try to make trouble, but they are few and far between. The hon. gentleman says that there are persons not interested in carrying out the law. Every person is interested in carrying out the law, as all should be; if not, then the laws upon the Statute Book would have no force or effect, and laws that have not the sympathy of the public are a dead letter upon our Statutes, and if this law has not such sympathy, it will remain a dead letter.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I beg to move the insertion of the words "may in his discretion" after the word "penalty."

The amendment was carried.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the House adjourned until Monday at 3 o'clock.

MONDAY, May 1st., 1916.

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

SEALING BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the sealing bill, Hon Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill that section 6 is mandatory upon master or other officers in charge of ships to send out search parties if any men are missing no matter what the weather conditions may be, though we all know very well that the usual conditions under which men are missing are such that it is only an invitation to further disaster to send out men to search for them. But here there is no alternative. Immediately upon its being known to the master that any men are missing, he must send a search party to look for them. In section 3 there is a provision that no master shall send men out when weather conditions make it undesirable. If it is not necessary to do so in section 3, why should it be necessary in section 6.

HON. MR. GIBBS—No men are expected to go, and it would be inhuman to send men out knowing that they may lose their lives. To do so would be to commit manslaughter.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—At the outset of any remarks I may make here this afternoon, I wish it to be

clearly understood again that I have no interest of any description from a monetary standpoint in any of the sealers that prosecute the seal fishery. I am as desirous as anybody in this House or the Lower House that the sealers shall have the best of comfort; and I am also desirous that the legislation enacted in this House should provide for the best food for the men; that they shall be well paid for the hardships and the dangers they from day to day undergo, and I also say they should all be provided with a doctor. I also noticed with pleasure the provision of wireless on all steamers. But there are two sides to every question, and we should make slow haste with legislation in the interests of this national industry. We should not in any way curtail or hamper in any way capital and prevent them from prosecuting this industry, and do not let us enact legislation to drive it out of the country. I have gone a little further into the facts of this industry since I spoke a few days ago, and with the permission of the House will give a few further figures of the history of the past. I give here now some facts and figures of some of the great sealing captains who have prosecuted this sealing industry in the past; showing the steamers they captained, their total catches and averages per spring as follows:

Late Captain Edward White, Sr., 1866 to 1882; 36 trips, 294,708. Steamers Hawk, Nimrod, Hector, Neptune. Largest trip 1877, Neptune, 36,662 Average per trip, 8,187 seals.

Captain Wm. Winsor, Sr., 1881 to 1905; 29 trips, 307,451 seals. Steamers Vanguard, Commodore, Greenland, Iceland, Panther, Walrus. Average per trip, 10,600 seals.

Late Capt. A. Jackman, 1871 to 1905; 47 trips, 543,045. Steamers Hawk, Falcon, Narwhal, Resolute, Eagle, Aurora, Terra Nova. Largest trip, 1881, Resolute, 35,021. Average for 47 trips, 11,554.

Late Capt. Richard Pike, 1870 to 1892; 27 trips, 224,694 seals. Steamers Retriever, Mastiff, Ranger, Proteus, Walrus, Hope. Largest trip 1875, Proteus, 40,466, 467 tons, 250 men. Average for 27 trips, 8,322 seals.

Late Capt. Chas. Dawe, 32 trips, 318,290 seals. Steamers Greenland, Aurora, Iceland, Thetis, Bear, Vanguard, Terra Nova, Newfoundland. Largest trip 1891, Terra Nova, 35,239 seals. Average for 32 trips, 9,947 seals.

Captain Henry Dawe, Bay Roberts, 1879 to 1905; 29 trips, 26,315 seals. Steamers Mastiff, Narwhal, Vanguard, Esquimaux, Arctic, Nimrod, Greenland, Ranger, Grand Lake. Largest trip 1904, Grand Lake, 30,171 seals. Average for 29 trips, 11,252 seals.

Late Captain Joseph Barbour, 1876 to 1890; 28 trips. Total 285,861 seals. Largest trip, 1889, Ranger, 353 tons, 34,373 seals.

1880 Walrus 3 trips, 183 tons—1st. trip, 13,500; Total 3 trips, 24,831. Average for 28 trips, 10,210 seals per year. Never had a steamer larger than the Walrus and Ranger.

Late Hon. Captain Samuel Blandford, 1874 to 1905, 39 trips. Total 584,492 seals. Steamers, Ospray, Iceland, Eagle, Esquimaux, Neptune, Newfoundland, (now named to his memory), and Virginia Lake. Average for 39 trips, 14,987 seals. Largest trip 1888, Neptune, 42,242 seals.

I have in a very brief way prepared a record of a few of our sealing captains who spent many years in the sealing industry of this country. If they were here to-day what would they do. The first on the list is that of Captain Arthur Jackman, 35 springs; Hon. Samuel Blandford, 30 springs; Captain Abraham Kean, 28 springs; Captain H. Dawe, 24 springs; Capt. Wm. Winsor, 24

springs; Captain C. Dawe, 22 springs; Capt. Edward White, Sr., 17 springs; Captain Job Knee, 17 springs; Captain Geo. Hann, 16 springs; Captain William Knee, 16 springs; Captain Richard Pike, 16 springs; Captain Geo. Smith, 15 springs.

Largest quantity of seals brought into port by eight steamers in rotation:

Late Captain Blandford, 39 trips, 584,492; 30 years.

Late Captain A. Jackman, 47 trips, 543,405; 35 years.

Capt. H. Dawe, Bay Roberts, 29 trips, 320,315; 24 years.

Late Captain C. Dawe, 29 trips, 318,290; 22 years.

Captain Winsor Sr., 29 trips, 307,451; 24 springs.

Captain G. White, 36 trips, 294,708; 17 springs.

Late Captain George Barbour, 28 trips, 285,861; 15 springs.

Late Captain R. Pike, 27 trips, 224,694; 16 springs.

Or a total for these eight captains of 2,284,856.

Two million, two hundred and eighty-four thousand, eight hundred and fifty-six seals.

Record of eight of our principal sealing captains whose last voyage was closed many years ago, and since then nearly all of them have crossed the Bar:

Late Hon. S. Blandford, 39 trips, 584,492; average 15,000.

Late Capt. A. Jackman, 47 trips, 543,045; average 11,554.

Capt. H. Dawe, Bay Roberts, 29 trips, 326,315; average 11,252.

Capt. Winsor, sr., 29 trips, 307,451; average 10,600.

Late Capt. George Barbour. 28 trips, 285,861; average 10,210.

Late Capt. C. Dawe, 32 trips, 318,290; average 9,947.

Late Capt. R. Pike, 27 trips, 224,694; average 8,322.

Late Capt. E. White, 36 trips, 294,708; average 8,187.

I wonder if the father of my hon. friend Mr. Blandford, were here in this House to-day listening to the debate on the sealing bill now before us, what would he do?

First on the list with a total of 584,492 seals brought into St. John's during a long period of thirty years, averaging 19,483 per year. What a splendid record for any man to leave behind him.

Second, Capt. Edward White, 17 springs; average 17,336.

Third, Captain Geo. Barbour, 13 springs; average 16,365.

Fourth, Captain Arthur Jackman, 35 springs; average, 15,516.

Fifth, Captain Job Knee, 17 springs, average 14,612.

Sixth, Captain C. Dawe, 22 springs; average 14,448.

Seventh, Captain Richard Pike, 16 springs; average 14,043.

Eighth, Capt. H. Dawe, 24 springs; average 13,506.

Ninth, Captain Wm. Winsor, 24 springs; average 12,810.

Tenth, Captain Wm. Knee, 16 springs; average 11,730.

Eleventh, Captain Geo. Hann, 16 springs; average 11,730.

Twelfth, Captain Geo. Smith, 15 springs; average 10,612.

Thirteenth, Captain Wm. Bartlett, 22 springs; average 9,235.

In the case of Captain Abraham Kean, who started his brilliant career twenty-eight years ago as a sealing master, he is still in active harness. I have every sympathy with the brilliant Captain, it was unfortunate for all concerned that the accident which happened two years ago should have caused so much sorrow and pain. What has happened has happened. It is over now, sorrow and pain will linger for a time. I am sure the gallant captain has suffered more

in mind and body, but no one can tell except himself.

Captain Kean from 1889 to 1916, 28 years ago, or in 28 springs to the ice, landed in St. John's, 640,917 seals, an average per year of 22,875 seals. This is a record to feel justly proud of. His largest trip in the wooden steamers was in the Aurora, 1904, 386 tons, men 187, 34,849.

Florizel, 1910, 1980 tons, 270 men, 49,069.

Stephano, 1913, 2143 tons, 270 men, 37,882.

Florizel, 1916, 1980 tons, 270 men, 46,481.

Mr. Chairman, such is a brief history from the records of this wonderful, productive, wealthy industry of the country. This industry, a national one, belongs to this country, then if so, let us try and keep it here, don't let our legislation be of such a nature that will drive it away. I am just as much interested in the comfort and profitable returns to the fishermen of the country, and the laborers of this town, as any member of this House or the Assembly. There are two sides to every question. Let us deal with both in justice to labour and in justice to capital, both go hand in hand, and should be in harmony, if we desire to have development and prosperity to the country.

I have shown, Mr. Chairman, that tonnage has nothing whatever to do with the sealing industry, large steel ships and small wooden ones have competed with each other. Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I must again refer to some remarkable trips of seals brought into St. John's by my revered, respected and late hon. friend and member of this House, Hon. Captain Samuel Blandford, whose average record stands the highest in the history of the seal fishery, whose last voyage is over, but his memory will live for ever in the fishery progress of this country.

Mr. Chairman, when your facts are wrong or incorrect your labour is lost and argument wrecked. Late Hon. Captain Samuel Blandford in the Neptune, 465 tons, 302 men, 41.-983 seals in 1884; in the year 1888, 42,242 seals; 1891, 32,061 seals; 1895, 32,308 seals; 1899, 32,134 seals; 1900, 36,255 seals.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that in addition to those whose names I mention in connection with the seal fishery, there were the Murphys, Mundens, Ash, Adams, Antle, Bartletts, Barbours, Bannerman, Bragg, Britt, Blackwood, Carter, Cummins, Delaney, Diamond, Smiths, Scott, Walsh, Fairweather, Farquhar, Graham, Guy, Green, Jackmans, Knees, Mullowney, McKay, Ryans, Thomey.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—I am sure all have been much interested in Hon. Mr. Anderson's address; he has covered the seal fishery from its inception to the present date. I have been associated with sealing masters and sealers themselves for many years, and I am not going to take one side more than the other, but judge them both. There are rights on both sides. This has always been a very debatable subject; for every year as long as I can remember, there have been enactments, repeals and every kind of amendment you can think of. We might take our memories back to 1914, when there was a disturbance as to the grub and accommodation, and then in 1902 there was the great strike which revolutionized the industry. It is my opinion that in this bill now before us there are some very good sections; at the same time there are sections that are absolutely useless and placed there without any foundation in fact. When ships of greater power are provided I am sure it is a step in the right direction, but to curtail them in any way seems to me like putting back the

hands of the clock. May I say that so far as my opinion is concerned, we have no knowledge of the seals, in spite of the fact that we have read very learned letters on the subject, but I still maintain we know nothing scientifically about the seals. We have heard there are two patches of seals, the northern patch and the southern patch, but they have never been discovered so as yet. It is contended by very experienced captains that there are two patches, but others, equally experienced, say there is only one. Further, with regard to the breeding of those seals, some are of opinion they breed every three years others every five, or seven, etc., but we have no scientific knowledge; it is all a matter of guess work, and unless we can get scientific information, it is hard to know where we are travelling. We seem to be no further than when we first prosecuted the industry. It has been said that we have been preserving the seal fishery. In my opinion we have been putting the car before the horse.

We have been passing laws year after year forbidding the killing of old seals. It is against the laws of nature. What we should have done in the past and should do in the future is to save the young and kill the old. In all departments of nature it is the young that grow, not the old, and the same is applicable to the seal fishery. Preserve the young by all means and do away with the old. What has happened all through these years? There was a time in my recollection, when one, two or three trips would be made to the ice; today after a number of years have elapsed, you cut out the third trip, then the second trip, and all this was for the preservation of the old seals. It seems ridiculous for us to be legislating every year. Now, coming to the question of tonnage, we are being asked, if I use the words of the introducer of the Bill correctly, to wipe out the large steamers. If it is in the interest of the fishery by all means do so, but you can't wipe out those steamers which have been built, for I fear if you attempt to do so you are liable to put yourself in the position that in the near future our great industry will be taken from us and we will find others not so very far from this Colony only too anxious to take up this industry and carry it on themselves. Protect it by all means. It has been said that the Florizel might be retained. Apply the position to the older days when the Neptune was recognized to be the most powerful and largest ship. Would it have been right to have sacrificed her in the same way as the Florizel at the present moment? There is no difficulty as far as the steamers are concerned, if they strike the right lead. There is a lot of luck in it, and where you get through the ice this lead takes you to the seals, but it is when you get within sight of picking up that the experience and good sense of the skilled captain comes into play. For these larger ships their owners know as well as we do that there are chances of passing the location of the seals, but it is absurd to think that we should shackle that new industry of the steel ships. Let us have them by all means, and the more we have the better. But you would be putting the hands of the clock back if you for a moment went back to the old system. You have to advance. Further, we have heard the expression from time to time that the old ships were "coffins," and that the new ships were far superior. We all know it, but in spite of the fact of these "coffins," may I say, and I say it with the authority of numbers of sealers, that first when the big ships came here, the men were more comfortable on board the wooden ships than the steel ships. Why? Because the steel ships

were not sheathed on the inside or ceiled, but only a short time after this fact was brought to the owners' notice they were attended to. Then there is the danger of these wooden ships being overloaded; if we bring in laws for the sealers, our laws should be laws that would protect them when the seals are on board, for then it is that you have your main danger. The danger is not so great when the ships are in the ice, but after they have loaded and left the ice. If any of our ships had met dangerous weather this year after leaving the ice, or had to run for many miles. the result, I fear, would have been similar to that of a couple of years ago. We should protect the captains, men and owners in arranging so that a limited number go on board every ship. There should be some mark. That is what I think is the proper course as far as our sealers are concerned.

With regard to the amendment, I have nothing to say with the exception that I think it is doubtful. We have known of captains in the past who have been fairly accurate with their tally of seals, but there is a likelihood of the captain overstepping the mark. But this difficulty can be overcome by having your own plimsol mark on the ship. With regard to the bill generally, as I said in my opening remarks, there are some sections that appeal to me strongly, others do not do so; my mind is open, and I shall vote according to my convictions.

HON. MR. HARVEY—What I would point out is that under the section as it comes up, the wooden ships can bring in forty or fifty thousand, and the steel ships are only allowed to bring in 35,000. What reason is there in this position? I do not think that we ought to argue here that this section of the bill is being passed or altered in the interests of capital or the interests of labour. The interests of all are alike. I think the interests of the sealers and the owners are equally to be considered. It is not a matter of obliging the captain or encouraging the capitalist; it is to make the best arrangements for all concerned, and particularly for the men. But to take the section as it stands and allow one ship to overload and penalize a steel ship for carrying over 35,000 is ridiculous. I believe in limiting the steel ships to 35,000, but I am also in favour of the amendment that has been just moved. With reference to Hon. Mr. Blandford's remarks about the protection of the old and the young seals, I do not agree with him in his position there.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I must call the attention of the House to the fact that a phase of the subject has not been touched upon at all, and that is that we make provision for only one steel steamer going. It may be possible that ships sold to the Russian Government, the Nascopie, Beothic, Adventure, Bellaventure and Bonaventure may be bought back at a reasonable price; we know that freight conditions will not come back to normal for some time after the war closes, but this law would prevent any one who may be disposed to invest their money for the purpose of purchasing these ships. They would not purchase them for this trade altogether or because of the likelihood of getting freights, even the high freights now prevailing for them. Under those circumstances it would be criminal to prohibit those vessels from coming back if they can be bought, and if we prohibit them from going to the seal fishery they will not come back. Conditions of freight will be such after the war that these ships will not be bought unless they have the seal fishery to fall back upon.

HON. MR. MURPHY—I will not have much to say on the bill, but it

appears to me that this hardy annual should have been brought in earlier in the season. I have been speaking to several men who have procured interesting statistics in connection with the fishery, and after listening to them my personal impression is that the reason the average catch is so small is that the seals are not out there to bring in. I do not see any other conclusion to arrive at. The protection of the men is far more to us, or should be, than the passing of laws to protect the seals; to see that they get proper treatment, to make them comfortable, and the next important thing is to protect the remnant of our seal herds and enable us to carry on the fag end of a played-out industry to the best advantage of those who have put their money in it. If we are going to protect the seals the fewer vessels that are out the better. We cannot stop progress,we must not,and cannot go back to the substitution of the sailing vessel. It is impossible, modern conditions will not admit of it. You can't put sailing vessels into the fishery, for you would not get men enough , for we have not got that class of sealer with us today. It will be a case of the "survival of the fittest," and I think steamers cannot be done without if we have nothing better to take their place. And while we must bear in mind that we are legislating here for the remnant of a played-out industry, we must try also to build up and propagate and enlarge the herd, and the only thing to do is not to let them go out at all, or let all, big and small, go out. Hon Mr. Anderson's average is a very small average, and if you limit all let them all prosecute the fishery. I don't believe in special legislation, and I think it will be a hardship for the owners of these large steamers, who have spent so much money, that they should be ruled out. The only way I see out of it is to limit the catch. What difference does it make if we have only a small herd out there? Are we protecting them if we only allow our wooden ships to go out and bring in 35,000 to 40,000? What difference will it make whether modern or steel ships will bring them in? If you are going to protect them and cut down the catch, then 30,000 should be enough to make a paying catch for our sealers. According to Hon. Mr. Anderson they have not averaged that at all. I think we are going to finish the harps as we finished the whales. You want to protect the harps for one year. Thirty thousand is as much as you can afford to take out of the herd. I do not think that the protection of the old seals will increase the herd. If you kill out the young you will surely kill out the old, because they will die naturally. When they cease to breed they are of no further service, but if you do not protect the young, it will be little good to protect the old. To protect them properly you must reduce the number of seals brought in. I would propose that in stead of 35,000 that 30,000 should be the largest number allowed to be brought in by the wooden or steel ships.

HON. MR. GIBBS—For the same reason we could see that no one but our own people could go out in those ships so that the chances of the industry passing into other hands if we adopt legislation of this kind are not to be seriously regarded. Now then, if hon. members are desirous of protecting this industry, and I have no doubt they are, Hon. Mr. Murphy has proposed an amendment that the catch for one ship be limited to 30,000, so that is an opportunity for them to do something, at present, at least, to protect the seal herds, and I have no doubt we shall be doing something good, but where we allow them to take 700 tons, we might permit them to take 40,000 or 45,000 and in a short time there would be no seals left.

HON. PRESIDENT—(On Section 13.)—With reference to this section, which I regard as the vital principle of the whole Bill, I wish to say that in my judgment the proposal to debar all steamers except the Florizel from taking part in the seal fishery is one that we ought to hesitate before bringing into effect. Everywhere sectional legislation is regarded, and properly so, as dangerous to the public interest and liable to be perverted for very undesirable purposes. It implies a monopoly, even if such is not intended, and monopolies are foreign to the spirit of modern legislation and detrimental to the well-being of any community.

In considering the whole sealing question, the first matter to which we should address ourselves is its eff ct upon those interested—upon the men, on the one hand, and upon the capitalists on the other. I have followed with keen interest the whole of this debate, and I think its general tone is one for which we have cause to be proud. Some of the members have gone into the question very thoroughly and have given much valuable information to the House, while every phase of the subject has been discussed with a praiseworthy effort to get at the facts which would enable us to form a proper judgment. The hon. gentleman in charge of the bill, Mr. Gibbs, has directed himself particularly to championing the interests of the men and to emphasing what, in his opinion, is the prime factor of this enactment, namely, the protection of the interests of the seal-hunters, or the masses. With that principle none of us will quarrel, but I think that the hon. gentleman should recognize that those who do not see eye to eye with him are not less regardful of the interests of the men than he is, or that they are influenced by any idea of sacrificing the masses in the interests of the classes or capitalists. Personally I am prepared to go as far as anybody in supporting any measure calculated to benefit the working man, and I think that I speak for many others in this House as well as myself when I say that we are only influenced in differing from the hon. gentleman in the views he takes by the belief that if we do not go as far as he does it is because we fear that the industry itself will suffer, and that the interests of the men as well as of the ship owners will be injured very considerably if, indeed, the industry itself is not destroyed, so far as the Colony is concerned. The reason we take this view is because we feel that capitalists as well as workingmen have some rights, that it is possible for a well-intentioned effort on behalf of the working classes to defeat its own purpose by crippling an industry, and that in so far as the sealing voyage is concerned, it must not be forgotten that however desirous men may be of taking part, and however earnest the effort to promote the industry, the two thousand or three thousand men who find employment in the seal fishery every spring, and as this year, earn very substantial sums in a very brief period, would be without this employment and perhaps without any employment at all if legislation were enacted which would make it unprofitable for the business man of Water Street to carry on this industry as it has been conducted in the past. And this view takes on special significance this year when we remember that all of the steel ships have been sold out of the industry, except the Florizel, and that it is a debatable question when we are to get them back again.

Second only in importance to this aspect of the matter is that of the conservation of the seals themselves. A very interesting discussion on this point was initiated in this House by

Hon. Mr. Harvey from two points of view and we would do well to consider them carefully. On the one hand there is the fact which we must admit in the light of the history of the industry, that the seal herd today is not more than half what it was a generation ago, and that the Legislature in years past has recognized this by enactments from time to time, first doing away with the third trips, then with second trips, then reducing the crews, then setting the date of opening the industry further back in March, and otherwise introducing limitations designed to preserve the seal herds as far as possible, while at the same time allowing the industry to remain fairly remunerative. The other aspect of this phase of the question is whether it behooves us to go to the extreme which is suggested by certain gentlemen in regard to the problem of the conservation of the seal herds and to introduce further limitations at the present time, restricting the industry to wooden ships alone and otherwise circumscribing the activities of those engaged in this industry.

In my judgment we can safely leave it to the common sense of the country to demand and the Legislature to enact, further measures, when the time comes that it is made certain that the existing enactments are not sufficient to preserve this industry to our people. But I do not think that time has come yet. We find today some people arguing that the way to deal with this proposition is to have a close season every few years. Others think the prevention of the killing of old seals altogether is another way to accomplish the same; others favour a limitation of the catch; others want the industry restricted to small ships, and there are other proposals in the same direction. To my mind it would be unwise for us at the present juncture to attempt any radical reforms along any of these lines. I believe this matter will cure itself by the enactment of legislation from time to time as the good sense of the community is awakened to the necessity for really drastic measures. But with all due deference to my hon. friend opposite, (Hon. Mr. Harvey), and while I admit that his arguments have much weight, I am not impressed with the view that radical enactments are required or that we cannot afford to maintain for some years to come, at any rate, legislation along the same lines as we have had to the present. We must not forget that the sealing fleet has been greatly reduced, by a variety of circumstances, within the past few years. It is down to twelve ships now, and there is little prospect of that number being increased, at least until the war is over, and even then it is debatable if the number will be rapidly augmented.

In the next place, we have all to bear in mind that we are likely to lose within the next few years some of the older wooden ships, and these will hardly be replaced, because there are so few of such vessels afloat today; and nobody seriously argues that any more will be built. Therefore, I think the prospect is that we are not going to have any excessive kill of seals within the next few years, and consequently, in view of the present circumstances and of the outlook for the near future, I do not think we should impose too serious restrictions upon this industry at the present time, remembering that with the new conditions to which the war has given rise, it is not always easy for our people to obtain congenial employment, and that the seriousness of this situation may be accentuated in the very near future. Another thing to consider is the prospect, which I regard as by no means remote, of our losing this fishery entirely if we attempt to legislate too severely in regard to it.

The hon. gentleman, Hon. Mr. Gibbs,

put forth the argument that such a contingency is not likely; that it is impossible for the seal fishery to be carried on without our people. I agree with him that men cannot be got on this side of the Atlantic as efficient as ours for this industry, but there is nothing to prevent the seal-hunt from being transferred, in a large part, if not altogether, to the neighbouring province of Nova Scotia, if we make our measures too harsh on the capitalists. The hon. gentleman said also we could prevent our people going to Canada to sail on these ships. To put forth such a contention as that is to strain the credulity of this House to the limit. We cannot stop men at Port aux Basques and ask them where they are going, or what for, and even if we did, and could stop them, there are enough Newfoundlanders in and around Sydney, Glace Bay and other parts of Cape Breton, all of whom would be only too glad to throw up their jobs and go to the sealfishery in the Stephano or Florizel with a chance of making $150 in two or three weeks, and then go back to the mines on their return. That is a contingency which we must not overlook. In the next place, there are two steamers owned largely in Nova Scotia prosecuting the seal fishery to-day and using this Colony for an outfitting base. They come in here and get crews, then go to the ice, return here at the close and land their catch here, although one, the Seal, did not do so this year, but went to Sydney. The Sable I. did land here, though, but she went away with two-thirds of the product of that industry, so far as she was concerned, in the captain's cabin, to be turned into industries in Nova Scotia to our loss, and if that can happen to two ships it is only a question of time if we make our laws too severe, when the whole industry might be transferred to Nova Scotia in the same way. Then, again, there were two ships from Norway operating in the Gulf last season, and though the results were not satisfactory, the most likely outcome is that they may be bought by parties in Nova Scotia and put into the sealing industry on the lines of the Seal and Sable I., and there will then be four ships from Nova Scotia, and perhaps a refinery put up over there and the seals sold to it.

We ought not to overlook these facts, and when we are told that we are enjoying a monopoly I would like the hon. gentleman to remember a few other facts. For a long time we thought we enjoyed a monopoly of the bait supply, but today we find that men like my hon. friend opposite, Hon. Mr. Harvey, are having to import cargoes of bait here from Glouchester to carry on the codfishery. We also thought we enjoyed a monopoly of the bank fishery, but now out of Lunenburg and other parts of Nova Scotia they are prosecuting that fishery as profitably, if not more so, than ourselves. Then, again, the steam trawler has to be taken into account. We cannot make it pay, but others can. The Frenchmen out of St. Pierre and the Canadians from Nova Scotia have a certain number of trawlers, and there are another dozen out of Boston, and all appear to be more than paying their way.

All these facts ought to give us occasion to pause and think before we go too far in radical legislation; even though we are told the fishermen want this particular form of legislation. It may be that they do, but the difficulty is for us to know just what the fishermen do want. The fishery rules of this country are the most extraordinary of any in the world. Every fishing settlement has a different set of rules. Starting at Cape Race and going down the coast you will find twenty different sets of rules; at one place you can set trawls and another

you can't; one place allows traps, and another does not; on the West Coast today we have one set of people petitioning the Legislature to have motor boats stopped, and another class of people asking not to have them stopped. In such an important matter as this, we ought to think for ourselves and not allow ourselves to be influenced by the statement that the fishermen want this or that form of legislation.

With reference to the particular section now before us, I am disposed to vote for the amendment proposed by my hon. friend. My personal preference would be to limit the catch to 30,000 as suggested by Hon. Mr. Murphy, but as I know others wish it to be put up to 40,000, I think 35,000 is a fair compromise, and will meet the immediate need. At the present time, with only one steel ship in the seal hunt this year I think we need not draw the line too closely, but when other big ships come back the Legislature may have to further reduce the catch in order to conserve the herd.

With reference to the ships sold out of this trade to-day, I want to say this: The argument is made that we ought to consider them; but I do not think they are entitled to any consideration whatever. These ships were built and brought into this industry, presumably, on the one part, to provide a profit for those who built them, and on the other to meet the trade requirements for tonnage. The moment, however, it became apparent to those interested in these ships that there was more money for them in selling the ships than keeping them here, they sold them, and by selling them they sacrificed any right they had to the consideration of this Legislature. If they came back to-morrow they ought to come back only on the understanding that they are to be subject to any enactments this Parliament feels obliged to pass in the interest of the conservation of this industry. But the Florizel and Stephano stand in a somewhat different relation. They are ships that were built of more than the required strength over Lloyd's demands, in order to admit of their taking part in this industry, it has been said at an additional cost of $75,000, and therefore these ships have a claim upon our consideration, and particularly because when the opportunity offered to them to sell their ships, they did not do so, but kept them, though I dare say they could have made a large profit on them. They elected this year to put the Florizel at the sealfishery; perhaps it might have been better if she had not been sent there, but, after all, those who own the ship are the best judges of what to do with her. But we must consider what will happen when the war is at an end and other ships have to be taken into account. To carry on adequately the overseas trade of this Colony we shall require more steam vessels. Some such vessels might be obtained by buying back the ones now in Russia, otherwise other ships will have to be built. In the light of the experience of those who built the Adventure and that class of ship, it is debatable if any great number will be constructed immediately, but having in view the possibilities of trade to Hudson Bay when the railway there is completed investors may plan to gain that trade, and utilize such ships at the sealfishery. We ought not to throw any obstacle in the way of such ships being built and used here, because when all is said and done we need the sealfishery. The men, the very men, who are petitioning now, need the sealfishery, and the men who are now wanting the big ships kept out, are the very men who a few years ago

wanted the wooden ships excluded, because they said these were coffin ships, but now they have changed their tune and they demand the prohibition of the steel ships entirely. I agree that it would be ruinous for us to allow big steel ships to come back here after the war and carry on the seal fishery without putting some limit on the number of seals they might bring in, because this year, if the six or seven of these big steamers had not gone to Russia but were here and taking part in the seal hunt, they might have killed 40,000 or 50,000 seals apiece, and so the benefits of the close season of last year would have been virtually destroyed. But while I agree that steel ships should be under regulation, I do not think it would be wise for us, in the interests of the country and its people, to keep out such ships altogether. To do so would be to run the risk of having the industry transferred to another country, and also to run the risk of our being without sufficient local steamers for the requirements of our general trade. To possess and operate such ships from this Colony would mean a big advantage to all classes of our people. The men who invest money in them would have the dividends, local crews would earn good wages out of them; local seamen would become navigators and captains; local engineers would operate them; and when the seal hunt would come round each year, local men would share in the profits and have the money to help them in our other fishery enterprises. Therefore, I think the policy of wisdom in this connection is to determine to allow any ship that wishes to take part in this industry, but to prescribe that she shall not bring into this Colony more than 35,000 seals in any voyage.

I apologize for taking up the time of the House at such length, but I thought it as well to put on record certain views which have appealed to me as of value in explaining why I am supporting the amendment now under discussion.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE— Before this section passes, it seems to me in legislating on seal fishery matters we are entirely astray. To limit the quantity of seals brought in, without reference to weight, is wrong. Forty thousand seals of a small weight might not weigh as much as 25,000 of a large size.

The Hon. President has shown very clearly that this industry may be transferred to Nova Scotia, and that these ships now in Russia may be bought back, but does he ignore the fact that they may be bought back by Canada. Therefore, I say it is a most dangerous thing to legislate in the manner proposed. We should limit the catch. The better the steamer, the better the catch, and it makes very little difference whether twenty steamers or ten go out. I do not agree that the catch should be limited to 30,000 or 35,000, and propose the amount should be 40,000.

HON. MR. POWER—I agree with Hon. Mr. Goodridge that the limit should be made 40,000. We should limit the catch, without a doubt.

HON. MR. GIBBS—There are some facts staring us in the face, which, to use a common phrase, "there is no use winking at." It has been proven conclusively, without shadow of a doubt, that the sealing industry is declining that the herd is decreasing. It has decreased in the number brought in to at least one half, and this has occurred where we were using the most up-to-date machinery and appliances in connection with it. We cannot approach the catch of former years. Why is this the case? Why does this condition exist? When the sailing vessels were prosecuting the industry, the

catch amounted to a half a million or more. The introduction of steam into the industry has decreased the catch to one half of what it was when the sailing vessels prosecuted it. It therefore follows as a matter of course that the sealing steamers are the cause of the decline in the number of seals brought in; and our destructive methods are such that if we continued them the sealing industry will be a thing of the past. With these facts before us, what is our duty as a branch of the Legislature which makes the laws? Our duty is to ensure and protect the industry. We do harm if hon. members put their private interests before their public duties. I do not question the motives of hon. members in this particular. All are imbued with the idea of doing their public duty and nobody questions the sincerity o' hon. members in this respect. Bu with the facts before us, showing t they do that the number of seals ar decreasing, are we performing our duty to the public if we permit the destructive methods of the past to continue for a few years longer. This is the point we must direct our attention and intelligence to. We must come to the conclusion no matter by what circuitous means we arrive at it, that if we permit the powerful steamer to prosecute the fishery, then there will be no sealing industry and no herd in the near future;consequently when hon. members want to argue that legislation of this character is class legislation, I say it is nothing of the kind. This legislation is not putting the industry into the hands of any section of the community; it aims at protecting the industry for the benefit of all, for the poor fishermen, the mechanic and merchant, and consequently there is nothing of class legislation about it. Hon. members admit that if the steel fleet that prosecuted the industry a couple of years ago had been out this year, the wooden fleet would not have obtained anything. What does this mean? It means because of superior power these ships could move among the floes and would capture the greater portion of the herd. There would be none left for the wooden ships, consequently if we restrict the right to send the powerful ships, we will preserve the industry and give the young a chance to live for many years. Whereas with the powerful steamers prosecuting the industry the seals would have no chance to live, except for the season in which they were born. It ought not to be a difficult matter for us to realize that the sealing industry is declining, and that it is only a matter of a short time when it will cease to be prosecuted at all. Why is it that we want the steel steamers of a powerful type prosecuting the seal fishery? The reason is, not the preservation of the industry, it is gain. No man wants to invest in the industry that is not going to be profited by it. And if capitalists can utilize the steamers at a certain season at the prosecution of the sealfishery, and at another season in the general trade of the Colony he will do so. But is it in the interest of the country in general that we should permit him to do it? The rights of the people are superior to the rights of the capitalist. There is no capital invested in the seal fishery except the ships which prosecuted it in 1916, consequently we are not interfering with vested rights or interests if we press this legislation. If we interfere with vested rights it would be unfair to confiscate the capital of any individual in the interests of the public and not indemnify him for so doing. That is the principle of British law. If the public desire the property of one individual they must compensate him. Hon. Mr. Anderson gave us a very interesting dissertation upon the quantity of seals brought in.

He has praised the sealing captains, and I want hon. members to let their thoughts go back to what he said. Those ships that brought in the greatest number of seals were always the powerful ships and not the wooden ships, thus showing that if you permit the powerful ships to continue, then a large number of seals will be brought in so long as they go out there, and with that occurring year after year we are going to bring about the destruction of the herds. Hon. members have said we must make haste slowly with this legislation. In that I agree with them when it has reference to legislation dealing with a national industry. As a matter of fact we have been slow in realizing that when legislating 10 or 15 years ago. We did not then limit the catch, but if we had made little more haste the industry would not be declining as it is today. He said we should not interfere with the disposition of the capital invested in the industry. I do not agree with this. The average man looks upon the material side of every question. He will not ask: "Is it for the benefit of the country or the community?" but "will it pay?" That is the motive that animates the average man who starts an industry or invests capital. And this is why we must legislate to prevent the greed of capital from destroying the national worth of the industry, or for that matter of this country. The national wealth of this Colony must not be exploited for the benefit of the individual. This has been the case with some countries, where the national wealth has been exploited by individuals for the benefit of the country at large. All countries are commencing to awaken to that fact that our men should have the right to realize the natural resources of a country for his own individual benefit and gain. The country should, moreover, be solicitous to see that in the carrying on of that industry it get a portion of the profits made in it. There is no attempt made in this legislation to sacrifice any ship or eliminate any ship. I would not be a party to inflicting punishment upon a person solely because he has a ship in which he invested his money for the purpose of engaging in the industry, but would permit him to prosecute that industry, subject to rules and regulations necessary in the interests of the industry and the country. Hon. Mr. Murphy has moved an amendment which I think gets at the root of the matter—that if we limit the catch to 30,000, then we will be doing something to prevent the depletion of the herd. Hon. Mr. Anderson's amendment allows 35,000 seals as the limit, and permits ships to bring in 700 tons of seals. What would that mean? Seals vary in weight. If we permit a ship to carry in 700 tons that would mean that if the seals averaged 30 pounds it would take 47,000 seals to weigh 700 tons. If they averaged 35 pounds, they would have to get 40,000, and if we permit 4 steamers of the large type to bring in 40,000 seals each, what is to become of the herd? But the sealing steamers are not going to strike the old seals. We have had two close seasons, and the seals will grow in weight. They will live under conditions which they did not live under for years past. Something unusual occurred by which they gained in weight this year more than for many years past, some conditions that we know nothing at all about, which caused them to be of greater weight. But we also have had the fact that the seals brought in for the past 10 or 15 years were less in weight than those of other years. Whether the fact of the female seal being able to care for its young for at least a season has had anything to do with the seals brought in this year, I don't know. Hon. Mr. Blandford says that some of the sections are useless to the Bill. He has failed to point to where they are useless or in what respect.

It is all very well to make statements, but it is another thing to prove them. All the sections of the bill have some object in view. There is nothing absolutely useless or obsolete in them. We may differ as to the objects or necessity of many sections,all cannot be of one mind. Progress must be made in every department in spite of our differences, whether they be as to the sealing or any other industry. We are all human, and all our acts have the seal of imperfection upon them. It does not matter how long we may work, the seal of imperfection is upon them. I have no doubt somebody two or three years hence will improve upon this legislation or on something else in connection with the industry. Perhaps in two or three years from now a bill will be brought in prohibiting the prosecution of the seal fishery for two, three or five years, because the herd is decreasing so rapidly. We have here before us a petition to show us how men interested in the industry view it. The petition is signed by A. Harvey & Co., Job Bros. & Co., Bowring Bros. Ltd., Baine, Johnston & Co., James Baird, Ltd., A. Kean, W. C. Winsor, S. R. Winsor and Geo. Whiteley, very successful men all, in their capacity as sealing owners and captains. These men have put their names to a petition wherein is stated that the guns on board the sealers are only used when the young are missed, and if they are prevented from getting seals the hope of profit is greatly diminished.

(Reads from Petition.)

We see this idea of profit running all through the petition. With them the sole consideration is not the preservation of the industry, but profit, for if they are not permitted to use guns the hope of profit is diminished. They may be perfectly honest in the statements made that could they get future generations to agree with them in that particular. And you will find other statements in the petition to the effect that they, the petitioners, would let any number of vessels prosecute the industry. As to arguments such as these advanced in favour of the non-adoption of legislation of this character, I do not think they are sufficiently strong or so forcible as to commend them to our judgment. Another hon. member advances the theory of preserving the young and killing the old. There is a great deal of force and common sense in what he says, but I do not think, if you make legislation of that kind, that wooden or steel ships will go out again, because none of them will go out to hunt the old seals. It would be a great way to give the sealing industry a chance to recuperate, if some hon. members propose an amendment, that sealing steamers next year should kill old seals only and not the young. If we have a law of that kind the sealing herd would be greatly multiplied. We would have a return, not to vessels but to the catches of 30 or 40 years ago. I do not agree with hon. members that the ships which have been sold to Russia are ever going to come back; I do not believe the owners will take them back. The ships are not sufficiently large carriers to make them profitable for trade outside the Colony or to carry the trade of the country to foreign ports. I do not look forward to any of them taking back the ships. One hon. member advancing arguments in favour of the Bill, held that there were enough men in Nova Scotia to man a sealing fleet; and that those men working in the coal mines and at other industries would be prepared to throw up their jobs and go to the seal fishery. I can say that no man working out of this country would throw up his job to go to the seal fishery. I have never been at the seal

fishery and do not know the hardships endured by the men, but I do know something of the conditions when they come back here. We can safely rely upon it that no Newfoundlander working in Nova Scotia would give up work to take part in the prosecution of the seal fishery, because he would not undergo the hardships our sealers suffer. It may be a sweeping statement, but I am prepared to prove it. Men here, because they do not travel or move about, are prepared to go out to this industry and live no better than cattle. To think that Newfoundlanders who have settled in Nova Scotia will go on this hazardous undertaking is absurd. Another argument is advanced that the "Sable Island" has taken away two-thirds of the value of her catch. There is nothing to prevent that from happening if it is desirable to be done. We have had vessels engaged in the seal fishery from Halifax for the past quarter of a century or more. They have brought seals here, shipped crews and carried on the industry here and none of us have ever thought that it was wrong or that they injured the country or industry. There is no fear of this industry leaving the country, because they must come here to get the crews to man the steamers. While we cannot prevent men from permanently leaving the country, how many will do so for the purpose of engaging in the fishery if carried on at St. Pierre or Louisburg? How many will give up their homes in the outports, where they live comfortably, to work in the coal mines of Nova Scotia, or its factories or mills? How many will give up the freedom they enjoy of being their own master, with nobody with a watch in his hand to see what time he comes to work or leaves off? In answer to Mr. Angel, I say we can prevent our men from prosecuting the seal fishery from the outside if it becomes necessary in the interest of the country. For the information of the House, I may say that the matter is being seriously considered as to whether in view of the Norwegian steamers in the Gulf coming here, we should not consider the adoption of legislation by which our people would be prohibited from going on board their ships. We have the right to do it.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—We cannot stop a man from going out of the country. He can do as he pleases.

HON. MR. GIBBS—If he goes out to prosecute the industry he must come back, and we can make it an offence for him to do anything with the seal fishery if the Legislature passed it. The Legislature could pass such a law. In America they have an Alien Labour Law, which forbids men entering that country.

HON. PRESIDENT—There are one or two points to which the hon. gentleman referred, namely, the men leaving the country. I am afraid the hon. gentleman misunderstands American Legislation on the subject, which is different altogether from what he represents it. The U. S. has what is known as an Alien Contract Law, which makes it a penal offence for people to go into the U. S. to work when brought in under contract. If it be shown to the satisfaction of the American emigration authorities that men are so brought in they can be prosecuted and deported, and that law was employed a few years ago when a prominent clergyman was brought over under contract to take the pastorate of some big church in New York. But that is a very different matter from men in this country who know that the seal fishery is going to be prosecuted out of Sydeny, going to that place to join those steamers. They do not have to have any contracts or written agreements.

With all due deference to my hon. friend, I maintain you cannot prosecute such men. My hon. friend does not seriously suppose that such legislation would be enacted; the Imperial authorities would never assent to it.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The Imperial authorities could not interfere, as this would be domestic legislation.

HON. PRESIDENT—Does the hon. member remember about the famous bribery bill that was held up by the Imperial authorities? That was domestic legislation, and yet it was vetoed.

The next point is that my hon. friend says that people up in Sydney and Louisburg would not leave their jobs to go to the seal fishery because of the hardships. There are hundreds giving up their jobs today to go to the seal fishery.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Not in Nova Scotia.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE— What about the two Norwegian ships now sealing from Sydney? Are they not crewed with Newfoundlanders?

HON. PRESIDENT—I was just coming to that. Of course these Norwegian ships are crewed by Newfoundlanders. They can get any number of our men at Sydney for their needs. With all due deference to the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill I must say that I think his argument about our men at Sydney not being willing to go sealing will not hold water. They are going across there every day from parts of this Colony to work in the steel mills and coal mines. They only go for short periods and their work is not at all in the nature of permanent employment. They may stay two, three, four or six months. Some of them go over two or three times a year. They would think it no hardship to leave a coal mine or the steel works to go to the seal fishery and return to the mining or other work after the seal hunt was over. It would be utterly impossible, I maintain ,for us to attempt to try and stop them. We would have no right to ask them at Port aux Basques if they intended to go sealing, for they would have no contracts and might be too late to get berths, but in any case it would be altogether absurd to argue that you could put whole crews of men in jail when they returned here because after they got to Sydney they went sealing on Canadian ships. In the first place, I maintain that no Government in this country would bring in such a law, because it would be so obvious an interference with the rights of the labouring people; in the second place, I do not believe the Imperial Government would consent to such a law, because it would be so dangerous a precedent, and in the third place, I am sure the Canadian Government would oppose such an enactment being passed, on the ground that it would interfere with their rights in the seal fishery, just as the Canadian Government 25 years ago protested against Sir Robert Bond's reciprocity arrangement with the United States, on the ground that it affected Canada's interests in the bait fishes of this Colony to which they had the same right as ourselves as fellow British subjects.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—As regards the decline in the seal fishery I cannot say I have had any actual experience, but from the facts shown by Hon. Mr. Anderson and others, I cannot see how there has been any decline in the past forty or fifty years. I do not agree with my hon. friend's statement that they have declined, and I do say that there are just as many seals killed as 25 years ago, and further, that there are just as many seals brought into Newfoundland now as in the days of the sailing vessels. The seals are breeding just the same

today as 20 years ago, and if we had close seasons it is because the ships missed them. How can I reconcile my mind to believing that the large and speedy steamers are doing injury? The Neptune was considered the largest and most powerful ship out there before the steel steamers came here, and what was the result? To my knowledge within the past forty years she only brought in two loads. The large steamer is just as likely to pass the herd as the small one, because as has been said, it is a mere crack in the ice that enables them to get to the centre of the seals and get a bumper trip. I cannot believe that the seal fishery has declined fifty per cent. as my hon. friend states. I think we ought to have more scientific knowledge, not alone as regards the seal fishery, but the cod fishery, and other fisheries. It has been said that this is class legislation. It is not so in my mind, but be that is it may, I shall always advocate the interest of the fisherman when he is right; I shall do the same thing by the merchant. I was not in this Chamber when the latter's petition was read, so my mind is clear and my own opinions unbiased in connection with this bill.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—There are one or two points to which I wish to refer, and I desire to add in connection with the remarks I made a short time ago. My hon. friend the other day gave us vital statistics that are worthy of great consideration, but doctors differ. 'Dr.' Job differed. I don't know which is right, but I do not think the seal fishery has in any way declined. I think there are as many seals to be caught to-day as ever. In 1831 the catch was 631,000. I think there are to-day as many seals on the ice as in the days I spoke of; I believe there are plenty for everybody.

HON. MR. MURPHY—We should follow the example taken in regard to the fur seals in the Pacific. When they found all the seals were being destroyed, the Japanese, Russian, Canadian and American Governments made a general law to protect them, and I think if it is necessary, and we are in earnest, and the seals are being destroyed, we ought to limit the ships to 30,000 each; it will be a fine trip in most cases. Hon. Mr. Goodridge's amendment sets the limit at 40,000. My amendment is to put the limit at 30,000 for each trip.

HON. PRESIDENT—While I am in favour of voting for the amendment that fixes the maximum catch at 35,000, I would like to have it made clear what the effect of this alternative position of 700 tons is going to be. The first consideration is that there shall not be an excessive number of seals brought in. In other words, cats and large seals amount to the same thing, limiting them as seals. Is it intended that if there are 35,000 cats, and they do not amount to 700 tons, that the ships can kill sufficient in excess to make up 700 tons?

HON. MR. BISHOP—You cannot exceed the number under any circumstances, or not exceed 700 tons by weight.

The amendments proposed by Hons. Messrs. Goodridge and Murphy were lost, and that of Hon. Mr. Anderson carried.

HON. MR. HARVEY—My amendment is in the form of another subsection, and provides that no ships be loaded below the special load line under a penalty of $25,000, to be collected from a master in a summary manner in an action in the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the penalty to be paid over to the Marine Disasters' Fund.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—This is the most practical amendment that has been brought forward here this or last year. If we had had this on the Stat-

ute Book we should not have all the talk we have had, for the Southern Cross might have been here today.

I am grateful to the hon. gentleman for bringing in an amendment of that kind. The principle of the amendment is unquestionable.

The amendment, being put, was carried.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I will suggest that the Committee rise, as it is past 6 o'clock, and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, recess was taken till 7.30 p.m.

The Chairman resumed the Chair after recess.

HON. MR. BISHOP—If the use of guns for killing old seals is prohibited under a penalty of $1,000, why should the number be limited to two? It seems to me that it should not matter if five or six or ten guns were permitted, if the further condition applies that they shall not be used in killing seals. More than two guns might be left on board with advantage for various reasons, for example, signalling, and various other things might arise where it would be desirable to have rifles; and as long as the penalty is left there and is sufficient, that ought to be sufficient safeguard

HON. PRESIDENT—I would like to ask also why it is that the penalty for killing should be on the owner of the ship. If one of the men shoots a seal the penalty might be on him or on the captain, but surely not on the owner who is in St. John's, and knows nothing about it.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The object of this Bill was to eliminate the steel fleet, and consequently there would be no necessity for the carrying of any guns by any ship of the fleet. Now that the steel ships are permitted to engage in the fishery I am not in a position to say how the Lower House will view this section. Because of the greater power of the steel fleet they may decide to have guns used by the other ships to offset the handicap. As regards the responsibility of the owner it should be his business to see that no more than the two guns go on board his ship. Of course, if some member of the crew smuggles out a gun without the owner's knowledge, he could not be held liable. The master is only the representative, merely the agent of the owner, and it will be his duty to see that this section is not infringed, but in putting the penalty on the owner we make the principal liable for the act of his agent, that agent being the captain.

HON. PRESIDENT—That may be law, but I do not think it is the sort of law this House ought to stand for. We heard an argument a few years ago where the owner was to be held liable if the cooks did not give the crew beans for breakfast. I shall make the same proposal now that I did then, that the word 'owner' be stricken out. The captain is the man who should be made liable, or go further back and make the man who uses the gun liable; but to say that the owner here in St. John's, perhaps 100 miles away, is to be fined because somebody on the ship fires off a gun, is a manifest joke.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would suggest that we insert the words that the penalty shall be not exceeding $1,000, which will enable the magistrate or the court to exercise some discretion. The owner should not be the party solely liable. It is quite reasonable to imagine that a passenger may take out an air gun or rifle in his baggage and start shooting seals, and when approached by the captain the latter might have difficulty with him. He can under this clause shoot in defiance of everyone as many seals as he wishes, and there is no penalty on him but on the unfortunate owner, not even on the captain.

I want to say also that, as everybody in the House knows, I am very strongly in favour of prohibiting the killing of old seals, and I regret the section does not go further. This shooting of seals is a very wasteful and expensive method of killing, and the number of seals lost is an unknown quantity, but is known to be very large. But bad as shooting seals is, I doubt if it is as bad as batting old ones, because when a ship bats three or four thousand old seals, an enormous majority of them are generally females, and this is equivalent to destroying many more than a similar number of young seals. I do not want to go over the ground as regards the decline again, but I must confess that it has been amazing to me that many hon. members hold the opinion that there has been no decline for the past forty or fifty years. The fact is that the only increase there is has been in the Gulf, where there has been a large increase. In the front of the Island there has been a very large decrease. I can appreciate the position of the Hon. President when he says he does not think there is any necessity to prevent the killing of old seals for the next two years because we have so many and can afford to. The argument is equivalent to saying we are rich and can afford to be extravagant, but to say that we should protect the young and kill the old is beyond me. We know that nature herself takes a large toll of these old seals every year. She is already killing so many we cannot afford to kill many more. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines naturally used an il lustration from an agricultural point of view, but there is no parallel between a plant which matures and dies inside of 12 months, and a species which takes four years to mature. Obviously if you don't kill any young the herd increases, but if the increase can be obtained otherwise, then that would be a very expensive way of doing it, because we should have to put off all income for a year or two, and that would mean a loss of about three quarters of a million dollars a year; whereas if you can keep on killing your annual income of seals, and at the same time keep the herd increasing a little, we can save the enormous cost of having these close seasons. Hon. Mr. Anderson has given us a number of figures, and how in the face of those he can claim the seal fishery has not declined, is a puzzle to me. Another argument used is that the seals escape every year or two. Of course they do, and then you see the increase afterwards. I have studied Captain Kean's report, one that I must give him great credit for. It was the first intelligent attempt to put the figures of the sealfishery out of the limbo of uncertainty into some sort of intelligent form, and though I do not agree with his conclusions, which, indeed, are self contradictory, still I must give him credit for putting forth an effort to find out something about the matter. It is all very well to say we don't know anything about it, but we have to use the facts and the figures we have, and they are by no means negligible, and interpret them as well as we can. In that report, based on a catch of 160,000 in 1913, Captain Kean estimated there was an escape of 50,000, making a total young herd of 210,000. This year there was something like 220,000 brought in. Can anybody believe in view of present conditions out there, and in the face of that estimate of Captain Kean's, that there has been no decline from the days when we caught 600,000? I think it is nonsense, with all due deference to the gentlemen who hold that opinion.

One argument in favour of the killing of old seals is that they must eventually become effete and unproductive, and therefore they may as

well be killed. If you could select these, I would say by all means kill them, but you can't. You are bound to kill for the most part good breeders, and you would find these old effete seals of small value, if indeed, there are any number available at all, for remember that nature is not beneficent to any wild creature that has lost strength and vitality. She finds means to get rid of them very quickly in every species. It is suggested that because of the unusually large number of bedlamers seen this year there was never a time when protective legislation was less required. It is quite true that next year and the year after the number of the seal herd should be higher than we have seen it for years. There ought to be large fisheries. Surely, then, this is the time to protect and maintain the industry and not to repeat again the experience of the past. We should not wait until they are depleted. As regards the shooting of old seals, why did the country, after full investigation, do away with the second and third trips of the steamers? I would ask Hon. Mr. Blandford why did the Blandfords of those days, the Dawes, Jackmans, and other of our most famous seal killers come to this Legislature and give evidence, which is on record, with recommendations to protect the old seals by prohibiting the second and third trips? If they had not been stopped, there would have been no seals at all. What we want then, is not 20 steamers with 2,000 or 1,500 men on board; what we want is seals enough out there to keep 30 or 40 steamers employed, and these should be the finest we can get. We want them to bring back within three or four weeks seals enough to afford the sealers from $60 to $120 per man, and after that to keep a large number employed all the year round in regular steamer work. That is the type of ship we need in the interests of capital and tradesmen and labourers, and of the country, and we want to see the seal fishery kept going annually in the meantime, if possible. It was pointed out by Hon. Mr. Gibbs that the Sable I. came from Halifax, took her crew here, and then went back to Halifax, and actually that we were just as well off as a community as if she were owned and operated in Newfoundland. Well, Mr. Gibbs is wrong, and I don't think it is necessary to argue the point. The way to build up a substantial fleet of modern steamers here is to try and increase that herd of seals, and the way that we may possibly be able to increase it with the least expense is to preserve the old seals. Of course, this may not increase it, and if we cannot increase it in this way then we must have an occasional close season at a cost of $750,000 per year. But if we can ever again increase the herd commensurate to what it was in the days of the sixties, when we got 600,000 seals, and carry on the operations of the ships for the rest of the year from this port it will be of untold benefit. The only thing I regret is that we are in the present act confined to the abolition of guns which do not cover the most important thing, the destruction by batting of the old harps. I refrain from pressing the logical position, because I believe it would not pass at present, but it certainly goes rather against the grain not to propose an extension of this section in order to protect the seals altogether.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I have to rise in this instance on behalf of the unfortunate captains. The amendment proposed by the hon. member, makes the captains responsible for the use of guns on board the ships. The object of sub-section (a) is that the owner of the ship shall not place on board

the ships more than two guns. The same infringement applies to the captain as to the owner. He will then be responsible for the irresponsible act of someone who might use a gun without his knowledge. It would be unfair to hold the captain personally responsible for acts of that kind and subject him to a penalty. The captain may stop the using of guns, you say. But the guns may be taken on board the ship and used on the ice without his knowledge. The principle underlying this section underlies many obligations thrown upon employers of labour. Suppose I hire an expressman to deliver goods about town, and during the course of his employment he runs down a person and injures him or damages property, the owner is responsible for the damage done by the employee, although the owner has no control over his actions.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I propose that section 14 be stricken out, and that the following be substituted as 14 (a): "That no owner put on board or authorize the putting on board of more than two guns, under a penalty of $1,000, to be recovered from the owner by any person suing for the same."

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—It seems to me that sub-section (a) is unnecessary. It does not make any difference if we have 2 or 25 guns, you cannot use them. It seems to me that our legislation is made incomprehensible by unnecessary verbiage. After the agitation that came up last year, I have no confidence in any legislation that comes from the Lower House in regard to sealing matters.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—The amendment proposed by the Hon. President opposite doesn't yet seem to be clear enough. Is it not possible that serious injustice may result there from? "The owner shall not put on board more than two guns." Supposing by some mistake on the part of an employee three guns are put on board; there is no discretionary power given the magistrate, and that extra gun may result in a fine of $1000. Two clerks might do the same thing by accident. Personally I agree with Hon. Mr. Goodridge that sub-section (a) is not necessary.

HON. MR. GIBBS—The object of the sub-section is to prevent the owner putting on board more than two guns; surely there can be no objection to that. The next section provides that if say twenty guns are put on board with an idea that they be used in killing old seals, no person on board may kill seals by the use of a gun.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I move as an amendment on the amendment that sub-section (a) be eliminated.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I fail to see why we should give the Magistrate discretionary powers. There can be no mitigating circumstances. This deals with the owner solely, and if he puts more than two guns on board he is committing a wilful act.

The amendment proposed by the Hon. President was carried.

HON. MR. BISHOP—On section 16—Though I am not going to move an amendment to this section, I regard it as a very dangerous one, and I think those of us who may be spared again to meet in this Legislature will not meet many times before we shall find it necessary to amend that section. I am quite confident there is a great danger in it.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—I wish to draw the attention of the House to a letter I received today for to-morrow's 'News,' or rather a paragraph of it. The writer says:—

"The first clause of this Bill is that no captain of a sealing ship shall allow his men (or a man) to be on the ice before daylight, for an hour after dark. Well, Mr. Editor, it is very easy to make those laws, but it is

quite another matter to carry them out properly. Now, let me put this case before the public. Supposing a crowd of men are sent by the captain to pan seals, say about five miles away from the ship (which is not a great distance if the ship is jammed), and when those men are leaving the ship the captain charges them not to stay so as to be out after night. Well, that is very well; the captain is aboard, and the men go away to pan seals; after reaching the seals they start in panning, and work away until they think it is time to go aboard, which if ice conditions are favorable they would get on board by sunset, or perhaps before, but on the other hand, supposing a rent breaks between where they were panning seals and the ship (which very often does happen), and the men panning seals do not see this until perhaps they are half way to the ship. Now in that case the men would have to walk around this rent (or bay of water) to get to the ship, which perhaps would mean that the men would have to walk miles to get to the ship. The ship being jammed cannot get to them. Now, if those men are after night getting on board, is the captain to blame? No, there is no one to blame in those cases; no person is accountable for what is going to happen. Conditions are favourable when the men go out, but before getting on board it is right the reverse. Again, there is another case. Some men when they get on the ice are too stupid for anything; when they get on the ice they are too frightened to do anything except the wrong, and if the Captain gives them orders, and they are not carried out, he is not to blame for what happens. When once men get away from the ships the captains have no control over them; the Master Watches in charge of those men have to use their own judgment, and do what they think is best, but there is one thing men have to do on the ice, they have to run risk, if not there will not be much done. Like many other things, no Captain wants his men to stay out after night if he can get them on board.

"Now, I think that is one clause which ought to be cut out of the Sealing Bill, or perhaps the next thing will be introduced to the sealfishery is six to six, which is no foolisher than some of the laws already made.

"In regard to sending a search party to look for men that are out after night, well that is alright, providing it is safe to do so; but supposing it is very bad weather, that by sending a search party you are risking the lives of more men, and it is not wise in all cases to do those things. I have known cases since I have been going to the ice, that some men, that when it is time to walk toward the ship, would be walking away from her. So that shows that the Captain is not accountable for what some men will do.

"The next clause is that no ship carrying a crew of over one hundred and fifty men should sail without a Doctor. This I quite agree with, and is a law which should be enforced, and I think would mean a lot more to the saving of lives than the clause mentioned above.

"The clause prohibiting the carrying of guns, I won't have much to say about. Perhaps it is a benefit to the country, and perhaps not; anyway there should be some protection for old seals.

"To prohibit ships from killing hood seals I do not agree with, i.e., killing of young hoods. I think it should be lawful to kill young hoods. Take for instance, a ship getting in the hoods; well, perhaps that ship gets jammed in the midst of those seals and gets frozen up, and cannot get on to get the pans; what are they going to do? Are they going to stay there look-

ing at those seals, and not allowed to kill them? Again, some of the ships may be too late getting into the harps, but if they were allowed to kill the hoods they would get a saving trip; but if the killing of hoods is prohibited, there are none for them. I quite agree with protection for old seals, but kill the young.

"Another absurd thing is that any dead seal or seals lying on the ice after forty-eight hours are free to whoever may take them. Now, in my opinion, this is one of the worst laws in the Sealing Bill, and which I think should be deeply considered. Often to the sealfishery, when seals are plentiful, and the men leave their ships early by sunset or before in many cases, they pan fifteen to twenty thousand seals. Now the ship is jammed and cannot get around to pick up these seals, which means that perhaps those seals will have to be hauled on board, which perhaps will mean four or five days' work, instead of two (or forty-eight hours), and should the ship be at liberty to pick up those many seals, it is considered more than good work to pick up fifteen or twenty thousand seals in 48 hours. Now, if another ship should come in and take another's seals which have been killed over forty-eight hours, and which was impossible to get on board before that time, would any common sense person think it fair to the owners of those seals seeing another coming to take their property before their eyes without kicking? I say no, and if this law is enforced it will mean murder at the icefields, and instead of trying to protect life, those who make those laws are only making laws to make mutiny. I myself, personally, would rather be killed than allow another to take what belongs to me, and I think amongst a crew of sealers you will find many of the same opinion. So I hope before another Sealing Bill is passed in the House it will have every consideration, and not to pass laws in one case to protect lives, and in another to be the cause of mutiny."

It is not necessary to comment. The writer of this letter speaks on these subjects from experience and knowledge.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I quite agree with the observations of the leader of the Government, and I do not think we should pass this section without serious consideration. If crews are not allowed to pan seals they run great risks of losing the seals altogether. It has been shown time and again that although many thousands are panned, it may be days and days before they are got on board. And to say that these seals so killed may become the property of anybody who might come along after 48 hours, may lead to very serious trouble. In view of the letter read by Hon. Mr. Robinson to-night, I think this is a responsibility this House ought not to assume, and I would move that this section be left over until some other arrangement may be arrived at. I think it would be shameful to give the right to a crew who had suffered none of the toil or hardships in getting such seals to come along after 48 hours and take them on board their ship to the loss of those who killed them, and I think it would surely lead to conflict on the ice between crews armed with gaffs and knives, and murder would surely be done.

HON. PRESIDENT—I want to point out with reference to this section that it is an absolutely impossible one to make operative. Before we consider the most serious aspect of it, let us look at it practically. A steamer is out panning and her crew are bringing seals to the pans, and the men throwing them into the pile. Who is to determine when the 48 hours are up, at

the end of which period these pans of seals can become the property of anybody that comes along? If you apply common sense to this thing, it appears to me it becomes an absolute farce. There is no provision whatever made for Sunday coming into the 48 hours. What effect will the Sunday regulations have on the matter? Our sealing cases have become historic heretofore for tall swearing, but if this goes into effect previous records will be nothing to this. In regard to the larger aspect of the matter, I want to go on record with other hon. gentlemen in saying that if an attempt is made to put this bill into practice it is going to result in trouble. Taking another's seals is going to result in lives being lost. I believe with the hon. leader of the Government that next session this section will have to be repealed.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I myself am in the position that I cannot accept the somewhat pessimistic views of some hon. members in regard to the operation of this section. I cannot accept the suggestion that the section be deferred. If you are going to accept this bill, let us accept it, or throw it out.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I cannot let section 14 pass without expressing the difficulty of this section in practical operation. Who is to tell when the 48 hours expire? There are two crews contending that the 48 hours have expired, how is the question decided? If this section is to protect the sealers then it fails in my opinion, because all the dangers of panning are present, with the additional danger of the men themselves pressing and being pressed to unusual effort to get their panned seals to the ship within the 48 hours. All the arguments in favour of the 48 hour limit are arguments in favour of no panning, or a limited panning which can be handled in the day in which the panning takes place. I have heard much argument in favour of panning and much in favour of no panning; neither set of arguments are met by this 48 hour compromise, and thus are added grave difficulties. A wooden ship got near the seals; the crew pans seals at some little distance from the ship, if this low powered ship is jammed and can not get to the seals, the crew must make a special struggle to haul the seals to the ship or watch some high powered steamer taking the seals the crew of the wooden ship worked hard to kill and pan. I have no amendment to offer because I understand this is a compromise section arranged for by a conference, but feel I should point out the fact that the difficulties and danger of panning are not overcome or materially lessened, and now an additional objection appears.

HON. PRESIDENT—This is a matter which may possibly involve men's lives, and as a branch of the Legislature of this Colony, I do not think we ought to enact into law a section with the full knowledge that it may mean the loss of life. I beg to move that the section be stricken out.

HON. MR. GOODRIDGE—I beg to second this; this is a most dangerous thing, and I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who preceded me.

Bloodshed will result from this. If panning is to continue, this clause should not be pressed. All the evidence we have had on the commission showed clearly that you cannot get a voyage without panning. I will support the amendment proposed by Hon. Mr. President.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—It seems to me that this section does just what others aim at avoiding. If the fleet gets jammed after the seals are panned, what is going to happen after 48 hours pass away. The most powerful

steamers like the 'Florizel' will make a break and grab up all the pans, and this clause puts the whole game into the hands of the more powerful steamers such as the 'Florizel.'

HON. MR. GIBBS—I cannot accept the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman. One hon. member says that if we adopt the section it may involve loss of life, because of quarrels that may arise between sealers who claim the panned seals and those who say they do not belong to them. The question is as to when they were panned, or when the 48 hours have commenced. We lose sight of the fact that the panning of seals is the cause of the loss of life at the seal fishery. If it was not for panning no sealers would have been frozen to death on the ice floes in 1914. The period was first proposed to be limited to 24 hours, but at the request of some members of the Select Committee it was extended to 48 hours. The object is to protect the lives of sealers. Does not the panning of seals encourage men to risk their lives? Any man who has prosecuted the seal fishery the past fifty or seventy years, will tell you of the untold suffering and misery because of being forced to go miles from the ship in order to pan seals. One of the hon. members has read a letter from a sealer here. There are hundreds of sealers who differ from him. He is only looking at the amount of money he makes out of it and if the property in seals be lost after 48 hours he foresees that other sealers will get what belongs to him. But he only looks at one aspect of it. We must protect the lives of the men engaged at the work. We have been supposing the most ludicrous positions with regard to the Bill, but no human being can frame legislation that will meet every emergency we might suppose could happen. You cannot legislate to cover every contingency. Another hon. gentleman says that the section will enable the Florizel, while the less powerful ships are jammed, to steam about and pick up the seals panned by other ships. But look at the other side. If we strike it out it will give the Florizel or ships like her, the privilege of sailing around and panning 60,000 to 100,000 seals while the less powerful ships are powerless to move. Now, under this section, the powerful ships must take on board daily what they pan, and cannot do the panning and killing that was done in the past, and await their opportunity to take their pans on board after the panning. Have not a large number of pans been lost every year, thus proving that the panning of seals is the most destructive method at the seal fishery.

HON. PRESIDENT—This is very interesting, but does not meet the point. The hon. gentleman's argument destroys itself. If his argument has any value it is an indictment of the panning of seals, and if he makes a proposition or will accept one from me, I will move an amendment to abolish the panning of seals altogether. But on the contrary, he tells us that the proposition was originally to make it 24 hours, and then at the instance of some members of the Select Committee to extend it to 48 hours. I cannot imagine anything better calculated to bring about the result he apprehends, the loss of life and increase of human misery in the industry, than the extension to which he has been a party. If the man who goes out to pan seals is limited to 24 hours, he cannot go far, and will bring back his tows in preference to panning, and in this way all will be home at night. But if the right is to be lost after 48 hours, then the risk will be increased, and the probability of disaster will increase in the same proportion. I would point out also that he

has not touched the practical aspect, viz: how this section is to be enforced. Does he essay to combat the proposition, that if an attempt is made to put this section in practice there will be bloodshed. I think I am prepared to poll this House unanimously in favour of that view. I believe, and I think a great many believe also, and I think further, the hon. gentleman believes that if we give the sealers the right at the fishery to kill a load of seals and tow them for some miles to the pans, and they go aboard their ship in the evening, are jammed the next day, and arise the next morning to get their seals and find somebody else with them, they will not lie down and submit to it. They value the seals too much. But his case is that the men who kill the seals and can't get them on board within the 24 hours will submit to see other people taking them away. How can seals be taken on board according as they are panned? Why is it necessary to pan? I am afraid he fails to realize that the captain does not send his men long distances if seals are near them. He only sends his men long distances when the seals are not near, and his ship can't get to them. The better policy to adopt would be to do away with panning and make it obligatory on the men to haul the seals to the ship as they kill them. If he will accept an amendment to that effect I will move it, but I feel that I would prefer the section stricken out altogether.

The motion that section 16 be stricken out was carried.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—If ever there was absurd legislation in the history of a civilized country, this caps the climax.

17.—If at the end of the voyage if the work of the cooking staff has been satisfactory to the owner of the ship, the said owner shall pay to the chief cook a bonus of twenty dollars and to each of the assistant cooks a bonus of fifteen dollars.

I have no objection to the ships' cooks being well paid, but I think it is a burlesque on the legislation of the country when by act of parliament we pay a bonus to cooks. If a bonus is to be paid it should be to the firemen and engineers, and those who take the ships to the icefloes. How will the owners know whether they give satisfaction or not unless they themselves go to the fishery? It is not fair in the interests of legislation in this country to embody such a change in an Act of Parliament. Do not, however, misunderstand me. I believe the cook, his assistants, engineers and firemen should be well paid, and given, if necessary, a bonus by the owners, but I must object to such being embodied in an Act of Parliament, and move it be stricken out.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I rise for the purpose of notifying the House that I cannot accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member. It may be all very well from our standpoint to call such legislation a burlesque and a farce, we who enjoy the comforts of home and are not forced to go out and incur the dangers and hardships and inconveniences that must be borne by the sealers. Consequently we cannot appreciate the position of the men at the seal fishery. It is a notorious fact that cannot be successfully contradicted, that it is only because of the agitation of recent years on the part of the sealers that the cooking has been made better. Anyone who has taken the trouble to follow the seal fishery must know that food has been served up to men which we would not put before our horses or dogs, and it is to prevent this kind of thing that the section is embodied in the Bill. The Bill simply aims at doing what many employers are doing in their everyday business. If it is right that a bonus be paid to good

and faithful servants for work performed in addition to the wages paid by the owner, where is the burlesque in it?

HON. MR. BISHOP—There is nothing in this section to warrant the ideas set forth by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill. The section reads:

17.—If at the end of the voyage the work of the cooking staff has been satisfactory to the owner of the ship, the said owner shall pay to the chief cook a bonus of twenty dollars, and to each of the assistant cooks a bonus of fifteen dollars.

The idea running through the bill is that there is a conflict between the owners and the crews. It does not seem to me that the section will have the desired result, for what may be eminently satisfactory to the owner may not be eminently satisfactory to the crew. I am not going to labour the question however, and while as far as I know cooks who have been giving satisfaction have been receiving bonuses in one form or another, the legislation as referred to by him seems to me to be at least peculiar that we select one, two or three members of a crew and legislate as to what they shall be paid for doing work expected of them.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—Is there any definition of the word "satisfaction?"

The amendment to strike out section 17 having been put to the vote was lost.

HON. PRESIDENT—I would like to point out that this clause (18), while it creates a Board to conduct examinations as to the competency of men who shall act as masters of watches, masters and mates, does not call for what I think it should, viz: that such regulation shall be approved by the Governor in Council. Surely it is not the intention that any rules made by this Board shall go into effect without being approved by the Governor in Council. Further down in the section a provision is made that the Governor in Council shall fix fees to be paid, and clearly it was not contemplated that three men shall constitute a tribunal to decide who shall go to the seal fishery in these capacities. Without their rules being subject to Governmental ratification or otherwise the effect will be to create the worst kind of monopoly. I suggest to the hon. gentleman in charge of the bill that he include words to that effect. I would suggest that in the sixth line after the words, "master watch" we insert, "which rules and regulations to be approved by the Governor in Council."

On being put, the amendment was carried

HON. MR. GIBBS—Some suggestion has been made as regards medical examination of men receiving weekly payments under this act, and I think that is something all will agree with, no matter how we view this Bill. I therefore move the following as new sub-sections (f) and (g). It is the same as in the Workmen's Compensation Act.

(f) Where a sealer has given notice under section 19 of this Act he shall if so required by the owner of the ship, submit himself for examination by a duly qualified medical practitioner provided and paid for by such owner, and if he refuses to submit himself to such examination, or in any way obstructs the same, his right to compensation, and to take or prosecute any proceedings under this Act in relation to compensation, shall be suspended until such examination has taken place.

(g) Any sealer receiving weekly payments under this Act shall, if so required by the owner of

the ship, from time to time submit himself for examination by a duly qualified medical practitioner, provided and paid by such owner. If the sealer refuses to submit himself to such examination, or in any way obstructs the same, his right to such weekly payment shall be suspended until such examination has taken place.

HON. MR. HARVEY—The owners suggested the desirability of holding over this section until the Governor in Council might issue a proclamation, as it is quite possible they would not get insurance in time. I am not moving any amendment, but merely remind the hon. gentleman in charge as to that suggestion.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Nearly twelve months must elapse before the prosecution of the next seal fishery, and that ought to be plenty of time for the owners to arrange for compensation

HON MR. ANDERSON—I beg to move the following new section:

(a' The provisions of this section shall come into force upon the publication of a proclamation by the Governor in Council.

HON. MR. GIBBS—With regard to the amendment, I submit it is not fair to throw the burden on the shoulders of the Governor in Council, to fix a time when the provisions of the Act shall come into force. If the Legislature is not prepared to shoulder the responsibility in the matter, then I fail to see why it should be thrown on the Governor in Council. You may have a council that may be, some of them, hostile to the provisions of the bill, and the result would be internal dissensions in the Government, and the object set out in this section would be lost. I regret I cannot accept the amendment.

HON. PRESIDENT—In this instance I am in accord with the hon. gentleman in charge of the bill. Last year I was one of the Select Committee appointed to consider this aspect of the sealing industry, and we went into the matter very thoroughly. A deadlock was created with regard to the bill and provision was made for a committee of both Houses to deal with it out of session, but after the House closed nothing was done, and if this clause which is proposed is inserted, I predict nothing will be done between now and the next session. In saying this, I sympathize a great deal with the owners, because they are being confronted now with a very serious situation, and one which may have the effect of destroying the seal fishery altogether, but we ought not to run the risk of having 2,500 men going to the seal fishery without making some provision for the safety of their lives, and protection of those depending on them After the disaster of 1914 there was a strong feeling in the country that something ought to be done as far as humanly possible in this direction. The 1915 fishery passed and nothing was done, and the 1916 fishery has passed without anything being done, and if we do not put something drastic in this section nothing will be done for the next year, and now the matter has reached a stage where something ought to be settled definitely. For that reason I strongly support the section.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I do think this is a matter for this House to dispose of, and not leave it to the Governor in Council. I consequently support the section in the bill as it stands.

The amendment was carried.

HON. MR. HARVEY—On section 23. This section as it stands is, I think, absolutely unworkable, and I would like to propose the following amendment which speaks for itself.

"It shall be the duty of the second

hand and master watches of each ship to sell to the highest bidder the crew's share of the seals brought in by such ship. Provided that if such second hand or master watches fail to perform the duty hereby imposed upon them, a majority of the said crew may appoint an agent to perform such duty in their stead. Any agreement made under this section by such second hand, master watches, or agent shall be in writing, and shall for all purposes be absolutely final and binding between the parties after the ship has begun discharging her seals.

HON. MR. HARVEY—I would ask the Committee to reconsider section 13, sub-section (c) in regard to the load line. Instead of having a penalty recoverable by any person suing for the same, it is proposed to make the Minister of Marine and Fisheries responsible for the same. The section will then read as follows:

(c) It shall be lawful for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to cause all ships to be surveyed and a special load line marked thereon for the purposes of the seal fishery, and no ship shall be loaded below the load-line so fixed, under a penalty not exceeding two thousand five hundred dollars, to be recovered from the master of such ship in a summary manner in an action in the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whose duty it shall be to see to the enforcement of this section. Any penalty recovered under this section shall be paid to the Marine Disasters Fund.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I would ask that section 24 be renumbered 25, and that a new section 24 be inserted to meet the objections raised in the early stages of the bill in regard to the manner of recovering the penalty, as follows:

"No person shall be liable to any penalty or forfeiture provided by this Act unless some prosecution, action, or suit in respect of the offence committed shall be commenced against such person within the space of six months after the commission of such offence. All penalties by this Act provided may be recovered in a summary manner before a Stipendiary Magistrate or a Justice.

HON. MR. BISHOP moved that section 6 be reconsidered.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—I was going to insert in the section as it stands the same words as are inserted in section 2. Then the words would be:

6.—Immediately upon it being made known to the Master or other officer in charge of a ship that any of his men are missing he shall send out a search party to look for them, unless in his opinion the state of the weather is such as endangers life and limb.

I think also that we ought to impose a penalty on the captain for failure to do that, otherwise there is not much sense in having it there. We may add to the balance of the clause as in section 3: "Under a penalty not exceeding one thousand dollars, to be recovered in a summary manner by any person who shall sue for the same: Provided that the Magistrate or Justice imposing such penalty may, in addition, suspend the certificate of competency held by such officer under this Act for such period as he may deem proper."

I recognize that it is extremely unlikely that any master will be so inhuman as to refuse to send out a search party, but surely if such men may be found, or if a master should be intoxicated outside the three mile limit, we ought to have a penalty if he fails to carry out the provision.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I move that section 3 be reconsidered, and that

after the word "addition," there be inserted the words "if the master or owner shall be proved to have wilfully ignored the provisions of this section."

HON. MR. PRESIDENT—The difficulty raised about this section, as I pointed out, is that of determining who is to be the judge as to the condition of the weather. If I recollect the case of 1914, it was elicited in evidence taken at the enquiry that the captain of one of the steamers wanted to proceed in a certain direction and some of the crew wanted to go in a different direction, while a certain section of the crew insisted that the captain go the way they wanted. This is what we will have if we pass this section as it stands. If a mishap occurs, the captain will swear the weather was fit to send men out, and some of the crew will always take the opposite view. The men will come and swear, not falsely. but uncon sciously, their minds being influenced into the belief that it was not the kind of day that men should go out The captain is in the position that he will be tried for an error of judgment, as we have been trying to try men in connection with the seal fishery, and this raises a position I do not think it is possible to maintain. There is the striking case of the Leopard some years ago, told by a prominent member of the Lower House. She was proceeding north when she struck a shoal, and the captain called down through the open skylight to the engineer to back her. The cook heard him and said: 'No, give her full speed ahead.' The engineer took the cook's advice, sent her full speed ahead, and the ship came off. That is what we will have if we put this section into effect.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD—I would suggest that "without lawful excuse" are superfluous words and should be struck out.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Personally, I fail to see why the words "lawful excuse" should be stricken out. The Board of Trade lays down certain rules and regulations that must be observed by master mariners on steamers, and failure to observe them is visited by penalties such as the loss of certificate for certain periods. A failure to observe conditions of weather upon the part of the captains at the seal fishery should be visited with some penalty. Suppose the captain does not take the precautions to use his log and his ship grounds, he loses his certificate. If he does not take the precaution to notice the weather when he is sending the men on the ice, surely he should be punished if loss occurs. It would have to be shown that he did not use the same care that an ordinary individual would to see whether the weather was of such character that men should not be sent out on the ice.

The Committee on the Sealing Bill rose and reported the Bill with some amendments, which report was received; the said Bill was then read a third time, passed, and it was ordered that it be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with some amendments in which the concurrence of the House of Assembly is requested.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the remainder of the order paper was deferred.

MESSAGES FROM ASSEMBLY.

HON. PRESIDENT read messages from the Assembly that they had passed the accompanying bills, entitled respectively: An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1905; An Act respecting the Censorship of Moving Pictures; An Act to amend the Death Duties Act, 1914-1915; An Act respecting Municipal Affairs; and An Act to authorize the raising of sums

of money by loan for naval, military and railway purposes.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the said bills were then read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion the House then adjourned until to-morrow at 4 o'clock.

TUESDAY, May 2nd.

The House met, pursuant to adjournment.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the Public Service Bill was read a second time, and the House then went into Committee of the Whole on this Bill, Hon. Mr. Angel in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the bill without amendment, which report was received. on motion, the said bill was then read a third time, passed, and was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

PROHIBITION BILL.

Second reading of the Prohibition Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP—It is unnecessary that anything should be said in the way of explanation of this bill, as hon. members are all aware what has transpired in relation to the Act of last session which was followed by a vote taken last fall, by which it was shown that a sufficient number of the electorate of this country had passed in favour of a prohibition measure. The matter, however, did not pass without some dispute, and action was taken in the courts regarding it. As it is not yet certain that some future action may not be taken by or on behalf of those who are in opposition to this measure, the government has decided to put beyond peradventure the will of the electorate, and the present bill comes before us so as to bring into effect on the first day of January, 1917, a prohibition measure in accordance with the act of last year. It has been found necessary to add to last year's measure new sections which appear in this bill as nine, ten and eleven. This has become necessary because, as all are doubtless aware, the druggists have intimated to the Government that they are unwilling to dispense intoxicating liquors even as medicine, and no other course appears at present to be open, but to appoint a controller who alone shall be authorized to import wines and spirits in accordance with the provisions of the Act, and that he shall be permitted to arrange for the dispensing under doctor's prescription for medicinal purposes.

This will necessitate careful consideration and the selection by the Government of a suitable competent man to perform the service, and with such selection the provisions of the bill should be successfully carried out. Section 7 is also new and empowers the Governor in Council to name certain patent medicines or drugs, or ales and wines over 2 per cent., intoxicating liquors, except such drugs as may be named by the Governor in Council. This matter will have to be proceeded with cautiously, as far as section 7 is concerned, and the Government will doubtless act under the advice of the Government analyst in respect of certain products which, under the Bill, will be prohibited. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—With reference to Section 9, it is very objectionable and dangerous. I presume it is experimental, but experiments are very often dangerous. I take it that the judgment of the people was that intoxicating liquors were more or less drugs, and dangerous drugs,

and the proper persons to deal with drugs are the chemists. No reputable chemist should refuse to fill prescriptions from properly qualified physicians. I take it that the appointment of this Controller to fill these prescriptions does not take away the power of filling prescriptions, in which alcohol is an ingredient, from the druggists, and that doing so is still optional. But can it be optional? Is it not directory? Druggists cannot do business unless they are prepared to fill prescriptions In section 9 I see serious trouble. You are giving the control of this to a person at present unknown and unproven. Is there not a danger that this power may result in establishing a glorified shebeen. I very much dislike this section, but in view of what the Minster of Justce has said as to possible future amendments, I will let it go and simply voice my objection.

On motion the Bill was read a second time.

On motion the House went into Committee on the Bill, Hon. Dr. Skelton in the Chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS—I would draw the attention of the House to an objectionable feature in section 10 now before the Chair. This is that the Controller shall keep a record of the date of the prescription, character and amount of liquor supplied, name and address of person for whom the liquor is prescribed. This means that people who get such prescriptions who suffer from ailments, must have this fact advertised over the country. This should not be tolerated. People expect that matters of this kind should be treated with utmost confidence and secrecy, and I must protest in the interest of society. It is said that this would not be advertised, but it is possible that in this House there may be tabled a list of persons with all particulars as to the prescriptions they get. In this respect we are going a step further than has been done anywhere else.

Hon. Mr. Squires followed.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT.—If I speak out of an experience in prescriptions obtained in some years in a city drug store, I would say that my hon. friend has the wrong end of the discussion entirely . Every prescription issued by a doctor has at the top the name of the party who orders the medicine. He is quite correct in saying that the confidences of medical men are regarded as secret but just the same any druggist of experience is able to tell in eight cases out of ten from the ingredients therein what the nature of the complaint from which the patient is suffering is. Bearing this in mind we must remember that after prohibition comes in we have reputable physicians here of high standing and they are not going to give prescriptions for liquors except there is occasion for them, and the inference of my friend that every prescription given for liquors or wines after the 1st January will carry on the face of it the suggestion that the party for whom it is written wants it as a beverage, is an erroneous one. if the purpose of his argument is not that what objection could there be if it were known to the people of the country that every hon. member of the House was having a prescription filled for some wines or spirits. I would have no objection to its being so far as I am concerned. Why should any man be concerned about the newspapers knowing or publishing the disease he suffers from. Even if a paper publishes it what effect would it have? Where is the danger then if a prescription be put up at a drug store today for my hon. friend becoming known through tabling in this house? It will not be public property when tabled. It will be the proprty of the House and no one has a right to pub-

lish matters without the permission of the House. I mean to say that quasi-publication is implied when the document is laid on the table but it is not believable that hon. members of this House will bring the controller's record here to get it into the newspapers. I fail to see why hon. members should not have it published if it sufficiently interests the public, but I do not think speaking as a journalist, that any paper in the Colony would publish it. The hon. gentleman thinks the names of the parties for whom the prescriptions are made out ought to be stricken out. This would be fatal. I have not the least doubt that the controller will be a man in whom the entire community will have confidence. But if there was a possibility of any fraud creeping into the section of the Bill it would be increased enormously if the name of the party were not put in the record, for this is your only protection against fraud. If a man gets liquor to-day with a blank prescription without anybody's name on it, then you will have sheebeens in right earnest. The only safeguard we have is that the prescriptions shall have the name of the party for whom the liquor is intended and that this shall be put in the record. Now I would like to say that the verbiage of that section, if my memory serves me right, is almost identical with that of a section of the Act dealing with poisons, which requires druggists to keep a record and similar information re persons procuring poisons. If that is so, I think the same precaution should be taken in this bill. To return to the other aspect of the question; I would like to point out to my hon. friend that there are people in this city importing liquor from day to day for their own private use through the Customs, and have been for years past ,and storing it in their cellars, and nobody has thought it of sufficient interest to look up the records. and publish that ,and why it should be thought they are going to do so under this Bill passes my comprehension.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—The hon. gentleman tells us that the only protection against fraud is the name of the person for whom the prescription is given and it should be kept as a matter of record. The hon. gentleman in advancing that argument would lead one to believe that the doctors of this city are going to be parties to the perpetration of fraud, that they will violate the spirit of the Act by issuing prescriptions for fictitious persons. Now I have no such idea. In fact I know that the medical men of this city would refuse to have anything to do with the keeping of liqour in their surgeries and I have every confidence that they will not be a party to any fraud of any kind in relation to the carrying out of the provisions of this section. The hon. gentleman asks how can the record be traced? My answer is first you have a reputable medical practitioner, and then you have the record of the person to whom the liquor is delivered. Now then if you want to trace whether the Act is being violated you have as a starting point ,the name of the doctor, the date of the prescription and the name of the person to whom the prescription was delivered. Surely that ought to be sufficient. It is very necessary to have provisions restricting the sale of poisons because a very limited quantity of certain kinds of poison would end the life of a man. but it takes a very large quantity of liquor to do the same thing. I know a man to-day in this city. who is 97 years of age and takes no less than three glasses of rum every day, and has done that for the last sixty or seventy years or so. I cannot imag-

ine anything more proper than that this record should be kept.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received.

The Bill was then read a third time, passed and it was ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL

Second reading of Exportation of Timber Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—The first section of this Bill deals with a condition of affairs that has arisen owing to the war, and grants an extension of time for the disposal of this wood until six months after the termination of the war. The next secton deals with wood cut on the three mile limit which if cut prior to April 15th may be exported. The next section provides for the formation of a Board to be called the Timber Exportation Board which will have power to fix a decent remuneration for the men cutting pit props ,and deals with matters in connection with exportation of the same ,and also fixing minimum prices which shall be not less than five dollars per cord for unrinded wood, and six dollars per cord for rinded wood, on the bank, and the men employed shall receive not less than thirty dollars per month with board and lodging. The next section provides that no Customs Officer shall issue export entries for the export of any wood till he has been shown that not less than the minimum prices were paid for the said wood. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time and went into committee of the Whole House.

Hon. Mr. Knowling in the Chair.

HON MR MURPHY.—On Section 4—This is something new, for the Government to take such a transaction out of the hands of the parties concerned and make a precedent of stating how much another may receive. I would not object to this if the Government were doing the same with regard to the fishermen, farmers and tradesmen but why should the lumbermen only be thus protected. Everybody knows the history of the lumbering business in this Colony Nobody has made any money at it while practically everybody who engaged in the business has lost money. I think Hon. Mr. Harvey will corroborate what I say for he himself I believe has lost considerably over the business. And now we are called upon to pay men $30 a month and $6.00 per cord for rinded wood, $5.00 for unrinded. Why you can't get a man to-day to "rind" a cord of wood for $2.00. The unrinded is full of knots and so on and they won't undertake to rind wood for $1.00 a cord. With regard to the $30.00 a month I think it is outrageous. Some there are who are worth that wage but others I would pay $30.00 a month to stay away. Then again in addition to the $30.00 we have to house and feed them. To say that all should be paid $30.00, irrespective of their ability, is absurd. It is said that the price of props in England to-day is very high. Quite true, but that is due to the enormous freight rates prevailing today, which have quadrupled since the outbreak of the war. But we cannot help that. I have handled many thousand cords and did not pay anything like these figures and came out at the wrong end. There is no excuse for legislation of this nature and I consider it a very objectionable precedent. The law of supply and demand should regulate the price of this article just as it does every other article. You might just as reasonably say that the fishermen shall be paid $6.00 a quintal for their fish and oil.

These lumbermen now work just when it suits them and in addition you have to feed them and build them hotels to live in. It is all right to have a Council appointed but when you say what shall be a minimum price it is starting a dangerous precedent which should be stopped.

HON. MR. ANGEL.—I think if the Government were to do as they did in Denmark at the time that the United States and Canada came into competition with Denmark and Great Britain it would be a prudent thing. It was found then that the farmers in Denmark could not live and were obliged to make other uses of their produce. They sent commissions to Ireland to find how they could put up butter, etc. to supply English markets. They went back and organized a system by which they established co-operative dairies, farming and raising of cattle. The Government was a second party and shipped the butter at a minimum charge. The same conditions might exist with reference to pit props. The Government might undertake to transport at a minimum charge and deliver at the port of shipment. Some way will be found out. The Government found it necessary to make this provision ,and if anybody is willing to go into the business and supply the pit props at a price set down by the Government, I do not see why we should interfere. I do not think the hon. gentleman is right when he says we might just as well fix the price of fish, etc. This is an exceptional case I take it. It is an industry lately introduced under exceptional circumstances, is not likely to last long and the Government have found it necessary in the interest of the fishermen to fix the prices so they are not allowed to sell under that price. I do not know if competition will be so keen as it was in Bay of Islands. As hon. members will remember, on one occasion it was found necessary because of competition to fix the price of herring and this measure operated remarkably well. I am not so certain that nothing will come of this. The hon. gentleman may have an extravagant way of feeding and paying his men. There may be some means of doing it cheaper if anything is made out of it, the fishermen will get the benefit of it.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I do not like this bill. I think that section 4 is dangerous and difficult, because we do not know when we have made a sale of props, that the board may not alter the price to the highest price. I sell, perhaps for 35 shillings free on board, but the board says we are going to fix the price at 40 shillings f.o.b. But how are you going to fix on a steamer under these circumstances. It is the Labrador fishery bill all over again. You appoint a board to fix prices and minimize prices. Six dollars is high I know myself. I have been trying hard to sell three cargoes on the basis of six dollars without success. I cannot sell them at $6 free on board. I am not going to vote against this. What I want to ask is this: What is going to be the position in regard to the large quantity of pit props contracted for, which have been cut and are now being cut at fixed prices? I do not know what prices the contractors asked. I do not know whether the people are paying the cutters too little or not. But what is going to be the position under the bill if people who have cut 10,000 cords, of pit props to-day under a definite contract, under which they are willing to pay a definite price? When this Bill goes through as it stands they must pay $6, although they may have contracted at $4 per cord, but there is no provision to protect anybody who may have sold. There may be several cargoes sold on a basis of $5. When

this Act comes into force these people who bought that wood at $4.50 and resold at $5, must pay $6 for the wood, and without opposing this section at this stage, I merely protest against the principle involved, and would like to be enlightened as to the position of the people cutting wood under special contract.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I am sorry that I did not hear all the remarks made by Hon. Mr. Harvey, but he did not point out another contingency, which is important. If, as he says, we permit the Bill to pass as it stands, as soon as it becomes law, every one is compelled to pay the prices named here. I am absolutely certain that the result will be that the whole of the wood will remain where it is. But it seems to me that we ought not to legislate for prices for any commodity nor should the government bring in a bill to fix prices upon any commodity which they are not prepared to shoulder the responsibility for to the extent of taking over the commodity themselves and seeing that people are not left with it on their hands. This is not the original Bill. It was amended in the Lower House by the addition of these sections fixing the prices. The Government of any country can fix the prices for the sale of products, but must be prepared to take over the product at that price if other purchasers cannot be found. How can we compel people from Britain to come to pay any price we choose to put on pit props? Moreover the principle is wrong, and legislation of this kind is vicious. We have to come into competition with other countries, and even under existing conditions ,if we have the power to compel payment of high prices, I submit it would be wrong for us to do so, always remembering that labor is entitled to a fair wage for a fair day's work. But at the present time there are pit props being produced at very considerably lower prices than those named in the Bill. I am not going to say that everyone is getting what he ought to get for his props. I think the prices they are getting in many cases are too low, and better prices might have been obtained. It is noticeable also that section 4 provides for different values in different localities. The prices shall be fixed from time to time in different localities. This clearly points to different prices being paid, for example in Bonavista Bay, from what will be paid in St. Mary's and Fortune Bays, and from Green Bay and so on. But if they are worth it at one point, it might be argued that they are worth it at other points and there should be regular prices, uniform prices, no matter where the timber may be exported. But we cannot compel the people to pay any prices we choose, and we shall always be in competition with the products of other countries. I think with others that this section should not pass. It if does it brings about a condition of affairs which was not contemplated by those responsible for putting the section in, and people who are left with a large amount of timber ,might reasonably hope that the Government will take it over, and that means that the taxpayers of the Colony must pay higher prices than necessary, and expenses will also be incurred in delivering the wood. It is possible that at the termination of the war we may be in competition with other countries producing this class of wood and we may be able to obtain better prices, but it is certain that the buyers and users of the wood will pay us only what it is worth, and if they can obtain it in Scandinavia at better prices than in Newfoundland,then Scandinavian wood will be used. It is not pleasant, I submit for this Council to have to be

amending bill after bill, legislation that has passed the lower branch, but we should not be doing cur duty, I submit ,if we allowed legislation to pass which we know to be harmful and of no value to the parties, whom it is supposed to benefit. To show how careless those responsible for this section have been, it will be within the knowledge of hon. members that the difference in value between unrinded and rinded wood is two dollars at least; there is a dollar difference to begin with and then there is another dollar difference between the measurement of the wood after it is rinded, so that whatever the difference is, it is two dollars at least. No man is going to attempt to deliver rinded wood if he did not get more than one dollar difference between delivering 128 cubic feet of wood and 128 cubic feet of rinded wood. It takes 140 c.f. unrinded wood to produce 128 c.f. of rinded. But these would seem to be trivial matters and unworthy of attention of those who pretend to know all about these matters and other matters of the country. I see no objection at all to the appointment of a Timber Exportation Board, but do not lay down a mandatory rule at this moment which leaves nothing to their own judgment as regards conditions and say that no wood shall be exported unless it fetched this price of $5 and $6, while today there is being delivered wood that was purchasd at $3.60 and even less per cord. I do not say that this is an adequate price. In my opinion the section should be amended by leaving out any reference to price, and allow the Board to make such a price as they feel conditions will warrant.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD.—I must take exception with Hon. Mr. Bishop's remarks as to the minimum price. As it reads now the section provides for this minimum price, but as much as people like can be paid, depending on conditions in the different districts. The trouble is that our people are not being paid enough at the present time. I have known cases where the poor unfortunates who cut pit props have come out of the woods in debt, and we must protect those people who cannot protect themselves and this is the only way to do it. If my hon. friend knows of cases where they are not dealt with rightly he should come forward and see that they get the right amount. Is it because the freights have gone up so enormously, or that somebody else is getting a big profit, that the poor man who goes in to cut the wood should have his price reduced? Certainly he should get his share. Why should not the Government itself purchase this wood at these prices and send it direct to the Imperial authorities. That would leave out all intermediate profits ,and it would all go in the pockets of the man who cuts. I read only recently in the remarks of Sir D. Morris, that he saw with his own eyes our pit props in the trenches in Flanders ,and I would devastate the whole island, if necessary, and send it over for the protection of our soldiers, after all they have done and are doing to-day. But if I see that large profits are being made by merchants and contractors, while the men are not being properly paid, then I think it is part of our duty to see that we provide legislation that will enable them to get a decent wage. I am consequently very strongly in favor of section four, and I do not agree with Hon. Mr. Bishop in leaving the amount out of the section.

HON. PRESIDENT---It seems to me that possibly this is a case for a compromise ,and as two such have been already effected this afternoon, it may be possible to have such an

arrangment effected as will be acceptable to both Chambers. I recognize that this proposal of a minimum price is dangerous legislation which we should all set our faces against, but be it remembered that the whole pit prop industry is sectional and extraordinary and contrary altogether to the policy of the Legislature. The policy of successive governments has been to prohibit the export of our timber resources save in a manufactured state but two or three years ago the bars were let down. At the time I protested very strongly against that law which allowed the export of raw material and pointed out to the House that the promoters of it boasted they had got their opportunities for levying tribute on the resources of the country to their own advantage and without the people of the country getting any commensurate benefit. However, the war intervened and as a result it became necessary for this Colony as a contribution to the resources of the Empire to make provision whereby our timber could be cut and shipped away for pit props. And our only regret is that we have not been able to ship more; but on the other hand I want to say this, that when it came down to the question of the people of this country getting anything like a proper share of the profits of the pit props business, they unquestionably did not get it, and I think the time has now come to protect these people who are not able to protect themselves. I want to say I have no interest in pit props or land, and never have been directly or indirectly connected with any timber propsition or any other proposition with the exception of two small mining areas which I went into with a friend a few years ago in Green Bay and on which we paid certain royalties; I have no interest in any such legislation—it is immaterial to me how it goes—but I have read a good deal and I am satisfied that the people who are cutting the pit props all round our sea-board have got what the Americans call a raw deal. Statements have been made in the other Chamber that men have not been able to make fifty cents a day cutting; it has been charged that on certain sections of the sea coast men have been engaged to go in and cut for $3.50 per cord, and have been charged $12 per barrel for the flour they used, and when these conditions exist, it is time we did something to protect the people and give them a fair share of the natural wealth of this country which they certainly have an equal right in with everybody else. The pit prop business at present so far as I can make it out is that there are certain people here from England who are monopolizing this thing. I have no objection to their doing so; it is legitimate for them; but I do not think we should stand by and allow them to do so to the detriment of our own people. To-day the freight rate on pit props going across the Atlantic is going up enormously. That means the people owning the steamers are making an enormous profit. I am told that the prices given for pit props on the other side are very high, which means that the people handling them are making good profits and that being so, if both the steamer owners and the people handling the pit props on the other side are making big profits, I do not think the people who are cutting them should have to do with starvation wages. Perhaps the figures quoted in this Bill are too high; I do not know. But it is because of the facts I suggest that I think we ought to make a compromise, and I would make the proposition to reduce the rate fixed here by fifty cents in each case, and then let us have a conference with the Lower

House and endeavor to work out some scheme to the satisfaction of both Houses. If the section is struck out, it may not appear to hon. gentlemen that there is a very serious phase of this measure contemplated in Section 2, because it indemnifies the Government for permitting exports of material cut on the three-mile limit, and if we take such a course as will create a deadlock and cause this Bill to drop, it will be impossible to export from this country a single pit prop cut on that reserve areas.

The Committee then rose for recess.

The sitting resumed at 8 o'clock.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—Before we took recess Hon. Mr. Harvey asked a question as regards contracts entered into during the past season for the cutting of pit props, and the position of the parties with regard to the obligations entered into. This act if passed in its present form would compel such persons as had entered into contracts at a less price than provided in section 4 to pay that minimum price, otherwise the wood could not be exported. Then that raises a large question and a serious one, that where a fixed price is agreed upon this Legislature afterwards brings in legislation providing for a higher price to be paid than had been agreed on between the parties, then the Government would be compelled to reimburse the purchaser to the excess he had been compelled to pay. I do not think there can be any question as to that. Whether the matter was considered by the framer of the bill I do not know; that they may not have been aware that there were any very extensive contracts entered into. Some hon. members have made the statement that trade fluctuates and the reason it does so in this country more so than elsewhere, is that we do not raise the natural products with which our markets are supplied, and consequently we are at the mercy, so to speak, of the country which supplies the natural products. That natural product must then be sold at a certain figure, a figure which will give fair remuneration to the men employed, and the men who employ them. Consequently with a natural product such as pit props in our own hands we should have the right to fix the price which the people will sell them for. The only question is as to whether five dollars is too much or too little, and hon. members who are more conversant with the matter than I am will know whether it is enough or not. But the fact remains that our people have not been getting as much as they should and with the control of this product in our hands we should prevent speculators from outside our own country, who want these pit props, from paying starvation wages for the cutting of the wood. I feel sure no hon. gentleman in this House wishes to be a party to any such policy being adopted.

HON. MR. POWER.—I think it is a great mistake for this or any other Legislature to enact into law a measure providing for prices to be paid for any commodity. The law of supply and demand should always regulate the price. I think this House should be very cautious in dealing with such matters. Let the men who cut the wood form a union and fix their own price. When there is a big demand the price will go up. Why should we put on a price for these pit props any more than we should for potatoes or any other article? For instance, in our trade they might do the same thing, and I think it is a bad precedent to establish. I have no interest in this bill personally, but we do not know where this style of legislation is to end.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I beg to propose the following amendment: "The minimum price shall not apply to lumber or timber for pit props cut prior to June 1st, 1916." I much dislike the whole section, but I shall not oppose it.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—Might I call the attention of the mover to this position. There are a lot of these not being cut under contract, and if that is the case we are going to discriminate between those cut under contract and those not cut under contract. Wouldn't this be better: "Provided that nothing herein contained shall interfere with contracts made prior to June 1st, 1916."

HON. MR. GIBBS.—It has been suggested that if you apply such an amendment and this act does not come into operation until Friday or Saturday of this week, it might be competent for persons to enter into contracts before that and take advatage of this bill now. I think it better to make the date May 1st.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I am entirely opposed to the principle of legislating a price for any of our products, but I only rise for the purpose of pointing out that if you are going to put that principle in this bill, that the difference between the value of barked and unbarked wood is at least two dollars a cord, and I would suggest making the amounts four dollars and six dollars

As the Bill is not intended to apply to wood cut during the past winter then there is not so much harm in it. I should be delighted to co-operate in this purpose and pay the price named in the Bill, but fear this is not possible, and unless the contracts can be made in advance for next year's cut no cutting will be undertaken. I however do not wish to oppose the section further than to suggest the price of unbarked wood be reduced to $4

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—There is one aspect of the question not spoken of in this Chamber. This is the Imperial aspect. Our pit props are undoubtedly very badly needed in Europe. As I have no expert knowledge I cannot say positively that this is going to imperil the industry, but I fear it. But the position I want to get at is this: Those who have contracted in the past may be unwilling to do it in the future, there may not be sufficient inducements to do so under the new section. In that case our pit props must be got across and our Government will have to step in and arrange for them to be able to be cut, and will have to pay the freight. We must get the pit props across so long as the Baltic ports are closed and you will get them for from $4 to $6 without bark. When the Baltic ports open again after the war the demand here will cease but meanwhile if you can't get anybody to go in on these prices how will you get the pot props across unless the Government are prepared to step in. This is a matter that must be considred for we must be prepared to look after Imperial as well as local interests.

HON. MR. MURPHY.—If we close down here they will get all they want from Canada, as they are shipping from there now. We have put up the prices too high. When a man is paid $1 per day and works for thirty days he is not working for nothing. With board he is then getting equal to $1.60 per day; but some men are worth a lot more. It is wrong to expect that every kind of man who comes to camp should get $30 per month. If you make this a uniform cut you are acting unfairly for you pay the lazy man as much as the good one. I would suggest to make it $26 per month or leave it in the hands of the Board.

HON. THE PRESIDENT.—The hon. gentleman says they can get pit props in Canada. Are they getting them cheaper than they are here now? We say they must pay $6 for them, but they are not paying less for these in Canada nowadays ,bcause in the first place they have so much further to carry them; in the second place they cannot get the facilities to bring them to tidal water. What is the history of some aspects of the transaction? When the war started one of the first people to come here for pit props made the most misleading representations and after being here 2 or 3 weeks exhibited telegrams saying that his company had made a test of our pit props and that they were no good, but when he had got down the prices to starvation rates he made more contracts than all the other people put togther. That is one of the reasons I am so strong on this question. It is time to stop such unfair dealing with our people. I am not prepared to say that prices named here are not too high. I merely made a proposition that the price be reduced when possibly some compromise might be arrived at, I said we had made two compromises within the past two days between the two houses and it seems to me the sensible thing to do with the Bill is to make certain amendments in it and take the matter up with the other House to effect a compromise in this Bill. I think that Hon. Mr. Bishop's proposal to make it $4 is too low; possibly $5 is too high; but possibly we can strike the happy medium in $4.50. But in my judgment this is better than allowing parties to come in and make undue profits out of the sweat and blood of our people as has been done the past 18 months.

HON. MR. BLANDFORD.—I feel the same as I did before recess, and I feel confident now and more pleased since recess. I think we should do all in our power to protect our fishermen. Hon. Mr. Murphy says it did not pay the contractor to pay $30 to take men in the woods. Well I say that the men engaged by the contractors will be the very best kind of men, and the best kind of men have been engaged at cutting pit props for the past two seasons, and during that period, as the hon. President has said, they have got starvation wages. This is what they have been receiving up to date and therefore we should not alter this Bill one jot or tittle. I agree with Hon. Mr. Bishop when he refers to the discrepancy between $5 for unbarked pit props and $6 for barked pit props, but I would prefer to see it $6.50 for barked wood, because I have been led to understand it would cost $1.50 to bark it. I remember when this pit prop question came before us, as the Hon. President said, I was met one day in my official capacity and shown telegrams by an individual who said a test was made of pit props from Newfoundland and they were a huge failure. Little did I think that any person could resort to such underhand tricks. We sent over two or three cords, had them tested and the result was that our pit props turned out to be superior to any on this side of the Atlantic and the English markets are looking for them.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—As there seems to be a difference of opinion as to the relative value of barked and unbarked props I suggest that we accept the proposals of the President and make the minimum $4.50 for unbarked props and $6.00 for barked.

HON. MR. ANGEL.—I should say there is certainly $2.00 difference. It would cast $1.50 to rind and certainly another fifty cents for the difference in the quantity of wood.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—Then a man who is barking for seventy cents a cord is getting more in the nature of starvation wages than anything we have heard of before in relation to this Bill. If you are going to allow him only seventy cents you are not consistent.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—I am not suggesting allowing only 70 cents but am simply putting this forward as against the claim that there is two dollars difference. They have received seventy cents under contract, and if we now give them $1.50 that will be eighty cents more than they had received.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment, which report was received and on motion the said Bill was then read a third time, passed and it was ordered that it be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same with some amendment, and requesting their concurrence in the same.

SAWMILLS BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. The object is to exempt from the payment of royalty lumber manufactured by a mill owner that shall be cut on private land as distinct from Crown Lands provided he furnishes to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, with his returns for royalty, a sworn statement by him or his agent of the quantity of lumber in respect to which he claims such exemption, and verifying the fact that the timber from which the same was manufactured was cut on private property.

The said Bill was then read a second time and sent to a Committee of the Whole House.

Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment which report was received, whereupon the Bill was read a third time, passed and was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

LOAN BILL.

HON. MR. BISHOP.—I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. It provides for the raising by loan the sum of five million dollars. As will appear by the sections of the bill, one million of this is intended to repay amounts approximating that amount which was borrowed from the Bank of Montreal; another million to repay that borrowed in London two years ago by the Premier; and three millions approximately for the cost of raising the regiment. I beg to move the second reading.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—I should just like to say that I am glad to see the Government has rated the interest at five and one-half per cent., as I am afraid it will not be possible to borrow money at a less rate for a long time to come, if we get it at 5½ per cent. I am sure the credit of this country is equal to that of other countries.

The Bill was read a second time, and then sent to a Committee of the Whole House, Hon. Mr. Harvey in the chair. The Committee reported the Bill without amendment, which report was received, and on motion the Bill was then read a third time, passed, and was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

DEATH DUTIES BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, this Bill was read a second time, and then sent to Committee of the Whole,

Hon. Mr. Murphy in the chair.

On motion the Committee rose and

reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

The Bill was then read a third time, passed, and was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the Bill without amendment. The Bill relating to the Consorship of Moving Pictures was also put through all its stages without discussion.

CODLIVER OIL BILL.

Hon. Mr. President informed the House that he had received a message from the House of Assembly intimating they had passed the Bill relative to the Refining of Cod Liver Oil, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Bill was read a first and second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

Hon the President read a message from the House of Assembly that the following Select Committee had been appointed by them to consider the Council's amendment to the Sealfishery Bill and asking the Council to appoint a similar committee to cooperate with them in considering same: Messrs. Piccott, Cashin, Coaker, Downey, Lloyd, Devereaux and Crosbie.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

Hon. the President nominated the following Select Committee to cooperate with the Select Committee of the Assembly on the Bill—Hons. Messrs. Bishop, Gibbs, Harvey, Squires, Goodridge, Murphy and Angel.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the report of the select committee on the Weights and Measures Bill was read and received.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop it was ordered that the amendments be considered on to-morrow.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I would ask leave to introduce certain Resolutions which at this late hour I shall not attempt to explain but which speak for themselves:

"It is the opinion of the House that from and after this date all Acts passed by this House shall in addition to the usual form of draft be distinguished by reference to the calendar year in which Bills are passed. It is also resolved that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Assembly requesting their concurrence in the same." Ordered accordingly.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned until 3.30 p.m. tomorrow.

WEDNESDAY May 3rd, 1916.

The House met at 3.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

EDUCATIONAL BILL.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—I beg leave to submit the report of the Joint Select Committee on the Education Bill. The Committee recommend that further consideration be held over for another year and the Council therefore withdraws its amendment.

The Report being received and adopted it was ordered that a message be sent to the Assembly acquainting them that the House withdraws its amendment on the bill.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

The Bill was then read a third time passed and was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the amendments to the Weights and Measures Bill were read a first and

second time and the final motion was held to wait the action of the Assembly on the Council's amendments.

REVENUE BILL.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Revenue Bill was read a second time and passed the Committee stage.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—Mr. President: For the past two sessions I have taken the opportunity of making a few remarks before the passing of the Revenue Bill,on the general financial condition of the country, and other passing events. On this occasion I hope, with the indulgence of the House, to present a review of what Great Britain and the Dominions, including Newfoundland, have been doing during the past twenty months—twenty months of the greatest war the world has ever known. Before doing so, Mr. President, you are sitting now where my old friend the late Hon. John Harris sat a year ago, when I last addressed this House on the Budget Speech. The Hon. John Harris is now sleeping within the walls of the Silent City. My acquaintance with the late Hon. President of this House extended over a period of forty years. A bright future of usefulness lay before him to carry out for the good of his native land. It was otherwise decreed, cut off just a little beyond the meridian of life (the sun set) and the Hon. John Harris who sat where you are sitting now is no more. His life was one of usefulness, doing good, and helping others. His life was one of usefulness, doing good for the city and the country. If ever there was man who reached and stood on the highest pinnacle of honour and integrity in this country, that man was John Harris. I had occasion at a meeting of the City Commissioners to refer to our late honourable and respected President who was a valued member of the Commission. At that time I concluded with the words, and I do so now: "We ne'er shall see his like again." "God's finger touched him and he slept." On this same occasion there was another familiar face which is missing from this Chamber. He sat opposite where I am now standing. I refer to the late Martin Furlong, Solicitor to both branches of the Legislature. He also has been taken away. "Cut off" when the brilliant star of the legal bar had reached the zenith in his profession. The memory of Martin Furlong will long be remembered as one of the most honoured, respected and brightest lawyers the country has yet produced. With other honourable gentlemen of this House I join in expressing the deepest sympathy with the widow and her young family. "His life's work is o'er."

During the present session of the Legislative Council we have listened with a great deal of pleasure, and I hope with interest and profit to the country, to the speceh delivered in this House a week ago by my friend, Hon. Mr. Milley—a speech brimful of patriotic sentiment as to the future Imperial Trade relationship within the Empire, and this Colony being represented in London, also the German and Austrian Trade after the war. With my hon. friend I quite agree. We also had a speech on the Education Bill by my hon. friend, Mr. Robinson, that I hope will be read by everyone in the country who is interested in education. The Hons. Mr. Harvey, Mr. Gibbs and Mr. Blandford during the present session have given to this House the full benefit of their opinions at length on the various questions that came before the House, so that altogether, Mr. President, we have had a very fruitful session in the Legislative Council which I hope will be to the benefit of the people, and the prosperity of the Colony.

With the indulgence of the House, I wish to put before you, in part, what has been doing in the British Empire,

and the part we have played in Newfoundland, and the assistance given to the Mother Country by the Overseas Dominions during the past twenty months.

In the first place, Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks on the Budget Speech delivered in the Lower House by the Hon. Minister of Finance on Tuesday, April 18th. I wish to congratulate the Government and the country on the splendid position we are in at the present time compared with what we were a year ago—June 30th, 1915. At this date the revenue was short $755,983 to meet this debit balance:

The cash reserve balance	$198,150.64
Bank of Montreal	500,000.00
Debit balance carried forward	57,832.36
	$755,983.00
Balance Dr. 1914-15	57,832.36
Estimated expenditure, June 30th, 1915-16 ..	4,100,000.00
	$4,157,832.36

Estimated revenue, June 30th, 1915-16, $4,160,000.00, showing a surplus of over two thousand dollars. I have no further desire, Mr. President, to review the Budget Speech of my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, except to say in his estimate of Expenditure for 1916 and ending 30th June, 1917, he puts the amount at $4,165,000.00. Four million, one hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars. About the revenue I have no fear. The season has opened with a good sealfishery, good prices have been paid in the national industry of the country good prospects are ahead with good markets. Tonnage to handle our imports and exports. The high markets for goods, under an ad valorem duty, and various war taxes. I believe the revenue for 1916-17 will surprise the country.

Mr. President: In Newfoundland we are still on the fringe of taxation. The taxes for carrying on the Government of the Colony are indirect, and paid through the Custom House on articles imported. We are what might be called a free trade country. We have no preferential tariff favour, or against any country. Our revenue act applies to all nations we import goods from. After the war, I have no doubt, this Colony like other parts of the British dominions, will consider the question of a tariff wall against German and Austria-Hungarian goods. At the present time Great Britain has been our market for merchandise. Since the outbreak of the war the British manufacturers have been so overwhelmed with orders from the British Government that they have found it impossible to attend and fill orders for the various markets of the world. Consequently today, so far as Newfoundland is concerned, Canada and the United States have increased their trade to a very great extent. How long this great and bloody war is to last is beyond the ken of man. Let us earnestly hope and pray for victory, honour, and lasting peace.

Mr. President: I wish for a short time to briefly refer to what has been done in the Mother Country, and the great strain it must be upon the minds of those who guide the nation's welfare—the cost of silver bullets, where the money comes from, and what taxation means to the population of Great Britain.

Mr. President: I might be allowed, and I take the liberty on behalf of the Irish people of Newfoundland and their descendants to express their deep regret and sympathy with the British Government on the recent trouble which happened in Dublin, the capital of Ireland, a few days ago. In the official despatch to His Ex-

cellency the Governor, 26th April, from the Rt. Hon. Bonar Law, Secretary of State for the Colonies, a Sinn Fein outbreak occurred in Dublin on Monday. The rebels seized the Post Office and other points in the city. The situation is well in hand and no outbreaks are reported elsewhere. I understand the proper pronunciation of Sinn Fein is Shin Fain, and repeated twice quickly—Shin Fain, Shin Fain, meaning ourselves and ourselves. Young men, boys, Sinn Feiners, or Fenians, whose secret policy was to make an effort to establish a Republic in Ireland. Thanks to Mr. John Redmond and Sir E. Carson, all the rebel commanders in Dublin have surrendered. The Dublin rebels have advised the rebels elsewhere to surrender and the movement generally is crushed.

Mr. President: Ireland's allegiance to the British Crown is stronger today than at any time during the history of the Irish nation. John Redmond, the idol of the Nationalist Party of Ireland, and the future peacemaker and Premier of a United Ireland under Home Rule. Sir E. Carson, late Cabinet Minister, I believe when the war is over, will support Home Rule for Ireland, on conditions that will meet with the approval of the Home Rule party. At the present time I am sure it must be a great relief and consolation to the Throne of England, that Sir E. Carson and Mr. John Redmond expressed themselves in the House of Commons, their abhorrence of the uprising in Ireland, and their earnest desire to support the Government. In a recent cable, Sir Edward Carson said he would gladly join with Redmond in doing anything to put down the rebels now and forever more. So say the Irish of Newfoundland, and all their friends of the Empire.

In this House we have Englishmen, Scotchmen, Irishmen and Newfoundlanders. In no part of the British Empire will you find a race more loyal to the British crown than the Irish and their descendants in Newfoundland. In fact, my friend, (Hon. J.D. Ryan), who, if he were today here, would be sitting on my left, is abroad on business. He is the respected President of the Benevolent Irish Society, a society which stands for the Irish nation and devotion and loyalty to the Mother Country.

If a battalion of Sinn Feiners or young Fenians, cranks, lunatics, and political demagogues, traitors to their country, have brought temporary disgrace to Ireland, and trouble to the British Government, I am certain the Imperial Government have the sympathy and support of the Irish nation, and the Irish people in all parts of the globe. This Colony has given a large contribution of our Irish friends who are now at the front fighting for King and Empire. I am proud to proclaim throughout the length and breadth of this country that a respected member of the Irish Society has been honoured by our King with the Military Cross, which was awarded to Lieut. J. J. Donnelly for conspicuous galantry and determination on the night of the 4th and 5th of November, 1915, on the Gallipoli Peninsula. He occupied with eight men a knoll to which our firing line was extended next day. By his coolness and skill in handling this small party, which was reduced to five by casualties, he repelled several determined Turkish bomb and rifle attacks on his front and flanks, and held his own during the night. Thousands of the true blood of the Irish race are now fighting for King, Country and Righteousness. Thousands of the loyal sons of Ireland are now sleeping the sleep of the just on the battlefield, who sacrificed their lives on the altar of Right, Justice and Honour

for the British Empire and their King.

Mr. President: I have gone to the trouble and prepared information relating to the Empire's war and our Allies, that I think will be interesting to the people of this Colony. There are many facts associated with what I have to say in relation to Newfoundland, that will interest those whose lads are fighting for our island home.

Mr. President: Twenty months of a world's raging war. Where are we? Where are we going? Is the British nation in danger? Are we drifting to defeat? or to a glorious victory?

This is not the time for fault finding contentious opposition, political partisans fighting in the Britsh Cabinet, in the House of Commons, or making political capital to the neglect and sacrifice of the British nation. What is wanted is unity, and fraternal brotherhood in every part of the Empire. We are paying a big price in human blood and money.

Great Britain's national ship of state is well manned, carefully watched and navigated by the Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, Prime Minister,—at the Helm; Rt. Hon. David Lloyd George, Muntions Minister—Chief Officer; Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bart., K. G., Secretary of State Foreign Affairs—on the bridge; Rt. Hon. Reginald McKenna, Chancellor of the Exchequer—on the look out; Rt. Hon. Earl Kitchener—Chief Pilot; Admiral Jellicoe—Navigator of Britain's Sure Shield, and supported by a Cabinet Crew of World Wide Knowledge and Experience.

The British Empire have undoubted confidence in the British Cabinet, especially the Prince of Peace, and honour of Britain—The Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, Prime Minister of England, back him up! Support him! for Great Britain's honor is at stake. Let all our fault finding and political opposition take place after we have accomplished Victory, Honour, and Glory for Britain and her Allies, which must come soon. Dark clouds are beginning to roll away. The sky is becoming clear. Everything is right. Everything will be well. Be calm and cool.

It is well for Britain that during the present crisis she has at the head of the Government a man of such strong will and clear brain. Read what this great British statesman said about Germany's cool request in 1912.

Mr. Asquith revealed for the first time in his speech at Cardiff, on October 2, 1914, the history of a proposal made by Germany.

"In the year 1912," he said, "we laid down in terms carefully approved by the Cabinet, and which I will textually quote, what our relations with Germany ought in our view to be. We said, and we communicated this to the German Government:

"'Britain declares that she will neither make, nor join in, any unprovoked attack upon Germany. Aggression upon Germany is not the subject, and forms no part of any treaty, understanding, or combination, to which Britain is now a party; nor will she become a party to anything that has such an object.'

"But that was not enough for German statesmanship. They wanted us to go further.

"They asked us to pledge ourselves absolutely to neutrality, in the event of Germany being engaged in war, and this, mind you, at a time when Germany was enormously increasing both her aggressive and defensive resources, and especially upon the sea. They asked us, to put it quite plainly, for a free hand as far as we were concerned, if and when they selected the opportunity to overbear, to dominate the European world.

"To such a demand but one answer was possible, and that was the

answer we gave," said Mr. Asquith, amid ringing cheers.

"We now see clearly written down in letters of carnage and spoliation the real aims and methods of this long-prepared and well-organized scheme against the liberties of Europe."

The Empire's Pledge:—"We shall never sheathe the sword which we have not lightly drawn until Belgium recovers in full measure all, and more than all she has sacrificed, until France is adequately secured against the menace of aggression, until the rights of the smaller nationalities of Europe are placed upon an unassailable foundation, and until the military domination of Prussia is wholly and finally destroyed."—The Prime Minister of England, Nov. 1914.

"The nation determined," says Sir E. Grey, Secretary of State, Foreign Affairs.

London, Nov. 12, 1915.—Reaffirmation of Asquith's pledge regarding the Entente Allies' term of peace delivered at the Lord Mayor's banquet on November 9th, 1914, was made by Sir Edward Grey today in a written answer to a question put by Sir Arthur Markham, Liberal member of parliament for Mansfield Division, Nottinghamshire.

After stating how Britain's position was fixed by her alliance with Japan, France and Russia, the Foreign Secretary proceeded:

"In our view the conditions of peace must fulfil those laid down by the Prime Minister on Nov. 9th, 1914. It is very desirable that it should be understood, once and for all, that this is the determination of the Government collectively and individually, and of the nation."

ANGLO-FRENCH COMBINATION OF WEALTH.

Recent United States Loan is Comparatively Small Sum for the Borrowing Allies.

The Anglo-French $500,000,000, 5 per cent., five-year external loan so successfully floated in the United States, offered to the public at 98. In connection with the prospectus the following data is given:

Exports from the United States to Great Britain and France amounted to $837,534,149 during the six months ended June 30th, 1915. This period does not include the heavy fall movement of the grain crops, which this year promises to be, both in quality and value, the largest in the history of the United States. The difficulty of financing the heavy export trade balance through ordinary channels has threatened seriously to curtail the foreign demand for United States products. The essential object of the loan is, by providing additional credits, to produce greater stability in the rate of foreign exchange, and this means to assist the United States export trade.

The bond will constitute a direct obligation, joint and several, of the governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the French Republic. Both principal and interest will be payable in United States gold coin in the city of New York, without deduction for any British or French taxes, present or future.

This loan is the only external loan of the issuing governments (except a comparatively small issue of French notes of short maturity.)

The ultimate security behind a national loan lies in the taking power of the government, which, in turn, is limited by the national wealth and the "financial morality" of the gov-

erned; that is, the ability and willingness of the people to contribute from their private resources to sustain the nation's honour and credit. The steady accumulation of national wealth in Great Britain and Fran e, and these nations' long record of scrupulous fidelity to their financial obligations have ranked their credit in the very forefront of the nations of the world.

During the last hundred years the foreign trade of the nations of the world has grown to such a magnitude, and their interests have become so interlocked, that the unimpaired maintenance of a nation's credit is recognized as not only of primary importance to the nation itself, but as also vitally affecting the personal credit of its citizens in the world's markets.

Wealth of British People.

The estimated wealth of the British people in 1914 was about $80,000,000,000. The present debt which approximates $11,000,000,000, including the entire present issue of $500,000,000, represents over 13 per cent. of the estimated present wealth of the British people whereas the national debt in 1816 amounted to 36 per cent of their estimated wealth at that time. Interest on this loan of $500,000,000 equals one-fifth of one per cent of the total estimated income of the British people in 1914.

Since the establishment of the nationa debt of Great Britain two hundred years ago, it has been the policy of the British Government to pay out of income in times of peace, not only all ordinary and extraordinary expenditures, but also large amounts in the reduction of the public debt. At the close of the Napoleonic wars in 1816, the British Government immediately went to work on the problem of reducing the debt, and although in the course of the succeeding century additional debt was incurred in times of special emergencies, the government's policy resulted in reducing the debt 20 per cent. by 1914.

During the ten years ended March 31st, 1914, the government reduced the public debt over $430,000,000 out of ordinary income. Whereas interest on the national debt consumed 11 per cent. of the people's estimated income in 1816, in 1914 interest of the debt amounted to only three-quarters of one per cent of the estimated income of the British people.

Sent Capital Abroad.

The amount of British capital annually invested abroad in recent years is estimated at $800,000,000, and the total foreign and colonial investments are estimated at $17,500,000,000 representing over 20 per cent. of the accumulated wealth of Great Britain. The estimated income of the British people from foreign and colonial investments is approximately $900,000,000 annually, or about 36 times the $25,000,000 interest charge on this, the only external debt of Great Britain. The estimated total annual income of the people of Great Britain increased from $1,500,000,000 in 1816 to $12,000,000,000 in 1914—an eight fold increase. On the basis of its present income, Great Britain could support, with no greater burden on the people than was successfully carried during the Napoleonic wars a national debt of $40,000,000,000, bearing interest at 5 per cent.

Annual Income of the French.

The wealth of the French people in 1914 was estimated at $50,000,000,000, and their annual income at $6,000,000,000. Interest on this loan of $500,000,000 equals slightly more than one-third of the one per cent. of the estimated total annual income of the French people in 1914.

The French people are widely

known for their thrift and their habit of investing in small sums, which is made possible under French methods of issuing securities. The total annual savings of the French people are estimated in normal times at about $1,000,000,000. Their ability to accumulate wealth was strikingly shown by the payment of an indemnity of $1,000,000,000 within the three years following 1870-1871, and the investment of large sums abroad within a few years thereafter.

It is estimated that the total amount of French capital invested abroad is $10,000,000,000, and that of this amount about $4,000,000,000 was placed abroad during the thirteen and one-half years prior to 1914. A large development of railroads and other enterprises in the United States.

The very latest information we have on Finance—"Pay our way as we go." The war must go on until we have reached the goal of victory.

Mammoth Expenditure.

London, Nov. 10th, (last loan.)—Premier Asquith was to have asked the Commons today for a vote of credit of £400,000,000—$2,000,000,000, but some unexpected development prevented him from taking this action, which was postponed until tomorrow.

The Premier made his expected statement in regard to the financial situation, and impressed upon the nation the necessity of careful husbanding of its resources. Including the new vote of credit, to be asked tomorrow, the Premier pointed out that the total amount voted for war purposes will be £1,062,000,000—$5,310,000,000. He presented figures showing that the Government has a sufficient sum left over from the previous vote to finance the war to the third week of November. The approximate daily cost of the war between September 12th and November 6th, as given by Asquith, was £4,350,000—$21,750,000. It rose to this figure from £2,700,000—$13,500,000 in the earlier part of the financial year. Loans advanced by Britain to her Allies and the Dominions between April 1st and November 6th, he said, amounted to £98,000,000—$490,000,000. In the same period £23,000,000—$115,000,000 was expended for food supplies and miscellaneous items. The main causes of the increase in the cost of the war, he continued, were great expenditures for munitions and advances to Britain's allies and the Dominions. He could hold out no hope that there was any immediate likelihood of a decrease in these two items. Silver bullets. Money talks for the nation. Figures that stagger the human mind, away and beyond the grasp of the ordinary man. Anglo-French loan recently and successfully floated in the United States. Is it too small to have any effect upon sterling exchange?

British Empire must save. Great Britain is supplying her Overseas Dominions with war funds. Citizens must help. Newfoundland has responded nobly to the Mother Country. In money, comforts to the army and navy, and in proportion to this part of the Empire we have given a large contribution in human blood, and the end not yet. The British Budget, introduced in the House of Commons in September last with its new income tax has given the British taxpayer something to study, and the Colonies to digest. Economic extravagance has forced many of Great Britain's citizens to curtail their expenditures. War has made a continuance of thrift necessary. Great Britain has seen fit to teach its citizens frugality. Sir George Paish, speaking in London, said:—

"England is carrying the great financial burden of the war. The war has found some weak spots in our

allies which we must repair. France has lost a large part of her income, and therefore we must find money with which to buy the things she needs. Russia has virtually no exports, so we must help her. In addition, we must provide for Belgium, Serbia, and other powers. The result of all this is that for the current year we must find, outside our own expenditures, £423,000,000—$2,115,000,000 for our Allies. Is England content to go on living as today? Money is being squandered on all sides with the result, perhaps, that later our allies may come to us for money and we shall not have the means to support them.

Adverse Trade Balance

"The adverse trade balance, if we include what we have done for our Allies, is already between £600,000,000—$3,000,000,000 and £700,000,000, to balance which we have succeeded in borrowing £50,000,000—$250,000,000. Britain's moiety of the United States loan. This country needs to save yearly £400,000,000—$2,000,000,000 out of its income of £3,000,000,000—$15,000,000,000. The great mass of the people should have 10 per cent. additional, and the more wealth 20 or 25 per cent.

"What is the alternative? Will it be possible for us to borrow £3,000,000,000—$15,000,000,000 to adjust our trade balance? I think it impossible. If we go on spending money as we are now, we shall see another break in American exchange accompanied by a break in Canadian, Argentine, Australian and Indian exchanges. This probably would mean the suspension of specie payments, and we should have to tell the world we were unable to pay our debts."

Mr. Edwin Samuel Montagu, financial secretary to the treasury, in replying to the British House of Commons to criticism of the new taxes imposed by the budget of Mr. Reginald McKenna, Chancellor of the Exchequer, said: "The man who did not study the idea of having half his income available for the state was not doing his duty. We have had to keep, and continue to keep an impregnable navy. We have paid, and continue to pay for an army which has increased from a few thousands of men to an army which runs into millions."

Helping Overseas Dominions.

"We are financing by loans to our great dominions part of their expenditure on the contingents which are helping us to fight. We are paying as regards India, the whole cost of the Indian contingents, except their normal peace expenditure.

"We have advanced to the Allies such a sum as it was estimated would equip and maintain in the field three million of their soldiers.

"We have a right to be proud of our share, and we ought to be proud of the way in which the proposals for meeting the war expenditure have been received by all classes."

Mr. Montague, added that the country had not yet bent itself to the task of meeting the obligations imposed by burdens which involved an expenditure amounting to not less than half his current income at the disposal of the state, either by tax or loan.

To do this, Mr. Montague continued, the civil population must stint itself and re-arrange its whole life with regard to the consumption of luxuries and foreign-purchased goods. There would, however, be still more money left in the pockets of the people that would have to be got later by loan taxation, and this had caused a feeling of relief and given an assurance that the country would continue to finance the war.

Mr. Montague said in conclusion that the Chancellor of the Exchequ-

uer intended to develop with all possible rapidity a compulsory taxation system for the country, but that this in itself would not be adequate to the case, and voluntary savings were essential to an ultimate victory.

It is impossible at the present time to give our views upon Great Britain's future fiscal policy, but I believe at no distant date or at least when the war is over, Great Britain's free trade policy must give way to tariff reform—when the ideals of him who is sleeping in the great silent city—the late Right Hon. Jos. Chamberlain will become an accomplished fact. Britain must have money, income tax and revenue through the custom house on imports. Duty must be either ad valorem or specific on goods imported from countries outside the Empire.

Interest on Great Britain's national debt is great, and the current expenditure of the nation must be met. Let us follow the financial condition of the country at the present time. Let us have a look at the nation's great balance sheet as it will appear at the end of March, 1916.

Must the banking system of Great Britain be changed? To be more on the lines with the banking system of Canada this is a question for future consideration.

(Here follow various statistics about the British Empire—its area and population, its trade and production, imports and exports, banking situation, national debt, revenue and expenditure, budget and taxation, drink bill, and liquor consumption, income tax, war budget, army and navy returns, etc., which are not printed. They may be found in any standard publication).

We give full credit to all parts of the British Empire in our heroic struggle to crush our enemies in this great war. Our colonies have responded nobly. The Commonwealth of Australia, Dominion of New Zealand, throughout the Union of South Africa, India, and many other places in the Empire, have all come forward to help the Mother Country in the battle for righteousness and our existence.

For a few moments, Mr. President, I would draw your attention to the part taken by Canada, as it is nearer our own country. Sir Robert Borden said Canada's authorized force for overseas service raised on January 1st, 1916, from 250,000 to 500,000. The first number in sight in beginning of the year. As a token of Canada's unflinching resolve to crown the justice of our cause with victory and an abiding peace.

Canada's gift to British Red Cross Society, $1,875,000. Canada's war gifts in 1914:—Dominion, 1,000,000 bags of flour; Ontario, 250,000 bags of flour; Quebec, 4,000,000 pounds of cheese; Nova Scotia 500,000 tons of coal; Prince Edward Island, 100,000 bushels of oats; Alberta, 500,000 bushels of oats; New Brunswick, 100,000 bushels of potatoes; Manitoba, 50,000 bags of flour; British Columbia, 1,200,000 cans of salmon; Saskatchewan, 1,500 horses. Canada's Indians contributed over $16,000 to patriotic and other war funds up to December, 1915. Canada's contributions to the patriotic fund by provinces during the first year of war, up to September 30th, 1915, $5,350,000, being 70 cents per capita, and to the present date $9,625,000. ("Canada is fully determined to spare no effort and shrink from no sacrifice to make triumphant the cause of our Allies."—Sir R. Borden).

The war cost Canada, during the first year $90,000,000, cost in 1916 with an army of 250,000, estimated at $250,000,000. Actual cash paid out on war account up to Jan. 1st, 1916, $154,000,000.

How do we find the financial affairs in the Dominion of Canada, in the Budget Speech delivered by Hon. Sir Thomas White, Minister of Finance in the House of Commons, Tuesday, February 15th, 1916.

After all, Mr. President, what is the principal factor in our great battle for victory; is it to be human blood or money? we must be prepared with both. In this respect Canada, like Newfoundland, has given a large contribution of human blood, and the patriotism of the population of the great Dominion of Canada when the history of this world's war is written, Canada will occupy a position in its pages—that will proudly last as long as the Globe itself.

In February, 1915, the Canadian Minister of Finance, by a comprehensive scheme of general and special taxation, aimed to increase the revenues of the Dominion for the fiscal year to an aggregate of $150,000,000. At the end of March last it was estimated the revenue would total $170,000,000, leaving a surplus over the estimate of $20,000,000. The fiscal year ends in Canada on March 31st. From the beginning of the past fiscal year up to February last, the total revenue of the Dominion from all sources amounted to $145,000,000, an increase of $31,000,000 over the same period of the preceding year. Of this revenue the sum of $82,000,000 has been derived from customs duties; $19,000,000 from excise; $14,000,000 from post office receipts, and about $30,000,000 from special taxes other than postal, levied under the Special War Revenue Act of last year.

Mr. President: Before I review briefly what we have been doing in Newfoundland, I wish to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to the war expenditure in Canada in 1915-16. During last session of the Dominion Parliament, they passed a War Appropriation Act for $100,000,000, this amount was the second Act. At the Special Session called upon the outbreak of war, $50,000,000 was provided. During the present session, the Canadian Prime Minister will introduce a Bill providing for an additional sum of $250,000, making a total of $400,000,000. The Canadian Minister of Finance explained to the House the number of troops had grown from 50,000 to 100,000 to 250,000, with a present authorized establishment of 500,000. War Expenditure had increased correspondingly, and at the present time has reached very large figures. From the outbreak of war to the end of January, 1916, it has amounted to $158,000,000. I have taken a very great interest in the advancement, progress and development of the Dominion of Canada. Ever since the beginning of the present war, the country has been loyal and patriotic to the core—in every way the populace has backed and supported the Government in all that was asked of them—to back up and help the Mother Country.

I am not going to weary hon. gentlemen with Canadian history—it is well known to all of us—nor yet am I going to put before this House—and through it to the people of this country—a lecture on Confederation, either for or against it—but I am going to make this statement: that after the war, when peace will have been proclaimed, the Dominion of Canada will begin and continue from year to year to become one of the richest and most glorious countries in the world. This vast country is bounded by three oceans, its 13,000 miles of coast line is nearly equal to half the circumference of the earth.

Canada is as large as 30 United Kingdoms, and 18 times the size of Germany; twice the size of British India, and almost as large as Europe; 18 times the size of France and 33 of Italy. In 1868 the area of the four

provinces forming Confederation was 662,148 square miles—now Parliament exercises jurisdiction in nine provinces over 3,729,665 square miles of an area—larger than the combined area square miles of the United Kingdom. The Commonwealth of Australia, Dominion of New Zealand, Newfoundland, Labrador, Cape of Good Hope and the Gold Coast. The total area of these countries is 3,723,430 square miles. The area of the Dominion of Canada is larger than the Continental United States (including Alaska) by 702,876 square miles, and only 13,679 square miles smaller including the dependencies of that great country, the United States, with a population of less than 8,000,000 or a little over that of the city of London, England. Who can prophesy what is the future of Canada? I believe it to be beyond the imagination of the human mind. The Canadian Government entered the past fiscal year on the 1st April, 1915, with $15,000,000 of treasury bills maturing in June. They had also a bank indebtedness of $55,000,000. These treasury bills were paid on maturity, and the bank indebtedness has been paid off. The Dominion Government at the present time has no outstanding Treasury Bills in the London market, and is not overdrawn with any financial institution. Such a condition of affairs should exist in Newfoundland to-day—if we had more loyalty, unity and confidence with each other throughout the country. I have no desire, Mr. President, to submit figures that on the face, would only mean artificial prosperity either for this country or Canada, large borrowing at any time means artificial prosperity, unless spent in productive utili ties for a country's development. The credit of no country stands higher today than Canada, either among its own people, the United States, or in the London market. What has been the loan transactions in Canada during the past year? In March last, 1915, $25,000,000, 4½ per cent., 99½ was raised in London. In August was made an issue in New York—$25,000,000, 5 per cent notes.

In November of last year a domestic loan of $50,000,000, 5 per cent. was offered, which the people—I say the people—in the words of the Minister of Finance was most enthusiastically and patriotically received throughout the length and breadth of that vast country. The response was so great, and the earnest desire of investors such that the amount was increased to $100,000,000, this amount being over-subscribed. What is the outlook of Canada in 1915-16?

Revenue from all sources	$170,000.000
Ordinary expenditure	125,000,000
Surplus	$45,000,000

During the year 1915-16 the national debt was increased $131,000,000, and stands about $585,000,000 at the present time.

The credits against the national debt are over half the debt itself, and in addition there is a gold reserve held against Dominion notes of $115,147,985, about 65 per cent. of the outstanding circulation.

What are the economic conditions of the Dominion of Canada?

For the fiscal year 1912-13 the balance of trade was adverse to the extent of over $300,000,000; in 1913-14 it was $180,000,000, and in 1914-15 $36,000,000. It is estimated that the total trade for the ensuing year will approximately reach $1,200,000,000, an increase of nearly $200,000,000 in exports, and a slight reduction in imports, and is the largest amount of trade in the history of the Dominion of Canada.

Canada the most marvellous coun-

try in the world. I now propose to have a look at the crops. In 1913, according to official figures issued in January, 1914, the principal field crops of Canada covered 35,375,000 acres, or almost the same area as in 1912. The total value of these crops is given at £110,554,000—$552,770,000. The wheat crop was grown upon 11,015,000 acres, and it produced 231,717,000 bushels, valued at £31,292,000—$156,460,000, while the crop of oats produced was 404,669,000 bushels, valued at £25,777,000—$128,895,000. These gigantic staggering figures of wealth are from the luxuriant and fertile soil of this great country. Let us now have a glance at the great harvest of the land for the year 1915.

For the first time in history Canada ranks fourth among the wheat producing nations of the world. Some years ago she occupied sixth place. After holding that position for some time she stepped into fifth place by passing Argentine. The United States has ranked first for some seasons now, with Russia a close second, India third and France fourth. Last year's estimates show that Canada surpasses France, Canada's total being 376,303,600 bushels, against France's 280,000,000. This year's crop in Canada was in excess of the 1914 crop in France, which was 313,000,000 bushels.

Mr. President: I would like to point out the nations which produce the largest wheat supply—in bushels:—

United States—1915, 965,600,000; 1914, 891,200,000

Russia—1915, 920,000,000; 1914, 808,000,000.

India—1915, 383,000,000; 1914, 314,400,000.

Canada—1915, 376,303,600; 1914, 160,000,000.

France—1915, 280,000,000; 1914, 313,600,000.

The Argentine—1915, 176,000,000; 1914, 176,000,000.

Canada's 1915 harvest was the most bountiful in her history, making new records for quantity, quality and value.

Wheat yield estimate, 376,303,600 bushels, worth $312,569,400; or 215,023,600 bushels more than in 1914. Average yield per acre 28.96 bushels; 1914, 15.67.

Oats is Canada's greatest crop: 520,103,000 bushels in 1915; worth $176,894,700. Yield in 1914, 313,078,000 bushels.

Other principal crops: Barley, 53,331,300 bushels; worth $26,704,700; rye, 2,394,100 bushels; worth $1,899,900. Peas, 3,478,850 bushels, worth $5,730,700.

The total yield of all field and root crops reached the record of 10,194,609,250 bushels.

"Canada alone can supply enough wheat, over and above her own needs to feed the whole British and French armies."—C. C. James.

Canada had, in 1911, 711,681 occupiers of land, or farm holdings, as against 544,688 in 1901, ten years ago, the increase of 30 per cent. being mainly in the Canadian west.

Canada's Government will spend $10,000,000 in aid of agricultural instruction. 1915-16 allotment, $900,000, viz: Ontario, $266,013; Quebec, $215,310; Saskatchewan, $68,011; Nova Scotia, $68,001; Manitoba, $64,421; British Columbia, $58,265; Alberta, $56,528; New Brunswick, $54,308; Prince Edward Island, $29,138; Veterinary College, $20,000. Total, $900,000.

Canada's total tilled area, 1915, 37,263,000 acres; 1914, 33,440,075 acres.

A one-day shipping record of grain was made on November 30th, 1915, from Fort William, of 7,464,000 bushels, in 31 boats.

The largest cargo of grain ever carried by any vessel in Canada was

476,315 bushels in the Grant Morden, December, 1915.

The quality of Canadian grain crops at time of harvest, 1915, measured against a standard of 100, representing good well-headed, well filled, well-saved and unaffected to any appreciable extent by frost, rust, smut, etc., superior to that of last 5-year average.

World's wheat crop estimate 1915: 2,064,876,000 bushels; Canada with 376,303,600 bushels, comes third.

Canada's 543 flour mills have daily capacity of 111,865 barrels. Ontario leads with 303 mills.

Prairie Provinces have 107 flour mills. Daily capacity, 34,175 barrels.

Wheat exports, 1914, $117,719,000; 1915, $74,293,000. Flour exports, 1914, $20,581,000; 1915, $29,610,000.

Largest quantity of wheat and wheat flour previously exported in any one fiscal years was 142,574,000 bushels, in 1913-14. Quantity now estimated as available for export is 85,558,200 bushels in excess of this amount.

Canada's average value of farm land held for agriculture purposes whether improved or unimproved, and including the value of dwelling houses, farms, stables, and other farm buildings, is $38.41 per acre. By provinces, the average values of 1914 ranges from $20 per acre in Alberta to $150 per acre in British Columbia.

Root and Fodder Crops, 1915. Total value, $229,623,000, from 8,980,000 acres, as compared in 1914, with $226,227,000, from 9,067,000.

Of above total: potatoes, $35,954,000; turnips, etc., $16,560,000; hay and clover, $155,807,000; fodder corn, $16,999,100; sugar beets, $891,000; alfalfa, $3,402,000.

Canada's potato crop, 1915, 62,604,000 bushels; turnips, etc., 64,281,000 bushels; hay and clover, 10,953,000 tons; fodder corn, 3,429,870 tons; sugar beets, 162,000 tons; alfalfa, 261,955 tons.

Exportable Surplus of Canadian Wheat, 1915.

Based on preliminary estimated total yield of 336,258,000 bushels.

Average loss in cleaning, and allowance for grain not of merchantable quality, say 10 per cent—33,625,800.

Total retained for seeding crop of 1916, say 14 million acres, at 1.75 bushels per acre—24,500,000.

Required for food, say 6.25 bushels per head for a population of eight millions—50,000,000.

Balance available for export—228,132,200.

Canada's exportable wheat and flour for 1915-16, may total $200,000,000.

Canada had, March, 1915, 2,813 elevators and 28 warehouses. Capacity in 1900 only 18,329,352 bushels.

The three Northwest Provinces estimated yield of wheat, 304,200,000 bushels, out of 336,258,000, or 90 per cent; oats, 305,680,000 bushels, out of 481,035,000, or 63 per cent.

Up to the end of October 31, 1915, 12,221,117 lbs. of raw beet-root sugar, equivalent to 11,315,849 lbs. of refined sugar, were obtained in Canada from 48,197 short tons of sugar beet-root.

I have selected ten of Canada's industrial investments, showing where Canada has invested millions of dollars.

Farm values—$4,231,000,000.

Industrial capital—$1,250,000,000.

Railways (steam and electric)—$1,955,000,000.

Fisheries capital—$27,500,000.

Mines, plant capital—$4,500,000.

Telegraphic capital—$202,000,000.

Telephone capital—$250,000,000.

Canals, (capital expenditure),—$107,000,000.

Waterworks, (value estimated),—$150,000,000.

Estimated total—$8,365,000,000.

Mr. President, it is impossible to give the productive values of the Do-

minion of Canada in the brief reference that I have made to that country this afternoon. I have selected seven that will give the people of this Colony some idea of the vast wealth of Canada.

Field Crops, 1915	$ 800,000,000
Fisheries	31,264,631
Forests	176,672,000
Mining	128,475,499
Dairying, (estimated) ..	100,000,000
Fruit, (estimated)	25,000,000
Fur trade, (estimated) .	2,000,000
Total	$1,263,412,130

Mr. President, you will observe the invested capital in the fisheries of Canada is $27,500,000. What are the fishery conditions of this great country, and what is the commercial value to investors of the capital, to those employed and to the Government?

Canada has the most extensive and best stocked commercial fishing waters in the world (with the exception of Newfoundland for codfish) including 5,000 miles of Atlantic, and 7,000 miles of Pacific Coast, and 220,000 square miles of fresh water.

The territorial fishing grounds of Canada extend from the Bay of Fundy to Strait of Belle Isle on the Atlantic Coast, and from the Fraser River to Prince Rupert on the Pacific Coast, with about one-quarter of a million square miles of fresh water in the interior.

Fishery exports, 1914-15, $19,687,-086.

Value produced, 1914-15, $31,264,631.

Value produced, 1913-14, $33207,748.

Value produced, 1912-13, $33,389,464.

Value produced, 1911-12, $34,667,872.

British Columbia comes first with $11,515,086; Nova Scotia second, $7,-730,191; New Brunswick third, $4,940,-083 Ontario fourth, $2,755,291; Quebec fifth, $1,924,430; Prince Edward Island sixth, $1,261,666; Manitoba seventh, $849,422; Saskatchewan eighth, $261,666; Alberta ninth, $86,720; Yukon Territory tenth, $69,725.

Salmon leads in value, $8,560,386; Lobsters, $4,339,929; Cod, $3,886,634; Herring, $2,735,257; Halibut, $1,793,-285; Haddock, $1,244,840; Oysters, $177,979. The total value of Canadian fisheries from 1870 to 1913, $894,799,-438.

Nova Scotia leads with 321 1-2 million dollars; British Columbia, $191,-000,000 ;New Brunswick, 160 1-2 million dollars; Quebec, $87,500,000; Ontario, $61,500,000.

Canada's fishery equipment is worth $24,733,162, an increase in value of $344,703 over the previous year.

Canada has a fishing fleet of 1,892 vessels and 39,144 boats, manned by 69,954 men, 24,559 employed on shore, or a total of 94,513. Motor boat fleet increased 602 during the year just closed.

The fishing bounties paid by Canada since 1882, $5,218,444.76. Canada is well supplied with fish-breeding hatcheries, during the year 1915, 64 hatcheries distributed 1,643,752,212 fry.

The oyster waters of Canada are as extensive as New York State, where two thousand obtain permanent employment; $6,000,000 capital is invested, and throughout the Maritime Provinces there are 10,550 acres of producing natural beds.

The fresh water fisheries have an annual value of about $4,000,000. Such is a brief history of the commercial value of the fisheries of Canada.

The estimated capital wealth of Canada, $9,920,000,000, and the income of $1,984,000,000, or $248 per head of the entire population.

Mr. President, before closing what reference I have made to the Dominion of Canada, and the enormous amounts which have been added to the funded debt—on war account— I am sure the present generation and generations to come, will gladly pay their

contribution of the cost when we all shall have the glorious satisfaction of knowing that the German Empire and all the military gods have been crushed forever, and the time come when spears will be turned into pruning hooks, and the world shall study the art of war no more. I am glad to note, Mr. President, that recently $75.000,000 of the $250,000,000 Loan Act passed recently has been taken up in the United States, and subscribed many times over.

The appropriation of $250,000,000 for this year is to be applied as follows:—

(a) The defense and security of Canada.

(b) The conduct of Naval or Military operations in or beyond Canada.

(c) Promoting the continuance of trade industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or otherwise.

(d) The carrying out of any measure deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor General in Council in consequence of the existence of a state of war.

The size of the appropriation is the most tangible evidence of Canada's increasing participation in the war. A year ago the appropriation asked from Pariament was $100,000,000. As Canada's army at the present time is over 300,000 men and is growing at the rate of about 1,000 a day, it will take careful financing to keep even within the $250,000,000 mark. It is roughly estimated that it costs $1,000 a year to maintain a soldier.

It is estimated the coming year that the ordinary expenditure will amount to about $135,000,000 as compared with $125,000,000 for the year just closed.

Mr President, we must bear in mind Canada in population is thirty-two times larger than Newfoundland, and hidden in the country is untold wealth. The cost to Canada for interest alone due to war borrowings is $20,000,000, and a further sum of $2,000,000 for pensions payable on account of the war.

I have briefly presented to this House, and through it to the people of the Colony, what Canada has been doing during the great struggle for our national existence.

Mr. President, I am proud to be able to say that the most brilliant and the greatest achievement that ever took place was last year when the first Canadian Contingent of nearly 33,000 men, 7,500 horses, and 70 pieces of artillery, was the greatest military force that ever crossed the Atlantic. Not only was it the first great force that ever "went back" from the new world, but it was larger than any force that ever came over from Europe in war times from Great Britain, or France, or Spain, or Holland.

Canada was supporting, in fall of 1915, 10,000 beds in France, England, etc., in 16 hospitals, with staffs of 2,000 doctors and over 500 nurses.

The over-subscriptions of the domestic loan—the giving of 100 millions where only 50 millions was asked—is one of the best advertisements that Canada ever had. The raising of this sum in one week in a country of eight million people compares favourably with the undertaking of the United States, with its immense population, in financing the Anglo-French loan of 500 millions.

The Canadian Army Transport Service transported, up to the end of November, 1915, 105,000 Canadian troops and hundreds of nurses without the loss of a single life.

Such is but a very brief outline of what the Dominion of Canada has been able to do for the Mother Country. The half has not been told.

Although I have not at the present time before me detailed information regarding the work done during the past twenty months, I cannot close without paying a tribute, however brief, to the women of Canada for the noble part they have taken in the great struggle for our Imperial and National life and honour, and I can assure this country that the patriotic work done by the women of the Dominion of Canada will compare most favourably with that of any part of the British Empire, and I am sure they will have the everlasting gratitude of both King and Country.

Mr. President, I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without saying a few words on the Commonwealth of Australia, and briefly refer to the part it has taken in the World's War of all Wars, although 11,500 miles from London. The Commonwealth of Australia proclaimed in 1901 consists of six Colonies or original States—New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania. The Legislature consists of the Crown (represented by the Governor General), a Senate of 36 members (six elected by each of the six original States for six years, half retire every three years), and a House of Representatives, numbering more than twice the Senate, and elected every three years. The area is 2,974,581 square miles, or 755,084 less than Canada. Population about 5,000,000, or 3,000,000 less than Canada.

For military purposes, Australia is divided into districts, the boundaries of which are identical with those of the States. Military training is compulsory, beginning with cadets of 12 to 18 years, followed by one year in the citizen forces, after which men remain as citizen soldiers for 7 years. At the age of 26 liability ceases, but men are expected to join existing rifle clubs. The period of training is 16 days, or their equivalent, each year. A new defence scheme based on Earl Kitchener's recommendations was brought into operation in 1911. The total number of men under training when the system is in full operation is estimated at 150,000 cadets and 200,000 citizen soldiers. On June 30th, 1913, the military forces of the Commonwealth showed a total of 173,967 men. The principal groups in this total are as follows:—Regular troops, 2,662; senior cadets, 88,708; rifle clubmen, 49,564; citizen soldiers, 31,281. At the same date the Australian navy had in its service 7,840 men, of whom 3,400 were permanent seamen. The headquarters of the fleet is Sydney. A Military College for the training of officers has been established at Canberra. The navy of Australia, after it is organized according to the agreement of 1911, is to consist of 1 battle cruiser, 3 protected cruisers, 6 destroyers and 2 submarines. This fleet will be one of the three divisions of the Eastern fleet, working in close association with the China and East India squadrons of the Royal Navy, all being under one control in time of war.

The outbreak of war in August caught the Commonwealth in the thick of a general election. A political crisis had arisen, graver in many ways than any that had occurred since federation; for the first time since the Commonwealth came into being a complete and simultaneous dissolution of both Houses of Parliament had taken place and a party campaign of unprecedented violence was in progress. When suddenly the tidings of war came, it was too late to stop the elections, but the situation was changed as if by magic. The government in office was hopelessly defeated, but party politics were at once pushed into the background, and the new Ministry showed itself no

whit behind its predecessor in loyalty to the Empire and helpfulness in the hour of need.

On the eve of war, Mr. Fisher (at that time still leader of the Opposition), declared that Australians would stand behind the Mother Country "to our last man and our last shilling." The Federal Government had already offered to place the vessels of the Australian navy under the control of the British Admiralty, and to dispatch an expeditionary force of 20,000 men. These offers the Imperial Government gladly accepted, and the accession to power a month later of a Labour Ministry under Mr. Fisher in no wise diminished Australia's readiness to put all her resources at the service of the Empire. Huge sums of money flowed in for British and Belgian funds. Volunteers poured in for the expeditionary force, and the reserves with which it was to be supplemented. Gifts in kind, colonial produce of one kind or another, were offered on a lavish scale. On September 11th the Australian navy attacked the German island of New Pommern in the Bismarck Archipelago.

A landing party hoisted the British flag, and after sharp bush fighting captured an important wireless station at Herbertshoe. This success was followed by others in New Guinea and the German possessions in the neighbourhood of Australia. The destruction of the German cruiser Emden by H.M.S. Sydney of the Australian navy aroused immense enthusiasm.

Mr. President, I have found it rather difficult at the present time to get the full details of what Australia has done for the Mother Country. The historian, when the war is over, I have no doubt, will give full credit to that country for the glorious part it has played in our Imperial struggle for right. The women of Australia, like other parts of the Empire, have nobly done their duty. We did expect from the Dominion Commonwealth being a naval and military country, that she would take part in the great Imperial battle in a righteous cause—that part will not soon be forgotten by our King and Country.

Thirty-three million pounds sterling —$165,000,000 for troops alone. Loyal devotion to the Mother Country. It is estimated that Australia with a population of 5,000,000 will be paying her soldiers in June at the rate of over $165,000,000 per annum—plus the cost of maintenance, transport, equipment and waste. This is exclusive of liberal pensions and allowances. The calculation is based on a force of 275,000.

The war in Europe was hardly a week old when the invasion of Cape Colony by German forces was announced on August 10, and several unimportant skirmishes resulted. A German blockhouse at Raman's Drift on the Orange River was surprised and captured on September by a force of the Fourth South African Mounted Rifles. Three days later eight South African Police at Nakob resisted a force of 250 Germans.

Meantime the Government of the Union of South Africa had not been behind in its practical expressions of loyalty. A Union Defence force was raised to replace the Imperial troops, and on September 22 it was announced that General Botha would take supreme command of the operations against German South-West Africa. In undertaking these operations, General Botha declared that his Government was co-operating with the Imperial Government, which had offered, if necessary, to finance the Union to the extent of $7,000,000.

General Botha's expeditionary force scored its first success on September 19, when it captured without resistance the town of Luderitzbucht, or Angra Pequina, as it was formerly

called. A week later Walfish Bay, the British possession on the coast, surrounded by German territory, was raided by a German patrol. On the eastern frontier of German South-West Africa, the Germans also captured the Union police post of Rietfontien.

About the second week of October a great German plot in South Africa was discovered. Lieut.-Col. S. G. Maritz, who had been in command of Union Government forces in the North-West of the Cape Province, sent an ultimatum to the Government threatening to invade the Union unless certain conditions were granted him by 10 a.m. on October 11. Maritz had been in league with the Governor of German South-West Africa, and had been scheming to establish a Republic in South Africa, and to cede Walfish Bay and other territory to the Germans. Prompt measures were taken by the Union Government and on October 12 martial law was proclaimed. On October 26th it was officially announced that Maritz had been completely defeated at Kasamas, and had fled into German territory. Soon after the Union Government learned that the Northern Orange Free State burghers and military requirements were being commandeered under authority of General Christian de Wet, and in the Western Transvaal under authority of General Beyers. Hielbron was seized, and the Government officials taken prisoners. Botha succeeded in routing the commando of Beyers, and scattered his forces on October 27. The same fate befell De Wet's commando early in November. In one of the fights that followed De Wet was wounded. The Government determined to deal with the matter with a firm hand, and mobilized large forces. The very great majority of the citizens were loyal and detested the very idea of rebellion.

New Zealand.

New Zealand was to the fore with offers of assistance, and as elsewhere throughout the Empire, there was no question of party politics. The naval forces of the Dominion were handed over to the Imperial Admiralty, and it was decided to send 8,000 men to the theatre of war in Europe. While preparations for this were being made, an expeditionary force was sent to Samoa, and on August 29 this received the surrender of Apia in German Samoa.

Mr. President, my hon. friend, Mr. Milley, to my right, struck the keynote when he said, the part that is being played in the great drama of the World's War, Newfoundland is better known to-day in all parts of the British Empire than ever before in our history, because of what this country has done and is doing in our great struggle for freedom.

Mr. President, what have we been doing in Newfoundland? "We pay our way." I am sure it must be very gratifying to the Government and to the people of the country to learn that so far we have been able, like other Colonies of the Empire and our Allies, with the assistance of the British Government, to meet our obligations as we go along. The number of men which left this Colony for Active Service, 1937, less 145, which includes those who have paid the supreme price for King and Country, leaving the total number of men on active service at the present time, 1792.

Mr. President, we are not a Military or Naval Colony. We are simply England's Oldest Colony, who responded nobly at the outbreak of war like other portions of the British Empire, and gave of our best—the youngest and brightest assets of the country—"our young men." Over three thousand men, between the Volunteer Force and our Royal Naval Reserve

have left our shores since the outbreak of war. At the present time in their various positions of trust and responsibility they are doing their duty for King and Country, fighting for Great Britain's honour, protection of the Empire, and our very existence. We hope before long the total number who will have answered the Royal Proclamation will have reached 5,000. Four hundred young men are in training now, and will soon be ready to go forward.

I am sure the statement here submitted to this House, and through it to the people of this country who take an interest in the financing of our military forces will get some idea at least—the cost in money we pay for war—what about the priceless cost of human blood?

It is very difficult to make an estimate as to what the cost of this war will be to the people of this country, but I am sure I only echo the voice of the population throughout the Island that this generation and those to follow will gladly pay their mite, and rejoice to know that the sons of this land did their duty, fought for King, Country and protection of the British Empire. Is the end of the war in sight? I am no prophet, but I believe it's not many months away. The German Empire is tottering to destruction in human blood, and financially the strain upon the people is becoming too great. They see nothing but ruin and degradation before them. The German Empire's commercial standing is forever gone—nothing will save it. Their peace will be a peace of disgrace and distrust of the German nation throughout the British Empire and our Allies.

Mr. President, the volunteer movement in this country, and the voluntary work done by the various committees associated with it are deserving of the best thanks of our people, for the great interest and splendid achievement that has been done since the outbreak of war. It would be very difficult for me to mention any one name who has done more work than another in connection with our Volunteer Force, but I think that I might be allowed to mention the great interest that has been taken by His Excellency Sr Walter Davidson, K.C.M.G., Governor of this Colony, and Captain A.G. Montgomerie, and many others that might be added. It is estimated that every volunteer who enlisted and was sent forward will cost the Colony $600 for the first year, as follows:

Pay (365 days at $1.10) ..	$401.50
Board while training, (sixty days at 50c.)	30.00
Equipment, St. John's	50.00
Passage to England	40.00
Incidentals	78.50
Total	600.00

Statement of Expenditure to March 31st, 1916.

Received from Treasury—$1,116,948.-73. 7

Sundry Cash Repayment—$5,713.36.

Paid directly by Finance Department ac. transportation—$23,179,98.

Paid for Equipment—$134,849,54.

Regimental Pay (a)—$577,656.71.

Allotments—$321,363.59.

Transportation—$87,513.51.

Adv. Staty. and Pkg.—$1,792.28.

Board and Lodging—$1,383.64.

Home Defence (b)—$6,432.37.

Musketry Inst.—$3,902.78.

Medicines—$1,068.93.

Fuel and Light—$1,071.98.

Incidentals—$6,457.29.

Cash on hand—$129.42.

Total—$1,145,842.07.

(a) includes transfers to London, a portion of which has been used for other purposes than "pay."

(b) pay of men who were engaged on the northern patrol.

The above statement shows the actual receipts and expenditures as shown in the regimental books to March 31st, but does not include the allotments for the month of March, which were not paid until April 7th, 1916, and which amount approximately $29,000.00.

For the statistical information which I have been able to gather and put together, I cordially express my sincere thanks to Mr. Howley, the efficient head of the Statistical Department of the Volunteers.

Under Act 5, Cap. 8.

Volunteer Force Loan—$491,582.48 at 3½ per cent.

Volunteer Force Loan—$512,280.70, at 4 per cent.

Volunteer Force Loan—$1,000,000.00 at 5 per cent.

Total—$2,003,863.18.

Total expenditure to March 31st, 1916—$1,145,842.07.

Credit balance in favour of Volunteer Force Loan—$858,021.11.

Total—$2,003,863.18.

Credit balance, March 31st, 1916—$858,021.11.

Mr. President: The following statement will give the people of the Colony an idea of what we have been doing in the Royal Naval Reserve. There is no compulsion in Newfoundland for either military or the naval reserve—each young man can join as he likes.

The financial agreement entered into with the Admiralty when the naval reserve was first established, limited the liability of the Government of this Colony to a payment of £3,000—$15,000 per annum. That agreement still holds good, and the financial liability involved in an increase of reservists is met by His Majesty's Government.

The following information, although published some time ago in the local press, should be at the present time of great interest to our soldiers of the country and their friends. The editorial notes of "The People"— a newsy little paper published at the Royal Gazette Office, says: "We know there are some clergymen in the Colony, and they are found in all denominations, who have defined and fostered the sense of national duty in their people, and we have seen the result in the ready recruits from their missions that have filled up our naval reserve and our first battalion. Let us instance a little picturesque village not far from St. John's, where a stalwart loyalist and Canon of the Anglican Church had taught his people their duty to God and their King, and from which between 30 and 40 young men joined the naval reserve. If such parsons had been found all round this outpost of empire what a different show we might have made in our extern districts to that which appears below, and which is almost heart-breaking in its evidence of unenlightened indifference. We understand that the Patriotic Association are endeavouring now to enlist the clergy in an effort to bring home to our young men a greater sense of their privileges and responsibilities as British Office, and if they (the clergy), take it up in a proper spirit they can create a whirlwind crusade that will sweep this ancient colony into line with the other overseas dominions, whose sons have known their duty and have nobly dared to do it."

Our soldiers and sailors are still in the thick of battle, doing duty for their King and Country. In proportion to the number of our men gone abroad we have every reason to feel proud of the honors we have received so far. Leander Green among the sailors has gained the Conspicuous Service Medal, and among our soldiers Captain J. J. Donnelly the Military Cross, and Sergt. Greene and Pte.

Hynes have won the Distinguished Conduct Medal.

Mr. President, the Patriotic Fund I very much fear is not properly understood. This fund, as I understand it, will be applied entirely in this country. I think the Committee in charge of the Patriotic Fund should decide to what purpose this amount will be applied, and again appeal to the country for subscriptions. This fund should reach at least $500,000. In Canada the Patriotic Fund is reaching $10,000,000. I have no doubt at least both these funds will be applied in much the same way. So far the Trustees of the Patriotic Fund have done good work by assisting worthy cases to the amount of about $20,000—in this way to augment if possible the resources of the families of Volunteers and Reservists who have gone on active service, where such families are unable to maintain themselves without such aid, to assist men invalided from active service until they can secure employment or until the State makes provision for them by pension or otherwise; to assist widows and other dependents of those who lose their lives while in active service, until they become beneficiaries of Legislative enactment; to afford help in such cases as do not come within the scope of the Legislative enactment but which have a moral claim upon the generosity of the public. The following statement shows the Patriotic Fund at the present time, or up to a very recent date:

Patriotic Fund, 31st March, 1916.

Contributions	$101,586.80
Canadian Repayments ...	2,779.99
Nfld. Repayments	25.00
Interest	4,938.74
Total amount	$109,330.53

From the Patriotic Fund two hundred and twenty-nine persons have received assistance:

229 Nfld. Beneficiaries ..	$ 16,717.00
Canadian Beneficiaries ..	2,811.99
Sundry expenses	477.60
Balance on hand	89,323.94
	$109,33053

The contributions to the fund is about 40c. per head of the population of the whole island.

The Aeroplane Fund amounted to $53,564.45, and "Our Day," or Red Cross Fund, $11,184.33. The amount contributed to the Belgian Relief Fund, $7,214.37. The Cot Fund is now about $20,000, and the Ladies' Patriotic Committee of Grand Falls have arranged to be responsible for the maintenance of two Grand Falls beds until the end of the war. The Cot Fund, as it is understood, means the supplying of a bed for the wounded. This Colony was asked to supply £100, or $500, for one bed. At the present time we are supplying for thirty beds. It is hoped this will be kept up until the end of the war at a cost of $150 per week for each ward. The balance to the credit of the Cot Fund, is about $2,000. The secretary of this fund informed me a few days ago that Burin Patriotic Association has written to him that they intend to support one cot until the end of the war. He also informed me that the sealers had contributed over $1,-500 to this worthy cause. A comfortable bed for our wounded—the greatest donations for this purpose has been contributed by the school children throughout the country, amounting to $5,000. One hundred and ten field glasses have been forwarded from this country to the seat of war. The sum of $1,295 was forwarded to Paris for distribution and relief of Belgian and French refugees.

The Mayo-Lind Fund initiated by

Hon. J. Alex. Robinson has provided tobacco of our own country manufacture for our own soldiers and sailors, and cost $1,835.50; other funds subscribed $1,207.95.

Mr. President, I find it most difficult to give a complete idea of the vast amount of work that has been done by the Patriotic Association of the women of Newfoundland. So much has been done in all parts of the country. I have compiled a few interesting facts that give but a faint idea of the enormous work. In addition to the work of the Association a great deal of private knitting and useful garments have been sent direct to our boys. From the excellent report of last year I take a few facts that are not known to the general public. At the first meeting called twenty months ago nearly 700 women in every station of life signed their names as willing workers for our soldiers and sailors of the Empire. At the time of the last report there were 151 branches, at the present time there are 198 branches, in different parts of the country. During the first year of the Women's Patriotic Association there were five shipments of useful garments of all kinds sent to London for distribution. The articles were 17,843 pairs of socks, 2,833 flannel shirts, 1,839 pillow slips, 760 pairs of mitts, 1,614 handkerchiefs, 1,130 mufflers, 842 night shirts, 791 house wives, 727 cholera belts, 677 pillows, 357 pyjamas, 143 Balaclava helmets, 125 surgical socks, 64 bed jackets, 24 bed socks, 8 sheets, and for hospital committee: bandages (various kinds), 3,500; dressings for 6,742.

During the past year, under the able guidance of Lady Davidson and her hon. secretary, Mrs. Cluny Macpherson, and the Hon. Treas., Mrs. Emerson, assisted by a staff of willing workers amounting to over 6,000 members, have had a busy year.

In the last report issued by the Hospital Committee, I find the following work has been accomplished: 5,424 bandages of every description, 428 binders, 1,020 swabs, 104 pneumonia jackets, 23 flannel shirts for fever cases, 21,860 sterilized dressings.

Besides the above items the following excellent work was sent forward by the Grand Falls Hospital Committee for shipment: 95 pneumonia jackets, 110 gauze bandages, 56 triangular bandages.

They have also forwarded 72 operation stockings, 152 pillow cases, 186 white fleecy calico shirts, and many other useful garments for our lads from our Island home. Packing and Shipping Committee. The number of goods received from the branches are as follows: Mitts, 2,344; shirts, 468; night shirts, 128; rifle covers, 200; scarves, 50; pillows, 6; socks, 5,431.

Mr. President, I am not in any way overestimating the work done by the Women's Patriotic Association when I state $250,000 would not pay for the work and gifts sent from Newfoundland to British soldiers and our Allies, in addition to individual soldiers and sailors of our own country.

Every shipment except one since the opening in September last has been sent to the Newfoundland Pay and Record Office, London, to be sent to the 1st Newfoundland Regiment The total number of goods forwarded is as follows: Gun covers, 1030; shirts, 5,471; mitts, 2,020; socks, 11,040 pairs. There are also about 1,900 pairs of socks, 120 shirts, 90 night shirts, 440 mitts, 110 rifle covers, 160 scarves, and many nurses from this Colony.

I find it, Mr. President, a very difficult task to express in words what this country owes to the Women's Patriotic Association for the marvellous amount of work they have accomplished during the past 20 months preparing and making comforts for

our soldiers and sailors of the Empire. All I can say is—they deserve the best thanks of King and Country for the willing and voluntary work they have accomplished during the past twenty months.

Mr. President, what is the future of our National debt? How much can this Colony bear?

The debt last year, $30,450,765.27, and the total funded debt to date, including the volunteer loan. etc., $34,673,261.78.

$ 1,581,666.66 at 3 per cent.
19,397,129.13 at 3½ per cent.
9,637,799.33 at 4 per cent.
360,000.00 at 4 4½ per cent.
3,446,666.66 at 5 per cent.
$250,000.00 at 5 ½ per cent.
Total,—$34,573,261.78.
Total interest,—$1,356,446.21.

When the war is over, when the great balance sheet of this country has to be settled, there is one thing we must bear in mind for many years to come—there will be no more cheap money. Gilt edge securities at a high rate of interest will be offered to investors in all parts of the world. Our present National Debt is about $138 per head of the population. This is not a very large debt when we consider the average wealth of the country.

I will now draw your attention to a National Debt of $40,000,000 and what it would mean to the taxpayers of the Colony. In interest alone the difference between our present debt and $40,000,000 is $5,326,738.20, at 5½ per cent., $292,970.91—add to the present interest total, $1,649,416.21. Such may be the price in money that we will yet have to pay for the Empire's honour, and the nation's liberty in addition to the priceless value of our young men who have paid the penalty for love of country and the protection of our island home.

I am going to show the taxpayers of our island home what it would cost the people of the country on future loans increasing from five to ten million dollars, added to our National Debt at $45,000,000 interest on increased loans, 5½. On $45,000,000 the interest would be $1,924,416.21, and if we have to bear the strain and pay interest on $50,000,000, the interest cost to the country would be $2,199,461.21.

I have put before this House the meaning of taxation in England; I have shown you what Canada has done for the Mother Country, and the half is not told—India, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa—every one of our Sister Colonies—all parts of the British Empire taking part, and in proportion to their wealth and population, doing their best to crush our enemies.

Newfoundland is not a large country, but loyal to the core. We are not a military or naval Colony. We have given and volunteered our best, given freely and gratuitously of the best our citizens could do. We feel proud of the part taken by Newfoundland. To those who have made sacrifices on land and sea their contribution has been great, but the part they have played will forever be remembered by a grateful country. They took a brilliant part in the nation's struggle for honour and justice, and we hope at an early date for a glorious victory to the British Empire, and her loyal Allies, when the nations of the earth will realize the time has come when all the armies of the world will turn their spears into pruning hooks, and the art of war shall be no more.

Lord! let war's trumpets cease,
Fold the whole world in peace
Under Thy wing.
Make all the Nations one,
All hearts beneath the sun,
Till Thou shalt reign alone,
Great King of Kings.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the Revenue Bill was read a third time and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message intimating that the House had passed the same without amendment.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

A couple of years ago the Board elected by the citizens was upon a largely signed petition of ratepayers, abolished by a special Act of the Legislature and a Board of twelve members was appointed in their stead. That Board has continued in office and the object of this Bill is to abolish the Board and make provision for an election to be held in June by citizens under the Act now in existence and it also makes provision that a question of whether the Ward System or an election of the Council shall be adopted by the city and that a plebiscite for that purpose be held in the month of September. It is unnecessary to go into any lengthy explanation of the matter or its object and I therefore move its second reading.

The Bill was then read a second time. On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on the Bill, Hon. Mr. Angel in the Chair.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—I have heard nothing to justify the additional expense which will be placed on the city if this bill passes in its present form. What reason can there possibly be to justify us in holding two elections when one would do quite as well. My motion is that the first part of section 4 be deleted and the following words take its place—"At "the said election there shall also be "submitted to the vote of the rate "payers of St. John's the following "question." That Section 5 be deleted and sections 6 and 7 be left as they are now. I signed the Report of the Joint Select Committee with one reservation. That is the reservation. The Bill is all that can be desired under the circumstances, but if the people are not intelligent enough to vote on the question in the month of June they will not be intelligent enough in the month of September. I make this move with the idea of registering my vote against the unnecessary waste and extravagance.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—I concur in the remarks made in this matter by Hon. Mr. Robinson. I fail to see why we should have the election in June and the plebiscite in September. In the Estimates for the year provision is made for the election and I think the plebiscite could be held at the same time and only the same cost would be incurred.

As a member of the Civic Commission who took office with the others on the 1st. July 1914, I feel I need not remind the House that during the period of two years there has been a vast amount of time, labor and attention devoted to the preparation of the Charter by the members who met night after night for a period of two years. But after all this expenditure of labor and time on the part of business men, what do they get? From a certain section of the press most uncharitable criticism. I believe in giving matters of that kind fair and honest criticism but this received the reverse. I question very much if you will get anothr dozen men who for two years will give their best time in the interests of the town. The public will never know the amount of work which has been done by Mr. Gosling, the Chairman of that Commission and the time he has given to every section of the Charter. I will also say that if the city realized the great amount of work done by Mr. Bradshaw it would be a great surprise to many. He has taken more

interst in trying to purify and cleanse the town than anyone else in its history. We had 120 regular meetings of the Commission in addition to 60 special meetings. We had Charter meetings 80, Committee meetings 50 and finance meetings twice a month or in the two years between 300 and 400 meetings, and each not less than 2 and 3 hours at a sitting.

If that succeeds in reducing the fire insurance premiums by $50,000 it will be of great benefit. As regards Mr. Longley, it was in the interests of the city to get the best man,and he was the man selected and all must admit that he did this work faithfully and well. I would have liked to see the charter receiving a greater amount of attention and criticism than it did, but unfortunately the time was not at the disposal of the Government or the Committee, and I do think the best that could be done was done. There is another matter to which I should like to refer. A great amount of hostility exists between some of the city tax-payers and the Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Slattery. I think Mr. Slattery is a very excellent official and has done good work and should anything happen to him to-morrow, although it is said you can always find somebody else to fill a man's place, it would be long before you could get another like him. Then there is the Solicitor, Mr. Frank Morris, and the City Engineer, and Mr. Conroy, permanent officials of the staff, all good men, but the chief cause for efficiency is Mr. Gosling, who has spared no time or efforts to do good work, and has given great care and attention to the town, and I hope some day it will be fully recognized what he has done both in the collection of the revenue and the expenditure.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I just want to say that we met here a very large committee and almost the entire Board of Commissioners and agreed that the election and the plebiscite should be held together; then we met again at the request of the Commissioners and they unanimously presented to that meeting a request that the plebiscite on the subject of the ward system should not be taken at the same time as the election for the Council be held. Several of the Commissioners spoke, the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Gosling read a capital paper proving it was undesirable to have both elections at the same time, and as I understand it, Hon. Mr. Anderson got up and supported it. Am I right or am I wrong?

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—You are wrong.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—The point made by the Commissioners was this; that we could deal with the question of ward elections by itself; that the whole charter was based on the principle of ward elections, and it was illustrated that if we took a number of sections the ward question was concerned in all of them. On that representation, and on that solely, this joint committee agreed they would not press the matter because the commissioners felt so strongly thereon, and it was stated, as I recollect it, that as the cost of a plebiscite would be only about $1,600 it was thought better to spend a little more than to run the risk of having this town decide on broad lines what would be done. Under these circumstances I am going to support the request of the Commissioners.

HON. MR. ANDERSON.—I should like to say that I attended that conference; but it took us two years to discuss that charter, and it takes the citizens about ten minutes. I fail to see how people between June and September are going to understand what it took two years to understand.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—In view of the explanation given by hon. Mr. Harvey, I beg to withdraw my amendment.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—I am going to move a new section to the bill for the purpose of continuing in existence the present board until the bill presented during the present session of the Legislature has been finally disposed of. It has been pointed out that in view of the time, attention and study that the present board has given to the recommendations they have submitted to the government in the form of a bill, it would be unwise to deprive the city of their services in explaining that bill, to the joint committee of the legislature, and for the purpose of making such further recommendations as they may think proper in the general welfare of the city. They will not have power to interfere with the government of the city in any way, but we shall have the benefit of their advice and counsel which would be most valuable in view of their two years' study of conditions.

The amendment was carried.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment, which report was received, and, on motion, the bill was then read a third time, passed and was ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the bill with some amendment and asking their concurrence in the same.

MESSAGES FROM ASSEMBLY.

HON. PRESIDENT announced a message from the Assembly that they had passed the resolutions sent up and thereto annexed with an amendment in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Harvey the resolutions as amended were read, passed and a message sent to the Assembly that this house concurred in the same.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

HON. PRESIDENT announced a message from the Assembly that they had passed the amendment in and upon the bill entitled An Act respecting Weights and Measures with some amendment in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop, the amendments were read and passed, and a message sent the Assembly that this House concurred in the same.

SEALING BILL.

HON. PRESIDENT announced a message from the Assembly that they had passed the amendments of the Council to the Sealing Bill with some amendment, in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the said amendments were read and passed and a message sent the Assembly that this house had concurred in the same.

EXPORTATION OF TIMBER BILL.

HON. PRESIDENT announced a message of the Assembly that they had passed the Council's amendments on the Exportation of Timber Bill without amendment.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL.

HON. JOHN ANDERSON.—I beg leave to introduce a bill entitled An Act respecting certain changes in the hours of the Day and Night.

Hon. gentleman was given leave accordingly, and the bill was read a second time.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—I beg to move an amendment that the bill be read a second time this day six months.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—The hon. gentleman might be allowed to explain the bill.

HON. MR. ROBINSON.—The hon. gentleman has already spoken. It is most unfair to bring in such a bill at this late hour

HON. MR. MILLEY.—I notice today in the telegraphic news from the Old Country that such a bill is about to be adopted there and I understand that is the reason the hon. gentleman has brought in this measure here now. I know it is rather late to do so, but think under the circumstances he might be allowed to do so. If this bill is adopted in the Old Country it will make a difference with us here in telegraphing. I do not know exactly the nature of the bill, but presume it is the old bill introduced in this house some few years ago, with a new section which provides that the bill would not go in force here unless it is passed in England. I just merely make that explanation as my hon. friend was not allowed to speak more than once on the second reading.

HON. MR. HARVEY.—I am very strongly in favor of this measure, and think it most unfortunate the Hon. Mr. Robinson would not allow the hon. gentleman to explain it. Why he did not do so when he introduced it, I do not know. As I understand the bill it puts forward the clock an hour in June and back again in September and does not come in force unless adopted in Great Britain. I do not think it would be a mistake it this colony followed the lead of Great Britain in this matter; I think the whole principle is correct; it is a saving in every way, and gives this Colony what we want more than anything else an extra hour of sunlight. I think that the extra hour of sunlight will do a large amount of good, and there is no question that it is an economical Bill and it will save people light and oil, save their eyes and give more time to handle the products of the country. I am very strongly in favour of it and would be happy to see it go through for it will add to the happiness, wealth and health of the Colony. How absolutely artificial is our present method of regulating ourselves by a clock, which has no reference whatever to the actions of the heavens; and instead of getting up with the sun and going to bed with the sun as we were intended, we fly in the face of nature. I look upon the Bill as an effort to some extent to get back to the conditions of Nature.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Like my hon. friend, Mr. Robinson, I think that this Bill should have been brought to the notice of the House before in order that it may be discussed. There are a great many people in the country who do not agree with the Bill. I think legislation of the kind is not suitable to the country. One of the reasons why legislation of this character found its way on the Statute Book of other countries is because conditions differ from those obtaining here. It was found necessary that something should be done. The greater portion of our people do not work in factories and mines and so do not require more sunlight. A very large proportion of our people live in the open air the greater part of their lives. My hon. friend at my right says we have not sunlight enough in this country. We have more sunlight here than in England, Ireland or Scotland, and the conditions between this country and these are far apart and I consider it a mistake for us to think that one can apply such legislation here successfully. If it had been brought in earlier, and the matter had been discussed and enquiries made as to the necessity for it, I might have been prepared to support it, but at present I cannot.

HON. MR. BISHOP—I rise to express my opinion that the introducer

of the measure is not out of order in attempting to speak to this Bill. We are now under suspended rules and, as we know, it is customary for anyone introducing a Bill, to explain it on the first reading and not on the second reading. I regret that the Bill has been presented at this late hour, because I feel it is not possible now for it to receive the attention that it should receive and a discussion would arise naturally, and therefore I think my hon. friend will have to defer it until next session, when, should a similar Bill become operative in England, no doubt then we could consider it and possibly be ready to adopt it here. I was not here when this matter was discussed in this Chamber some years ago, but had I been I should have opposed the measure as it did not appear to me then to be in the best interest of conditions here. But I have changed my opinion as regards that, and I am now convinced that no interest will suffer,and that the measure would act beneficially. I think, however, that under present conditions and at this late hour when it is the intention to close the session to-morrow that the hon. gentleman had better defer the Bill.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—I must apologise to the House for having introduced a Bill at this late hour in the session. My sole reason for doing so is that at a very largely attended meeting at the Guildhall, London, last March there was a very large vote taken upon the question, and I question very much if there was a dissentient voice upon it. But my reason for bringing it in is that in the message from London today it is stated that a Daylight Saving Bill will probably be adopted by the British Government. Now if that is correct, and the British Government should adopt it in the Old Country, what does it mean? We are 3½ hours behind England now, and if they adopt this bill we will be 4½ hours, and it promises serious complications in the telegraphic correspondence of business people. When it is 12 o'clock here it will be 4.30 in England, and if you want to send a cable to the Old Country you must send it early in the morning to get a reply. My hon. friend sees through different spectacles, but I tell him there is coming a time when we must realize its utility whether we adopt it or not. In other towns and countries it is considered the best bill introduced in the history of the world, and this is my sole reason in bringing it in. And further than that although it is similar to the last bill, I have added another section, 6, providing that this Act shall come into force provided that the Imperial Parliament shall adopt similar legislation with regard to England. I have no desire to press it. I thought probably that we would adopt it and that if passed in this House, the members of the Lower House would understand the position and would also pass it. I must now ask leave to withdraw it however.

HON. MR. ANGEL—I think the bill came before the House some two or three years ago and was fully discussed some being in favour of it and some against it. From an industrial standpoint, I think it will be good. I can see no objection to the Bill. Getting up a little earlier in the morning will not hurt us a bit. If this bill interfered with the rights of people or did injury or damage to any section of the people. I would be opposed to it. People in the outports have got to get up at four, and sometimes stay up all night, so the Bill does not affect them in the slightest. In any industrial parts of the country, however, such as in St. John's particularly, it would be of material benefit. We seem to split straws on matters of this kind which are of no importance and very often will have bills passed detrimental to the people, while here is a bill

which cannot injure any one and yet we want to reject it. This matter was fully discussed in this house some time ago, and was looked upon at the time something like the 'Great Eastern' of 22,000 tons was looked upon. She was before her time; now we have ships of 50,000 tons and they are a success, and this Bill of Hon. Mr. Anderson may be also successful not only in England, but also in Newfoundland. If it reaches the Committee, I will vote for it.

HON. MR. ROBINSON—As there is now another motion before the House, I think I am at liberty to speak again. If the hon. gentleman or any other hon. member thinks I was guilty of discourtesy in questioning his speaking the second time, I wish to say that I regret it. No discourtesy was intended. But I do think that a discourtesy is perpetrated on this House when the hon. member takes advantage of the suspension of the rules to introduce a bill which, though he may think it of an uncontroversial character, others may look upon as a dangerous experiment. I must protest against the suspension of the rules being used to push legislation through the House. If the hon. gentleman says the bill has been thoroughly discussed, I would remind him that the House rejected it, and if it comes up again we should get ample time to consider it. I am opposed to the bill, but not so much to it as to the taking advantage of the dying hours of the session to bring in such a bill. I am glad the hon. gentleman has consented to withdraw the bill.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

HON. PRESIDENT announced a message from the House of Assembly that they had passed the amendment sent down in and upon the bill sent up entitled: "An Act respecting Municipal Affairs in the town of St. John's" without amendment, also that they had passed the accompanying resolutions in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

On motion, the resolutions were read by the Clerk, and Hon. Mr. Bishop moved that this House do concur in the same, and that a message be sent to the Assembly to that effect.

HON. MR. BISHOP tabled the report of Public Schools under the Methodist Boards for year ending December 31st, 1915.

Here the House took recess from 5.30 to 6 p.m.

HON. MR. GIBBS—Before the motion for adjournment, I desire to draw the attention of the House to the young men who are acting as reporters for this Chamber. During this session, and particularly during the latter part of it, a great deal of work has fallen upon their shoulders, and work of a character, with all due deference to others, does not receive that amount of remuneration which it might. One of the reporters informs me that since the 24th of this month up to the beginning of today's proceedings, he had 31 half hours work which had accumulated which will require many more hours to transcribe. In the lower branch, I understand they have 7 reporters as against the two here, and the volume of work for them in this Chamber is practically equal to to that entailed on the reporters of the other House. I make this appeal especially to hon. members here who are members of the Internal Economy Commission, believing that they will secure for them a proper recognition for services faithfully performed.

HON. MR. ANDERSON—It affords me pleasure to support the appeal made by Hon. Mr. Gibbs on behalf of the two reporters of this Chamber. I agree with him that their work which has accumulated this session, particulalry, during the last few days has

been enormous. I also would ask that the hon. gentlemen in this Chamber, members of the Internal Economy Commission would bring the case of these two men before that body.

HON. MR. BISHOP—The matter to which both the hon gentlemen have referred, will be represented to the Internal Economy Commission.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bishop the House adjourned until 2.30 to-morrow evening.

THURSDAY, May 4th.

The House met at 2.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

At 3 p.m. His Excellency the Governor arrived, and the members of the House of Assembly having been summoned to the Bar of the House, gave his formal consent to the various Bills passed during the session, after which the session was prorogued.

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY.
Motion for, 5, 16.
Committee on, 15

ARTICLES OF COMMERCE POSSESSION BILL, 21, 22, 28, 32, 37.

ANGEL, HON. J.
On Resolutions of Condolence, Hon. J. Harris, etc., 4
Shipbuilding Bill, 77, 93.
Herring Fishery Bill, 109.
Education Bill, 136.
Sealing Bill, 153, 160.
Timber Exportation Bill, 190, 196.
Daylight Savings Bill, 226.

ANDERSON, HON. J.
On Article of Commerce Possession Bill, 31, 33, 35.
Passenger Accommodation Bill, 46.
Trawl Fishery Bill, 63, 108.
Education Bill, 91, 103, 123.
Shipbuilding Bill, 93.
Herring Fishery Bill, 197.
Sealing Bill, 119, 120, 138, 150, 155, 172, 178, 181, 183.
Loan Bill, 197.
Revenue Bill, 199.
Municipal Bill, 222, 223.
Daylight Savings Bill, 224, 226.
Reporters and Reporting, 227.

BISHOP, HON. R. K.
On Resolutions of Condolence, Hon. J. Harris, etc., 3
Sealing Prosecution Bill, 20.
Labrador Railway Bill, 21.

War Measures Bill, 22.
Articles of Commerce Possession Bill, 22, 28, 33.
Control of Trading Bill, 36.
Trawl Fishing Bill, 38, 40, 44, 45, 62, 63.
Carbonear Rebuilding Bill, 41.
Passenger Accommodation Bill, 41, 46.
Volunteer Force Bill, 47.
Education Bill, 54, 67, 68, 82, 85, 101, 104, 122.
Local Affairs Bill, 76.
Shipbuilding Bill, 76, 93.
Herring Fishery Bill, 79, 108, 112.
Weights and Measures Bill, 92, 107.
Sealing Bill, 120, 121, 143, 151, 153, 155, 172, 173, 176, 182.
Prohibition Bill, 180.
Timber Exportation Bill, 191, 195, 197 .
Sawmills Bill, 197.
Loan Bill, 197.
Daylight Savings Bill, 225.
Reporters and Reporting, 228.

BLANDFORD, HON. S. D.
On Resolutions of Condolence, Hon. J. Harris, etc., 4
Patent Bill, 94, 118.
Sealfishery Bill, 158, 171, 185.
Education Bill, 96.
Timber Exportation Bill, 192, 196.

CODLIVER OIL BILL, 198.

COMPANIES (GOVT. GUARANTEE) BILL, 76, 95, 113.

CARBONEAR REBUILDING BILL, 38, 41, 46.

CONDOLENCE, RESOLUTIONS OF.
On Death Hon. J. Harris, Judge Emerson, M. W. Furlong.

CONTROL OF TRADING BILL, 32, 36, 37, 38.

DAYLIGHT SAVINGS BILL, 224.

DEATH DUTIES BILL, 185, 197.

EDUCATION BILL, 38, 54, 63, 81, 83, 96, 107, 122, 136, 198.

GIBBS, HON. M. P.
On Trawl Fishery Bill, 44.
Marriage Facility Bill, 60.
Education Bill, 69, 86, 88, 96, 136.
Herring Fishery Bill, 108.
Inflammable Substances Bill, 113, 114.
Patents Bill, 114.
Sealing Bill, 119, 121, 123, 136, 138, 146, 149, 152, 153, 154, 155, 161, 166, 170, 171, 173, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185.
Prohibition Bill, 187, 188.
Timber Exportation Bill, 189, 194, 195, 196, 197.
Municipal Bill, 222, 224.
Daylight Savings Bill, 225.
Reporters and Reporting, 227.

GOODRIDGE, HON. A. F.
On Resolutions of Condolence, Hon. J. Harris, etc., 4
Motion for Address in Reply, 5.
Trawl Fishing Bill, 38, 44, 62, 63.
Passenger Accommodation Bill, 46.
Shipbuilding Bill, 76, 93.
Sealing Bill, 119, 141, 166, 171, 176, 179.

HARVEY, HON. J.
On Motion for Address in Reply, 13, 15.
Articles of Commerce Possession Bill, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37.
Passenger Accommodation Bill, 47.
Education Bill, 60, 63, 82, 85, 89, 92, 99, 100, 104, 137.
Trawl Fishery Bill, 63.
Shipbuilding Bill, 78.
Herring Fishery Bill, 81.
Weights and Measures Bill, 106.
Inflammable Oils Bill, 114.
Sealing Bill, 120, 129, 152, 153, 154, 160, 172, 173, 183, 184, 185.
Timber Exportation Bill ,190, 195.
Dating of Bills, 198.

Municipal Bill, 223.
Daylight Savings Bill, 224, 225.

HERRING FISHERY BILL, 61, 79, 108.

INFLAMMABLE SUBSTANCES BILL, 76, 113.

KNOWLING, HON. G.
On Trawl Fishing Bill, 108.
Herring Fishery Bill, 111.
Sealing Bill, 152.

LABRADOR RAILWAY BILL, 21, 28, 31.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL, 54, 76, 93, 96.

LOAN BILL, 185, 197.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS BILL, 185, 222, 227.

MOVING PICTURES CENSORSHIP BILL, 185.

MARRIAGE FACILITY BILL, 45, 60, 76, 83.

MURPHY, HON. J. J.
On Motion for Address in Reply, 10.
Weights and Measures Bill, 105, 107, 122.
Sealing Bill, 160, 172.
Timber Exportation Bill, 189, 195.

MILLEY, HON. S.
On Volunteer Force Bill, 47.
Daylight Savings Bill, 225.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS BILL, 21, 27, 31.

POWER, HON. M.
On Resolutions of Condolence, Hon. J. Harris, etc., 4
Herring Fishery Bill, 110.
Sealing Bill, 153, 166.
Timber Exportation Bill, 194

PASSENGER ACCOMMODATION BILL, 38, 41, 46.

PATENTS BILL, 76, 94, 114.

PENSION BILL, 122.

PETITIONS.
Hon. J. Anderson, 118.
PUBLIC SERVICE BILL, 145, 180.
PROHIBITION BILL, 145, 180.
PRESIDENT, THE HON. (HON. P. T. McGRATH).
On Motion for Address in Reply, 16.
Articles of Commerce Possession Bill, 29, 31, 34, 36.
Trawl Fishery Bill, 43, 45, 62.
Passenger Accommodation Bill, 47.
Education Bill, 85, 86, 97, 100, 102, 103.
Patents Bill, 115.
Sealing Bill, 149, 151, 155, 162, 170, 171, 172, 173, 176, 178, 179, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185.
Prohibition Bill, 187.
Timber Exportation Bill, 192, 196.
QUESTIONS.
Hon. J. Anderson, 37.
ROBINSON, HON. J. ALEX.
On Motion for Address in Reply, 14.
Articles of Commerce Possession Bill, 35.
Trawl Fishing Bill, 39, 62, 63.
Volunteer Force Bill, 52.
Education Bill, 55, 67, 69, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 90, 96, 99, 102, 103, 104, 136, 137, 198.
Shipbuilding Bill, 79, 93.
Sealing Bill, 120, 121, 122, 153, 154, 172, 176, 179, 182.
Prohibition Bill, 186.
Timber Exportation Bill, 195.
Municipal Bill, 222, 224.
Daylight Savings Bill, 224, 225, 227.
RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL, 83.
RULES SUSPENDED, 107.
REVENUE BILL, 185, 199.
SALVATION ARMY BILL, 21, 22, 31.
STATUTES REVISION BILL, 38, 41, 60.

SQUIRES, HON. R. A. (Minister of Justice.)
Moves Resolution of Condolence, 4.
On Salvation Army Bill, 22.
Naturalization of Aliens Bill, 27.
Articles of Commerce Possession Bill, 29.
Statutes Revision Bill, 41.
Union Power Incorporation Bill, 42.
Patents Bill, 94, 95, 116.
Companies (Govt. Guarantee) Bill, 95.
Education Bill, 123.
Sealing Bill, 152, 154, 179, 183.

SHIPBUILDING ENCOURAGEMENT BILL, 61, 76, 93, 96.

SEALING PROSECUTION BILL, 20.

SEALING BILL, 118, 123, 138, 145, 155, 224.

SAWMILLS BILL, 145, 197.

SELECT COMMITTEES .
On Address in Reply, 15.
Sealing Bill, 20.
Municipal Affairs Bill, 45.
Patents Bill, 118.
Education Bill, 145.
Codliver Oil Bill, 198.

TRAWL FISHING BILL, 38, 43, 62, 108, 122.

TRADING WITH ENEMY BILL, 38, 40, 46.

TIMBER EXPORTATION BILL, 145, 189, 224.

UNION ELECTRIC AND POWER CO. BILL, 38, 42, 47.

VOLUNTEER FORCE BILL, 43, 47.

WAR MEASURES BILL, 21, 22, 28, 31.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL, 54, 92, 105, 122, 198, 224.